

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee

July 10, 2017

Minutes

COMMITTEE CHAIR HORVATH CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 10:35 AM

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions

In attendance were the following voting SBCCOG Board Members:

Christian Horvath, Chair (Redondo Beach)

Olivia Valentine (Hawthorne)

Hany Fangary (Hermosa Beach)

Jeff Duclos (Hermosa Beach)

Kurt Weideman, Vice Chair (Torrance)

Jim Osborne (Lawndale)

Non-Voting Representatives

Donald Szerlip, Metro South Bay Sector Council

Ted Semaan, IWG (Redondo Beach)

James Lee, Transit Operators (Torrance Transit)

Also in attendance were the following persons:

David Leger (SBCCOG)

Jacki Bacharach (SBCCOG)

Steve Lantz (SBCCOG)

Mike Bohlke (Metro)

Joyce Rooney (Beach Cities Transit)

Leslie Scott (Beach Cities Transit)

Godfrey Offoegbu (Torrance Transit)

Josie Gutierrez (LA County Public Works)

Rob Beste (Torrance)

Jimmy Shih (Caltrans)

Christine Song (Caltrans)

Orlando Rodriguez (El Segundo)

Frank Senteno (Lawndale)

II. Consent Calendar

A. Minutes of June 12, 2017 meeting – approved as presented.

B. July 2017 Transportation Update – received and filed.

C. Consent Calendar - MOTION by Committee Vice Chair Weideman, seconded by Committee Member Osborne, to APPROVE the consent calendar. No objection. So ordered.

D. S . B. 1 Overview -Steve Lantz reviewed the SB1 funding details using a chart that illustrates the different sources and allocations of funds authorized by SB1. The chart can be found online at: http://www.southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_SB1%20allocation%20summary%20PPT%20version.pdf

Mr. Lantz reported that he recently attended a CALCOG meeting on SB1. Mr. Lantz explained that there is discussion going on in Sacramento on how to begin spending SB1 funds. Some decision makers want to allocate the first couple of years' funds prior to development of detailed procedures and guidelines to ensure that money is being spent and projects are being started. The rationale behind this is that there is an effort underway to repeal SB1. The State would be able to show voters that funds are being used to improve the roads throughout the state and therefore possibly sway voters from signing the petition. If the State drafts the guidelines first, there will be several months delay in the spending of funds.

Mr. Szerlip asked Mr. Lantz if there are protections in place to ensure that the funds brought in through SB1 are specifically used for the transportation related items as was the intent of the legislation, as opposed to being diverted to something else such as the general fund. Mr. Lantz explained that SB1 has restrictions in it that are supposed to protect these funds from situations such as that.

Committee Vice Chair Weideman commented that it seems disingenuous that revenues from the gas tax increase wouldn't be used quickly. Mr. Lantz explained that this is the core of the disagreement between the

State and the COGs. The State (Caltrans and the CTC) want to develop the guidelines first, and then give out the money. The COGs want the first couple years' worth of funds given out quickly, under the broadest guidelines possible, so that projects can get started. While those projects are underway, the more detailed guidelines could be developed for future year allocations.

Committee Chair Horvath asked Mr. Lantz if the Transportation Improvement Fee would impact the Green Line extension to Torrance. Mr. Lantz explained that it is not a likely source of for the Green Line project.

Mr. Lee asked Mr. Lantz if there was any sense of the prospects of the repeal movement's success at the CALCOG meeting. Mr. Lantz explained that it is so early in the process that nobody knows if they will be successful or not. The organizers must still collect the required number of signatures to even place the item on the November 2018 ballot.

III. Measure R South Bay Highway Program Updates

A. SBHP One-on-One Meetings with Lead Agencies – Steve Lantz reported that SBCCOG staff has met with City staff from each of the cities to review their projects and review the new Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) requirement with them (see APE detail below). Mr. Lantz added that normally, new project requests are accepted at this time of the year, but they will be accepted in early fall this year instead.

B. Annual Performance Evaluation

The SBCCOG / Metro SBHP Cooperative Agreement includes a new Annual Performance Evaluation requirement. For each project, a City must provide to the SBCCOG in June each year anticipated project milestone schedule goals that will be accomplished during the subsequent fiscal year that begins July 1st. SBCCOG staff will monitor the progress and report monthly to the IWG and quarterly to the Transportation Committee. 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 planned project progress schedule milestones.

Mr. Lantz then briefly reviewed a presentation on how to fill out the new APE Milestone Tool. The presentation can be viewed online at:

http://www.southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/PRESENTATION_SBHP%20Annual%20Performance%20Evaluation%20Project%20Management%20Milestone%20Tool.pdf

Committee Vice Chair Weideman asked Mr. Lantz how the scoring will be done. Mr. Lantz explained that 80% of the total number of milestones for all of the projects within the SBHP program must meet their planned milestones by the end of FY17-18. The milestones are physical progress related milestones such as design, right of way, and construction.

