

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee

SBCCOG Office
20285 Western Avenue, Suite 100
Torrance, Ca. 90501

AGENDA (revised) Monday, June 12, 2017 10:30 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.

- 10:30 a.m. Welcome / Self-Introductions
- 10:35 a.m. Consent Calendar – Receive and file
- a. **April 10, 2017 Transportation Committee meeting minutes** (Attachment A, Exhibit 1)
 - b. May 8, 2017 Transportation Committee meeting notes (Attachment A, Exhibit 2)
 - c. June 2017 Transportation Update (Attachment B)
- 10:40 a.m. Measure R South Bay Highway Program Updates
- a. SBHP One-on-One Meetings with Lead Agencies
 - b. Annual Performance Evaluation
 - c. Caltrans Project Permitting Improvement Strategy Update
- 11:00 a.m. Measure M Guidelines Development Updates
- a. Guideline development coordination with other COGs in L. A. County
 - b. Measure M Policy Advisory Council
- 11:20 a. m. Playa del Rey traffic calming project (Attachment C)
- 11:40 a.m. Announcements
- 11:45 a.m. Adjournment

Next Transportation Committee meeting – July 10, 2017, 10:30 a.m.

To include an item in the agenda, e-mail to: lantzsh10@gmail.com by June 26, 2017.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee

April 10, 2017

Minutes

COMMITTEE CHAIR HORVATH CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 10:30AM

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions

In attendance were the following voting SBCCOG Board Members:

Christian Horvath (Redondo Beach)	Kurt Weideman (Torrance)
Hany Fangary (Hermosa Beach)	Jim Butts (Inglewood)
Olivia Valentine (Hawthorne)	

Also in attendance were the following persons:

Hon. Rodney Tanaka (Gardena)	Lance Grindle (LA County Public Works)
David Leger (SBCCOG)	Ted Semaan (Redondo Beach Public Works)
Jacki Bacharach (SBCCOG)	Kelly Lamare (Caltrans)
Steve Lantz (SBCCOG)	Jimmy Shih (Caltrans)
Isidro Panuco (Metro)	Greg Farr (Caltrans)
Mark Dierking (Metro)	Donald Szerlip (Metro South Bay Service Council)
Leslie Scott (Beach Cities Transit)	Orland Rodriguez (El Segundo)
Amy Ahdi (Beach Cities Transit)	Jill Crump (Torrance)
Josie Gutierrez (LA County Public Works)	Stephanie Katsouleas (Manhattan Beach Public Works)
Andres Narvaez (LA County Public Works)	
Robert Torres (LA County Public Works)	

II. Consent Calendar

A. Minutes of March 13, 2017 meeting

B. Monthly Transportation Update

MOTION by Committee Vice Chair Weideman, seconded by Committee Member Valentine, to **APPROVE** the consent calendar. No objection. So ordered.

III. Measure R South Bay Highway Program

A. Metro/SBCCOG Measure R Cooperative Agreement Amendment #1

Jacki Bacharach began by explaining that Metro and the SBCCOG have a cooperative agreement in place for the SBCCOG to oversee the Measure R South Bay Highway Program (SBHP) projects for South Bay jurisdictions. This agreement has been in place since 2012 and expires at the end of May.

Steve Lantz added that the SBCCOG is not responsible for oversight of Caltrans projects and the responsibility lies with Metro. Mr. Lantz then explained the two main changes to the cooperative agreement that are included in the Amendment #1, which would extend the agreement through May 2022. Mr. Lantz explained that Metro added an annual performance measure, called the Annual Performance Evaluation, which requires the SBCCOG to meet with all cities in July of each year to set project milestone accomplishments for the following fiscal year. Metro has set a goal of 80% adherence for individual projects and the SBHP as a whole, with the

objective of holding the local jurisdictions and the SBCCOG accountable for project progress. Mr. Lantz informed the Committee that SBCCOG staff will continue to prepare the monthly project progress and risk report for the Infrastructure Working Group and bring the report to the Committee quarterly as was done for the Steering Committee previously.

Committee Chair Horvath asked Mr. Lantz if the reporting requirements begin when construction on a project begins. Mr. Lantz explained that it begins whenever the local jurisdiction enters into the funding agreement with Metro for the project. Each project receives its own funding agreement with its own unique project milestones determined during that time.

