

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.