

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.