Committee Chair Horvath followed up with a question on whether a city will be penalized for delays or issues outside of their control, such as Caltrans permitting issues. Mr. Lantz said that they would not be, and that the milestones are mostly a goal, not a hard requirement that must be met.

Jacki Bacharach added that she thought it could be good to bring delayed projects to the Transportation Committee monthly, until they are back on schedule or the issue has been resolved.

Donald Szerlip asked what the Transportation Committee can do to help deal with the delays. Mr. Lantz informed him that often times, making the elected officials in a city aware of the delays will help with the issue. Other causes of delay could be issues such as the need for additional funds, which can be dealt with if adequate notice is provided to SBCCOG staff. There were further examples given by Infrastructure Working Group Chair Stephanie Katsouleas, explaining that there is not one fix-all solution to help bring a project back on to schedule, explaining that each situation may be different from the next and require different solutions.

MOTION by Committee Member Butts, seconded by Committee Vice Chair Weideman, to **RECOMMEND BOARD APPROVAL** of the Metro/SBCCOG Measure R Cooperative Agreement Amendment #1. No objection. So ordered.

B. Discussion

a. Quarterly Report & SBHP Project Progress and Risk Report

This item was discussed during the discussion on the Cooperative Agreement Amendment above.

b. Caltrans Project Improvement Strategy

Steve Lantz provided a brief historical context on the need for this concept. He explained that many of the SBHP projects have experienced lengthy delays during the Caltrans permitting process. He added that the SBCCOG hired LRS Project Delivery to develop a strategy to help eliminate the delays so projects were no longer stopped for months at a time waiting for a permit. Mr. Lantz described the Caltrans Project Improvement Strategy as an early collaborative effort between cities along the state highway and Caltrans. The idea would be that cities who have projects along a state highway, such as Pacific Coast Highway would develop a plan for what that corridor would look like. They would then bring that plan to Caltrans for their comments and questions, prior to actually needing the permit. This would allow each of the cities to come back to Caltrans when the permit is needed and be given the permit as long as the design is consistent with what was first approved by Caltrans for the entire corridor.

Jimmy Shih from Caltrans added that Caltrans Permitting staff has offered to meet with cities prior to their application to discuss what will be needed, in hopes of making the process smoother.

Isidro Panuco from Metro also added that there are monthly Caltrans-Metro meetings to review projects and that permitting issues for local jurisdictions may be able to be added to those discussions.

IV. Measure M Guidelines Development

A. Consider Draft SBCCOG letter to Metro re Metro's Draft Measure M Guidelines

B. Guideline development coordination with other COGs in L.A. County

C. Measure M Advisory Council Update

Jacki Bacharach and Steve Lantz updated the Committee on the last Measure M Advisory Council meeting. Ms. Bacharach explained that Metro wanted the Council to serve as a communications channel for the public

and not to provide comments of their own on the guidelines development. Ms. Bacharach added that the Advisory Council did not agree with that and decided to break into three subgroups to discuss recommendations and provide them to Metro. Metro staff indicated that the guidelines must be in place prior to the collection of the tax, meaning that there would be less than three months of development for the guidelines. Ms. Bacharach asked Metro staff during the meeting where in the ordinance it stated the guidelines must be completed prior to the collection of the tax. After further inquiry, it was learned from the Metro legal department that there is no mention of that requirement in the ordinance, meaning the deadline to complete the guidelines is an artificial one. Therefore there may end up being more time to develop the guidelines than originally thought if it is requested.

Mr. Lantz added that the recommendations that are made by the Advisory Council will go straight to the Metro Board, not to Metro staff for their review first.

Ms. Bacharach then reviewed the draft SBCCOG letter to Metro regarding the draft guidelines. The Committee recommended some stylistic edits to the letter, but agreed with the overall points made. These points included the emphasis that the SBCCOG has a greater programming role in subregional programs, that subregional funding amounts should be certain and not up in the air, and that Measure M funds should be able to be used for project studies (project development) considering the broad eligible uses for Measure M funds. Ms. Bacharach and Mr. Lantz will continue to work with other groups such as the Infrastructure Working Group and Transit Operators Working Group to gather further comments on the draft letter prior to the SBCCOG Board action on the letter.

