

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee
February 10, 2020
Meeting Minutes

COMMITTEE CHAIR HORVATH CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 10:38 A.M.

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions

In attendance were the following voting SBCCOG Board Members:

Christian Horvath, Chair (Redondo Beach)	James Butts (Inglewood)
Chris Pimentel (El Segundo)	Geoff Rizzo (Torrance)
Olivia Valentine (Hawthorne)	

Non-Voting Representatives

Ted Semaan, IWG (Redondo Beach)	Don Szerlip, Metro South Bay Service Council
James Lee, TOWG (Torrance Transit)	

Also in attendance were the following persons:

Cheryl Ebert (El Segundo)	Daniel Kopulsky (Caltrans)
Alex Chou (Lawndale)	Mike Bohlke (Metro Deputy to James Butts)
Tunisia Johnson (Inglewood)	Mark Dierking (Metro)
Lisa Tifiletti (Inglewood)	Craig Hoshijima (Metro)
Omar Pulido (Inglewood)	Laurie Lombardi (Metro)
Nasser Razepoor (Rancho Palos Verdes)	Scott Greene (Metro)
Kim Turner (Torrance Transit)	Jane Cataldo (Lynn Capouya Inc.)
Leslie Scott (Beach Cities Transit)	David Leger (SBCCOG)
Michael Ervin (Sup. Hahn's Office)	Natalie Champion (SBCCOG)
Maryam Adhami (LACDPW)	Steve Lantz (SBCCOG)
Jimmy Shih (Caltrans)	Kim Fuentes (SBCCOG)

II. Consent Calendar

- A. January 13, 2020 Transportation Committee Minutes - APPROVED**
- B. February 2020 Transportation Update – RECEIVED AND FILED**

MOTION by Committee Member Butts, seconded by Committee Member Pimentel, to **APPROVE** the consent calendar. No objection. So ordered.

III. SBCCOG Transportation Working Group Updates

A. Infrastructure Working Group Update

Mr. Semaan reported that the IWG is scheduled to meet later this week so there is nothing new to report since the last meeting. Mr. Semaan noted that a sub-committee meeting was held with representatives from the IWG and Transit Operators Working Group to review Metro Budget Request match policies and project scoring.

B. Transit Operators Working Group Update

Mr. Lee reported that the TOWG met on February 6th and discussed the status of the Measure R Decennial Transfer policy under consideration by the Metro Board. There was additional discussion on the "Micro by Metro" initiative, which is Metro's foray into microtransit. The next TOWG meeting is scheduled for March 5th.

C. Metro Service Council

Mr. Szerlip reported that the Service Council has been focusing on Metro's NextGen Bus Plan. A NextGen Public Workshop was held on February 4th in San Pedro. The next meeting will be combined with a NextGen workshop and will include details on proposed changes to South Bay lines. Mr. Szerlip passed around the

schedule of NextGen workshops, available online here:

http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_Metro%20NextGen%20Workshops%20.pdf

IV. Annual Performance Evaluation Report / Monthly Status Report

Mr. Lantz explained that historically, Metro has required monthly and quarterly reports for Measure R and M projects. Metro recently eliminated the monthly reporting requirement. The monthly reports have provided the data for the Annual Performance Evaluation Report. The draft monthly status report was passed out showing the format going forward. The APE report will be distributed quarterly. The monthly status report is available online: http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_Draft%20SBHP%20Project%20updates.pdf

V. Evaluation Criteria, Match Formula, Project Ranking for Recommended FY 20-21 Metro Budget Request Project Applications – DEFERRED TO MARCH MEETING

Mr. Lantz reviewed Attachment C with the Committee. Mr. Lantz noted that in addition to \$340M in “cost to complete” projects, the SBCCOG received applications for 22 highway and 11 transit projects totaling over \$1B in funding requests. The project applications identified only 1.2% in matching funds in their applications. SBCCOG has had a matching policy for ten years that required no match for projects below \$2 million in cost with an increased match in increments as project costs got larger. The sub-committee of IWG/TOWG representatives proposed a new matching formula as shown in the Attachment C. However, SBCCOG staff is recommending the use of the existing Measure R SBHP policy for this budget request because it allows more projects to be funded (as it requires a greater matching share).