Committee Member Valentine asked Mr. Lantz if this same process will be done in Measure M as well. Mr. Lantz explained that the Measure M program is very different than the Measure R program, so it is too early to determine if the APE will be used in that program as well. Mr. Lantz added that the Measure M administrative guidelines are still being written which will determine what kinds of projects or strategies are able to be funded. He also noted that Measure M may fund more “strategies” than the physical improvements that are typically funded using Measure R, which would require a different evaluation tool than the APE, since the APE tracks physical progress.

IV. Measure M Guidelines Development Updates

A. Measure M Master Guidelines

Committee Chair Horvath began by congratulating Ms. Bacharach, Mr. Lantz, and all of those who engaged with Metro on the Measure M Master Guidelines because, in his view, the South Bay sub-region came out a winner in the process.

Mr. Lantz reported that the only major outstanding issue from previous guideline drafts were the amount/ source of administrative funding for the Measure M Multi-year Subregional Programs (MSPs) and what entity will administer them. The adopted Master Guidelines allow for 0.5% of the funds allocated to each subregional program each year to be used for administrative funding. In the South Bay, the SBCCOG will administer four MSPs. There should be approximately \$200,000 annually available for program administration and project development.

Mr. Lantz reviewed the Measure M Master Guidelines (Attachment D) and noted other key policy changes, including the Metro Board decision in June that there will not be a Local Return supplemental allocation floor for cities that have resident populations smaller than their employment populations. The Local Return allocations will continue to be based solely on each jurisdiction's per-capita share of countywide resident population. Mr. Lantz also reported that the Metro board approved a change in the performance measure by which it will select and evaluate Measure M projects from Level of Service to Vehicle Miles Travelled in all Measure M funding categories. This change will affect the types of projects that are funded through Measure M and opens up the opportunity for a broader range of projects than are eligible in Measure R.

B. Measure M Policy Advisory Council (PAC)

Ms. Bacharach announced that the PAC is going to continue meeting monthly to help draft the administrative guidelines for the Measure M programs as well as provide policy input to the Metro Board on Metro's update of its Long-Range Transportation Plan.

V. Update on Metro Green Line Extension

Mr. Lantz announced that Metro staff will be meeting with the cities of Lawndale, Redondo Beach, and Torrance to discuss the scope of an Alternatives Analysis for the planned Green Line extension to Torrance. The analysis should be completed by the Fall and would influence the scope of the Draft EIR that is being updated by Metro staff.

Mr. Lantz also reported that many other subregions are looking into accelerating their Major Measure M projects from the schedule in the Measure M Expenditure Plan by using funding outside the projected Measure M funding for Major Projects. He also noted that Metro has a policy that before an acceleration is approved, they must study the proposed acceleration's potential to delay other projects.

Mr. Bohlke added that discussing acceleration is in a way like opening up Pandora's Box because it leads to a lot of other potential issues such as overextension of funds, the need to finance the acceleration with borrowing / bonding, the need to secure funds to run the new lines earlier than planned in the Measure M expenditure plan, etc. He noted that Measure M operating and maintenance funds have the highest priority for Measure M which could result in the deferral of highway and transit capital projects. Ms. Bacharach proposed having a representative from Metro make a presentation on the Green Line Extension studies at an upcoming Transportation Committee meeting.

VI. Playa del Rey traffic calming project Update

Mr. Lantz announced that LADOT will be holding an "open house" on the project at Loyola Marymount University on July 29th

Committee Member Duclos asked if the SBCCOG's position has changed since the issue arose, noting that it seems like most people are upset with the process that took place, and the fact that the City of LA is looking at these streets as local residential streets when in fact they are regional arterials carrying 25,000+ cars each day. Mr. Lantz agreed that the street needs to be looked at as an arterial, and that the South Bay should consider its major arterials in the same way in the event that similar projects are proposed in the sub-region. Ms. Bacharach noted that perhaps the Measure M administrative guidelines should address the difference between a regional arterial and a local street.

VII. Announcements / Adjournment - Next meeting date/time –August 14, 2017 at 10:30am.

Ms. Bacharach announced the upcoming Broadband Brown Bag workshop taking place on July 13th.

Joyce Rooney announced that there will be a Living Streets workshop for Aviation Blvd on July 17th in Manhattan Beach to discuss setting policies for these types of projects.

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

Committee Chair Horvath adjourned the meeting at 11:50 AM.