MOTION by Committee Member Butts, seconded by Committee Member Valentine, **to RECOMMEND BOARD APPROVAL** of a letter to Metro regarding the Measure M Guidelines that includes recommended edits from the Transportation Committee, Infrastructure Working Group and Transit Operators Working Group. No objection. So ordered.

Announcements / Adjournment - Next meeting date/time – May 8, 2017 at 10:30am.

MOTION by Committee Vice Chair Weideman, seconded by Committee Member Butts, **TO ADJOURN THIS MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.** No objection. So ordered.

Committee Chair Horvath adjourned the meeting at 11:42 AM.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee

May 8, 2017

Meeting Notes

(NO QUORUM)

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions

In attendance were the following voting SBCCOG Board Members:

Christian Horvath (Redondo Beach)

Kurt Weideman (Torrance)

Olivia Valentine (Hawthorne)

Also in attendance were the following persons:

Don Szerlip (Metro South Bay Service Council)

Josie Gutierrez (LA County Public Works)

David Leger (SBCCOG)

Ted Semaan (Redondo Beach Public Works)

Jacki Bacharach (SBCCOG)

Ken Berkman (El Segundo Public Works)

Steve Lantz (SBCCOG)

Isidro Panuco (Metro)

Lan Saadatnejadi (LRS Program Delivery)

Mike Bohlke (Metro)

James Lee (Torrance Transit)

Godfrey Offoegbu (Torrance Transit)

II. Consent Calendar

A. Minutes of March 13, 2017 meeting

B. Monthly Transportation Update

Steve Lantz briefly reviewed the Monthly Transportation Update with the Committee. Mr. Lantz touched on the Federal budget bill that would continue funding the government through September, and also noted that a separate \$1 Trillion infrastructure bill suggested by President Trump would most likely consist of both public and private investment strategies. Mr. Lantz also reported that Governor Brown signed Senate Bill 1, the transportation/infrastructure funding bill proposed by the State Legislature.

III. Measure R South Bay Highway Program

A. SBHP Project Progress and Risk Report

Jacki Bacharach began by informing the Committee that they will be receiving this report quarterly and that if there were projects experiencing significant issues, those individual projects would be reported on monthly.

Steve Lantz reported that several projects had experienced staffing issues in the past, but that staff has been added and progress is now being made. Mr. Lantz noted that although the staffing issue has been fixed, it won't recover the schedule that has already been lost. Mr. Lantz added that in June, SBCCOG staff will be meeting with each lead agency's Public Works Directors/staff and Metro to review their projects and set project progress milestones for the next year. SBCCOG staff will then monitor the progress throughout the year. This is part of the Annual Performance Evaluation requirement in the Cooperative Agreement between Metro and SBCCOG to administer the SBHP. At the end of each fiscal year, the SBCCOG will report to Metro whether or not each

project met its milestone goals for that year. The goal as set by Metro is for 80% of projects to meet their established milestones. Mr. Lantz informed the Committee that the Risk Report may look slightly different in July as data from the new requirements are incorporated into the report.

Steve Lantz also noted that there will be recommendations to remove projects from the list that have not made significant progress during the past. The funds that were allocated for these projects would be released back to the SBHP for reprogramming. Cities could then reapply for these projects without prejudice when they are ready to work on the projects.

Committee Member Valentine asked Mr. Lantz a question about projects that show no funds having been reimbursed. Mr. Lantz explained that there are a few reasons why they may show no funds being reimbursed: Some cities that have smaller projects choose to request reimbursement after the project is completed because quarterly billing for the small amounts would not be worth the effort required; or, the city has recently submitted for their first reimbursement and it has not yet been fully processed by Metro; or, the city has not completed any reimbursable work on the project.

Committee Chair Horvath asked Mr. Lantz about LA County and Caltrans projects. Mr. Lantz informed him that SBCCOG holds oversight responsibility for the County, but that Metro has the responsibility for Caltrans projects. The SBCCOG reports will still include Caltrans projects.

Committee Member Weideman asked Mr. Lantz if there are projects waiting to be funded after projects are de-obligated from the list. Mr. Lantz answered that there are, and that SBCCOG and Metro staff will sit down with each lead agency again later in the summer to consider new project applications.