Mr. Semaan noted that the sub-committee’s proposal was written in a way to stimulate project development since it would eliminate the local match up to \$20M and the match has been prohibitive for most SBCCOG cities. He suggested that the breakdown could be revised to still stimulate city projects without requiring a match above the \$2M level like the existing policy requires.

Mr. Szerlip asked if these were the only two options to choose from. Committee Chair Horvath explained that these are just recommendations and that the Committee can adopt whatever breakdown it feels is best.

Ms. Turner asked if the project applications that were submitted in October would be subject to these match breakdowns. Mr. Lantz explained that that is the plan, and that the one policy would apply to both highway and transit project applications.

Committee Member Butts shared his view that the projects and their schedules should drive the funding matrices. He added that he requested Metro staff attend this meeting to provide clarification on what funding is available to be used. Committee Member Butts then introduced Ms. Lombardi and Mr. Hoshijima who explained that in Measure M, there is an annual limit on the amount available to be spent in each MSP. However, in Measure R there is no annual maximum. This means that the SBCCOG can choose to spend up to the balance of the \$906M available through 2039. Mr. Hoshijima clarified that during the Great Recession, the Metro Board enacted a policy that eliminated the use of “inflation funds” previously identified in Metro financial documents, and that since the organization has not recovered from the recession yet, that policy is still in place. This means that the Measure R SBHP only has \$906M in funding, not \$1.5B adjusted for inflation.

Committee Member Butts added that his policy aims to increase the flexibility of the funding and that transit projects have better chances to reduce VMT and GHG emissions more than Caltrans highway projects, and therefore should take priority over Caltrans projects. Mr. Lantz added that the SBHP was originally created to fund highway projects and was expanded through SBCCOG advocacy to also include local projects benefitting the state highway/freeway system.

Committee Member Rizzo shared his view that this item contains too many action items that also require additional information. He recommended that Item 1 be removed from the list, Item 4 requires a decision on the match formula, so the only items to act on would be #2 and #3. Committee Member Rizzo made a MOTION to APPROVE the match formula as recommended by the Subcommittee. Committee Member Butts seconded the motion. Upon further discussion, Committee Member Butts noted that as Metro Chair, he will provide the SBCCOG additional time to submit its Metro Budget Request, and subsequently withdrew his second to the motion. With no second, Committee Member Rizzo withdrew his motion.

Committee Member Butts made a **MOTION** to order the Subcommittee to look at both match scenarios, what projects could be funded under each, and to make a decision at the March meeting. Second by Committee Member Rizzo. No objection. So ordered.

Committee Chair Horvath reminded the Committee that the SBCCOG Board is dark in March, and the Steering Committee acts as Board. Therefore, this item will be acted on by the Transportation Committee and immediately transmitted to the Steering Committee following that meeting for approval. Please be sure to attend these meetings.

VI. Metro NextGen Transit Study Update – RECEIVED AND FILED

Mr. Greene provided a quick presentation to the Committee on Metro's NextGen Bus Plan. Mr. Greene explained that the plan was driven by data (TAP cards and cell phone data) and was used to increase the efficiency of the Metro bus system. A series of workshops are being held throughout the county to review specific changes taking place in each Service Council region. Due to limited time remaining, Mr. Greene urged everyone to check out the Metro website which includes several tools to see proposed route changes, including a trip planner to show current vs. proposed trip times under the new plan. There will also be a presentation to the SBCCOG Board in February on the NextGen Plan. If approved by the Metro Board, implementation would begin December 2020 and continue through 2021.

Mr. Lantz asked if there was coordination with the local municipal operators. Mr. Greene noted that Metro is working closely with the municipal operators to identify overlap and opportunities for the local operators to take over lines Metro no longer will be running.

Mr. Greene handed out a copy of his presentation which is available online here: http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_NextGen%20Bus%20Plan%20presentation.pdf

VII. Three Month Look-Ahead

No discussion on this item.

VIII. Announcements / Adjournment

Committee Chair Horvath adjourned the meeting at 11:47 a.m. to March 9, 2020.