Committee Member Valentine asked Mr. Lantz if there was funding available to do studies. Mr. Lantz informed her that studies used to be an eligible use of Measure R funds, but that Metro decided to discontinue SBHP funding eligibility for studies last year. Mr. Lantz added that a city must define a Measure R-funded project using their own funds. Measure R funds are available for environmental clearance, design, right of way and construction.

Caltrans Project Permitting Improvement Strategy Update

Steve Lantz provided an update on the SBCCOG efforts to improve the permitting process for South Bay Highway Program projects needing Caltrans permits. Historically, several SBHP projects have experienced lengthy delays in this stage of the project process. The overall improvement strategy is to have more emphasis at the early planning stages of a project on identifying a design that is acceptable to Caltrans and to look at the street as a corridor as opposed to pursuing discrete projects on an intersection-by-intersection basis.

For example, Pacific Coast Highway may have three discrete segments as you travel from El Segundo, along the Beach Cities, to Torrance, Lomita, and eastward through Wilmington. The corridor as a whole doesn't have a workable standard lane width, etc. The improvement strategy would bring together the local jurisdictions and Caltrans to do "corridor project development" and create the typical cross sections and an understanding of what's doable as you go through each segment of PCH. When the project then reaches the permitting stage, the jurisdiction would not need to request a design exception for the project because the design would have already been approved by Caltrans in the early development and project EIR phases. What this means is that the planning section of Caltrans must work in conjunction with the permitting section and the lead agency must get early concurrence with both Caltrans sections.

Mr. Lantz announced that there will be a meeting with Caltrans District 7 Director Carrie Bowen and her planning deputy on May 24th to review the proposed strategy.

IV. Measure M Guidelines Development

- A. Guideline development coordination with other COGs in L.A. County**
- B. Measure M Advisory Council Update**

C. Consider Draft SBCCOG letter to Metro re Metro's Draft Measure M Guidelines

Jacki Bacharach informed the Committee that the SBCCOG draft letter to Metro was sent around to the other COGs. The COGs held several conference calls to discuss the issues that are important to them. The draft letter has slightly changed format (page numbers added). Ms. Bacharach briefly reviewed the major issues for the COGs: Major issues include: Metro has no role for COGs in the programs and projects to be funded using Measure M; the COGs agree that their cities should not have to work directly with Metro regarding the sub-regional program; Metro has stated that sub-regional funds may only be used for construction and not for planning studies but the COGs would need development funding from Sub-regional funds to create and support the sub-regional programs; and, sub-regional projects are currently funded at a lower priority than regional and Local Return commitments. Language was added to the letter to urge Metro to recognize that a project does not necessarily begin when a shovel hits the ground.

Mr. Lantz added that in specialized programs, such as the Bus Rapid Transit program, Active Transportation and the Visionary Seed Funding, Metro currently has listed Transit Operators as the lead recipient (visionary seed funding) and the only eligible recipient for the other programs (BRT and Active Transportation). Mr. Lantz stated that the SBCCOG disagrees, and that after much spirited discussion with the Transit Operators in the South Bay, the SBCCOG sense is that there is absolutely a role for the Transit Operators when it is within their scope, but that these funds should be eligible for a broader array of projects that may not be transit related. There would be places where the Transit Operators should unquestionably be the lead agencies, but that there may also be places where it is not within their purview, so the SBCCOG was advocating for a broader range of eligible lead agencies for projects.

Committee Member Weideman asked the Transit Operators if they agreed to disagree about this issue. James Lee (Torrance Transit) stated that Mr. Lantz's report was very accurate and that for the most part, the Transit Operators agree with what the SBCCOG has to say. However, there are four areas of disagreement: disagreement over the definitions of terms such as "active transportation" and "first mile - last mile" that have transit-industry-standard definitions; the Visionary Seed Funding; and the issue of ride-hailing services. Mr. Lee stated that they understand why the SBCCOG is advocating for a broader definition, but that the Transit Operators generally feel that the industry standard definition is sufficient. Mr. Lee added that the major disagreement was over the visionary seed funding which the Transit Operators were viewing as an issue of sustainability. Mr. Lee stated that he agrees that there will be great ideas coming from non-Transit Operators, but that Transit Operators do not want to be stuck with the burden of funding the programs that are piloted through the visionary seed funding once that source of funds is exhausted. Regarding the ride hailing services, Mr. Lee stated that the Transit Operators aren't necessarily opposed to expanding it to include services such as Uber and Lyft, but that they have some concerns about safeguards for the vulnerable populations Transit Operators serve (seniors and disabled) using those services. Mr. Lantz added that he didn't feel like the SBCCOG had advocated that Transit Operators be responsible for continuing the funding of programs started through the Visionary Seed Fund and that he agrees whoever applies for those funds should be required to provide a plan for continuing a successful program after the funding is exhausted.

Mr. Szerlip and Committee Chair Horvath both referenced the need to ensure that the letter is in the proper format and structure that will make it easily digestible by Metro staff reading it.

Mr. Lantz explained that the SBCCOG was looking for authorization to send this letter to Metro with the understanding that a follow up letter could be sent if needed. Due to the fact that there was no quorum, authorization to send this letter would need to be requested from the SBCCOG Steering Committee which will be meeting immediately after the Transportation Committee meeting.

Finally, Ms. Bacharach announced that Metro has decided to study the acceleration of the Purple Line extension to Westwood, the people mover to LAX, and the extension of the Sepulveda Tunnel to LAX, in hopes of getting prepared for the possible Olympics in 2024. Mike Bohlke, Deputy to Metro Board Member Butts, pointed out that Board Member Butts had a motion that requires Metro

to study the impact of acceleration of one project on other projects. It is not clear that the impact study will take place. The fear is that these accelerations could cause the Green Line Extension to Torrance to be delayed.

Announcements / Adjournment - *Next meeting date/time – June 12, 2017 at 10:30am.*

Committee Chair Horvath adjourned the meeting at 11:37 AM.

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

June 12, 2017

TO: SBCCOG Transportation Committee
FROM: Steve Lantz, SBCCOG Transportation Director
RE: SBCCOG Transportation Update – June 2017

Adherence to Strategic Plan:

Goal A: Environment, Transportation and Economic Development. Facilitate, implement and/or educate members and others about environmental, transportation and economic development programs that benefit the South Bay.

FEDERAL

Chao Previews FY 17-18 Transportation Budget; Congress Rejects Current FY Cuts

U. S. Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao announced on May 23rd that transportation and infrastructure projects would see a reduced federal footprint in both regulation and funding under President Donald Trump’s proposed fiscal Year 2018 budget and an accompanying infrastructure principles document.

Although federal transportation spending would be cut by 13 percent, the plan recommends setting aside \$200 billion in new budget authority for President Trump’s \$1 Trillion Infrastructure proposal for FY 17-18 that begins on October 1st. The President’s infrastructure initiative includes not only the transportation portion – bridges, roads, ports, transit – but also energy, water, possibly broadband, and possibly VA hospitals.

Chao noted that the Trump infrastructure initiative will likely be released in the summer when infrastructure earmarks will be competing with must-pass aviation, debt ceiling and other spending bills. According to Chao, the infrastructure plan would cost \$1 trillion over 10 years, \$200 billion of which would be direct federal funding. The Office of Management and Budget projects \$5 billion in outlays from that initiative in fiscal 2018, with the balance being spent in future budgets through fiscal 2026. However, Chao estimated lawmakers will need to come up with \$200 billion in offsetting budget cuts, and that the cuts would be used to leverage about \$1 trillion worth of overall investment through financing and funding strategies like public-private partnerships and toll revenues over the next decade.

The Trump budget would eliminate funding for new TIGER grants and capital grants that support transit capital investments beyond those already in the transit administration’s pipeline. Local and state governments would be fully responsible for future public transit programs under the Trump plan.

The budget reiterates other proposals the administration laid out earlier this year in its “skinny” budget, including an end to funding for long-haul Amtrak routes and the termination of federal subsidies for commercial passenger air service to rural airports through the Essential Air Service program. An infrastructure fact sheet raises the prospect of expanding tolling on existing federal highways, allowing private companies to build and maintain interstate rest stops and expanding a program that provides loans for surface transportation projects.

On May 2nd, Congress ignored the President’s request for immediate cuts in the current fiscal year budget and passed a \$1.2 trillion federal funding bill that covers federal spending through September 30th. The bill has more than \$2.6 billion for California transportation projects, including \$1.6 billion for transit capital projects across the state and \$528 million in emergency road repair funding. In addition, \$500 million nationally was earmarked to continue the federal TIGER program that Trump proposed to eliminate entirely, and \$3 billion was allocated to the Community Development Block Grant program which the Trump administration had proposed cutting to \$1.5 billion

It is unclear if USDOT will make grant awards by September 30. The bill urges the Federal Transit Administration to keep infrastructure funding moving forward by writing checks for the transit projects that already have grant agreements, and — most importantly — to set aside funding this year for the scores of projects across the nation with new grant agreements ready to sign this year. However, the Trump Administration could simply stop executing the project agreements in the federal funding pipeline.

STATE

SB 775 Would Replace And Significantly Change The State Cap-And-Trade Program

California State Senator Bob Wieckowski, chair of the Senate Environmental Quality Committee, introduced SB 775 on May 2nd to significantly modify California’s current greenhouse gas emission strategy—the cap-and-trade program that expires in 2020. If approved by a 2/3 vote of the legislature, the bill would establish a new program with a new set of metrics for pricing carbon dioxide; return auction revenues to consumers through a climate rebate / dividend; and, potentially, provide more legal certainty.

SB 775 would establish an entirely new trading system, starting in 2020 and continuing indefinitely. Allowances and offsets from the old program would not transfer into the new program. New allowances would be issued in 2020 and trading would begin anew. All allowances in the system would be auctioned. None would be allocated for free since there would be no carbon offsets found in the current program that allow complying with a carbon cap by paying someone else to reduce carbon.

Prices for allowances will be contained by a “price collar” that establishes both a floor and a ceiling. In 2021, the minimum credit is estimated to cost \$20 which is significantly higher than the last auction’s results of roughly \$13. The maximum would be \$30. By 2030, the formula in the measure allows the cost ceiling to rise to \$100 plus inflation for each credit. The new design, unfettered with the previously accumulating credits, could generate \$6-9 billion dollars in 2021.

Revenues from the cap and trade program quarterly auctions would be allocated into three funding pots: one for climate research; one to fund climate adaptation, and infrastructure—with

particular attention to disadvantaged communities; and a third pot to provide consumer rebates, on a per capita basis, to offset an expected increase in the price of gasoline and carbon-based products in California and to keep the state economy competitive with other foreign and out-of-state companies. The proportionate allocation of the revenues to each of the three pots would be determined by subsequent state legislation that would require a simple majority vote rather than the 2/3rds vote needed to create the new fee.

The bill also includes The Economic Competitiveness Assurance program that would create a border adjustment (fees) that foreign and out-of-state companies would have to pay. The California Air Resources Board would develop the carbon pricing structure for these foreign and out-of-state companies.

Caltrans Issues First Statewide Bike and Pedestrian Plan

Caltrans released the final draft of its first-ever statewide bike and pedestrian plan on May 23rd. *Toward an Active California* outlines the policies and measures that the state can take to help reach its goals of increasing bicycling and walking in California while reducing fatalities among bike riders and pedestrians.

The plan's stated vision is that, "By 2040, people in California of all ages, abilities, and incomes can safely, conveniently, and comfortably walk and bicycle for their transportation needs." It is designed to complement local and regional active transportation plans that are now at various stages of development throughout the state.

While the department does not have jurisdiction over local transportation planning or policies off of state highways, Caltrans believes a statewide plan that provides a cohesive vision for safe, comfortable biking and walking in California communities is an important first step towards making that happen. It is written as a guide to planning and developing infrastructure for people who don't use cars, and, importantly, to guide future investments in the state highway system. It is also aimed at improving bike and pedestrian connections among local and regional roads, public transit, and intercity and passenger rail.

The plan includes strategies aimed at achieving targets from the Caltrans Strategic Management Plan, specifically to double the number of trips made by walking, triple the number of trips made by bike, and double transit use – all by 2020 – as well as reduce bicycle and pedestrian fatalities by ten percent per year. The plan also has a goal to increase the number of complete streets projects in California by twenty percent.

Important and innovative ideas in the plan include: creating a universal elementary school curriculum on safely traveling by bike and foot; improving data collection on collisions and near-misses, and getting a better idea how many bikers and pedestrians are out there now; training for police and diversion programs for ticketed bicyclists; setting lower speed limits; training transportation planners to think about complete networks; and, investing in new networks.

REGION

San Pedro And Wilmington Bike Share Program To Start July 31st

Just in time for end-of-summer events — including what is expected to be a strongly attended Fleet Week — the county's bike share program will debut July 31 along the LA Waterfront that runs through San Pedro and Wilmington. Payment kiosks at each station allow riders to use

either their Metro TAP card or credit card to purchase an annual flex pass, a monthly pass and/or rent a bike for an individual trip.

There will be a dozen or more bike stations scattered along or near the waterline through San Pedro and Wilmington. Waterfront stations will be installed at San Pedro's Fanfare Fountain, Cabrillo Beach, the Battleship USS Iowa, Crafted at the Port of L.A. and Ports O' Call Village. In Wilmington, stations are slated for the Wilmington Waterfront Park and Banning's Landing, at Avalon Boulevard and Anaheim Street in Wilmington, and near the Crowne Plaza Hotel on Sixth Street in San Pedro

Declining ridership Prompts Metro To Consider Overhauling Regional Bus System

Amid declining bus ridership, Metro is looking into overhauling and updating its bus transit network as a way to bring more people back to its system. Metro's plan includes working with the 16 other agencies in the county on ways the systems can better integrate with and complement each other.

While train ridership has increased, the number of people using buses throughout the Metro system fell 18% percent in April, compared with the same month two years ago. The Silver Line, Metro's express bus service between San Pedro and El Monte, saw ridership fall 8% in April, compared with the same month last year.

Although Metro has made a significant investment in its rail system and has tweaked its bus routes when new rail segments have opened, there hasn't been a systemwide study of the bus network in the past 25 years. The purpose of the study is to find out from riders where the buses need to be and when they need to be there. Metro will conduct a full bus system study beginning January 2018. The results will be presented to the Metro Board in the spring of 2019, after which changes to the bus system could be implemented to overhaul the entire system.

Metro Approves Development of SmartPhone Fare Payment System

The Metro Board on May 25th approved a contract extension through 2024 with Cubic Corporation in which Cubic will develop Nextlink, a cloud-based fare payment system that will link the legacy TAP system to programs and services such as a new TAP mobile payment app, Bike Share, fare subsidy programs, parking, and ride-hailing services using a mobile and smartphone application.

Cubic currently provides Metro's fare collection systems including the TAP card. The development costs will be borne by Cubic, in exchange for sales transaction fees of 0.5-3.0%, based on use of mobile app and TAP retail fare sales for five (5) years of operation after development.

TRENDS

Amazon Creating Air Traffic Control System For Autonomous Drone Deliveries

Amazon announced on May 19th it is building a new development center in Clichy, France to create a traffic control system for the company's planned fleet of delivery drones. The new system is being developed to coordinate with other air traffic control systems to make sure that drones don't interfere with other aircraft, and that Amazon's delivery drones have the necessary on-board artificial intelligence to avoid obstacles at low altitudes such as construction cranes, rooftop antennas, and birds in flight.

Amazon has said about 85 percent of the products on its website are light enough to be delivered by drone. When making a delivery, Amazon has proposed the vehicles will fly at heights between 200 feet and 400 feet. The drones, which will operate autonomously without a pilot, will fly at speeds up to 50 miles per hour.

In addition to building tools for managing its own drone fleet, Amazon said it has also been working with the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration, European Union and other countries to develop a broader traffic control system for coordinating all drone flights in the air. Collision avoidance has been listed as one of the challenges drone delivery companies must solve before Federal Aviation Administration will approve U. S. remote-controlled or autonomous drone delivery programs.

Uber Opens Its First Public Transit Service In Innisfil, Canada

Innisfil, a Canadian town north of Toronto on Lake Superior with no local public transit service, has contracted with Uber to operate a 2-route public transit system. The town has set aside about \$74,000 US to subsidize Uber fixed route and rideshare services. On May 15th, the town inaugurated a one-year pilot program for the town's 36,000 people.

Innisfil's political leaders wanted a public transit service consisting of two bus routes through town — one north-south and the other east-west. They estimated the two routes would cost more than \$442,000 US in the first year which they decided was not financially feasible. The money will cover the difference in the cost of a ride and a fixed rate paid by passengers, as well as a discount ride for rides on other non-fixed route trips in the town.

To overcome one concern that the reliance on smartphones and credit or debit cards in these arrangements would exclude those who have neither, Innisfil's program allows passengers to send a text message to Uber if they do not own a smartphone with the Uber app, for example. Anyone in town with a mobile phone, and a credit or debit card, can summon a car, which they might share with another passenger going the same way. Town leaders say they are still working on solutions for people needing to pay cash.

In response to concerns from local taxi operators, the town changed its taxi laws to allow drivers to charge less to compete with Uber and refunded fees paid by local taxi operators for the first year of the Uber deal. One of Innisfil's taxi companies has signed a similar partnership with the town to provide service for passengers with special transit needs, such as disabled people. They can use the taxi company's 24-hour call center instead of a mobile phone and get the same subsidized service.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

June 12, 2017

TO: SBCCOG Transportation Committee

FROM: Jacki Bacharach, SBCCOG Executive Director
Steve Lantz, SBCCOG Transportation Director

SUBJECT: City of Los Angeles Vista Del Mar Restriping Project

Adherence to Strategic Plan:

Goal B: Regional Advocacy. Advocate for the interests of the South Bay. Strategy 3 – Maintain and continue to nurture effective relationships with regional, state and federal representatives and other policy and regulatory bodies to advocate for interests of the South Bay and to protect against mandates, programs and initiatives that would have a negative effect on the sub-region.

BACKGROUND

L. A City Councilman Mike Bonin announced on May 25th that by the end of June Vista Del Mar, Pershing Drive, Culver Boulevard and Jefferson Boulevard will be restriped to reduce travel lanes from two lanes to one lane in each direction to improve safety and calm traffic in Playa del Rey. Bonin's goal is to create safer streets for people using all modes of travel (pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists) by adding bicycle lanes, increasing parking inventory, reducing speeding, and curbing the use of Playa del Rey streets as a short-cut from the South Bay to points north.

The city restriped Vista del Mar beginning on May 25th between Westchester Parkway and Culver Boulevard, moving all of the parking to the west side of the street, creating U-turn pockets, and narrowing the road to one lane in each direction. On June 3, the Bureau of Street Services will begin resurfacing and reconfiguring Pershing Drive from Imperial Boulevard to Culver Boulevard. When the resurfacing is done, LADOT also will restripe Culver Boulevard from Vista del Mar to Jefferson Boulevard and Jefferson Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard (Culver Boulevard is already a single lane in each direction from Jefferson Boulevard to Lincoln Boulevard.). Once the restriping is completed, all three streets will have one travel lane in each direction, as well as center turn lanes and bike lanes.

The project received little advance notice or formal public review. No outreach was made to adjacent South Bay communities. A staff member in Bonin's office said the Vista del Mar project resulted from a traffic fatality and resulting lawsuit. The other projects are part of a community-generated traffic calming program. In a Playa del Rey community newsletter, Bonin noted that the new lane configurations are pilot programs, using low-cost and temporary materials. Once the work is completed and motorists adjust to the new configuration, Bonin said the city will be able to evaluate impacts, gather data and public input, analyze whether impacts are positive or not, and adjust accordingly.

According to the Council office, the projects contain elements that are both statutory and categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). AB 417, signed into law in October 2013, exempts from review a bike plan and its projects to the extent its impacts are limited to traffic, bicycle parking infrastructure, and signage. The law created a new

statutory exemption from CEQA until January 1, 2018, for bicycle transportation plans (as defined by Cal. Streets and Highways Code § 891.2) for an urbanized area (as defined by the CEQA Guidelines § 15387) for restriping of streets and highways, bicycle parking and storage, signal timing to improve street and highway intersection operations, and related signage for bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles. The new CEQA exemption is codified at Public Resources Code § 21080.20.5.

The contact for the project is Jessie Holzer, Councilman Bonin's Mobility Deputy, who can be reached at jessie.holzer@lacity.org or 310-575-8461.

RECOMMENDATION

Discuss and provide direction.