

Status of SBCCOG Concerns with Metro Proposed Ballot Measure (PBM)

South Bay PBM Concerns	Metro staff 6/9/16 Recommendation	Notes
Local Return should be no less than 20%	Through 2039 (when Measure R expires), increased from 16% to 17% using 1% of administration funding; after 2040 (when Measure X becomes 1-cent) Local Return is increased from 16% to 20% using 3% from Highway Capital Sub-fund and 1% from Transit Capital Sub-fund	Local jurisdictions need 20% now, not after 2040 if they are going to continue pavement management programs and transit services.
Local Return should not have earmarks	Proposed earmarks have been removed from the staff recommendation	
Local Return should be allocated based on: 1/3 on population, 1/3 on lane miles, 1/3 on sales tax generated	No change from current allocation based on population only.	
South Bay Highway Operational Improvements should continue	Line 63 - Continued through 2057 with a total of \$1.1 bil.	What happens after 2057?
There should be a sub-regional fund for complete streets, sustainability, private sector innovation, etc.	Line 66 - South Bay Transportation System and Mobility Improvement Program; 2018 - 2057; increased from \$350 mil. to \$643.5 mil. to reflect savings on Green Line South estimate and elimination of subregional contribution to I-105 ExpressLanes project.	What happens after 2057?
2% for Access Services and senior programs may be insufficient	No change.	
Green Line South should start construction during first decade (2018, not 2031)	Scheduled from 2026-30, accelerated 5 years	This so-called SBGLE "acceleration" is really only a net 2 years NOT 5 years, heretofore Metro always used "Funds Available Beginning" (2028) column in the Measure R Exp Plan; for the PBM they suddenly used the "Expected Completion" column that was 3 years farther out.
Continue development of Crenshaw North rail project to be constructed after Green Line South Project	Scheduled for 2041-47	11 year gap in Crenshaw line South and North construction
I-105 ExpressLane should not use sub-regional funding	South Bay funding share reduced from 100% to 0%, scheduled from 2044-46	
I-405 / I-110 Interchange should be improved	Scheduled for 2043-2047	No change
I-110 ExpressLane should be extended from SR91 to I-405	Scheduled for 2044-2046	No change
I-405 South Bay Curve should be improved	Scheduled for 2045-2047	No change
Eliminate PBM sunset or match on-going 1/4-cent for <u>regional</u> state of good repair /debt service with 1/4-cent for <u>local</u> state of good repair and debt service	Sunset provision eliminated. Schedules were not adjusted post 2057.	
3% Local Contribution to Rail Projects should be eliminated	Board changed use of 3% contribution for baseline projects to be used 100% for Active Transportation Projects in the community surrounding the station.	With this change, there is now no clear nexus between project costs and the 3% Local Match for ATP investments.
An extension of the Green Line from Torrance to L.B. Blue Line or San Pedro should be developed	Studies will be completed to evaluate a future Green Line Connection to the Blue Line (City of Long Beach). No capital funds from the Green Line to Torrance project will be used for the studies.	Schedule for the study not stated in Expenditure Plan
Is 2% of state of good repair sufficient?	No change.	
Complete Measure R commitments before starting new projects	Not implemented. Metro staff disagrees with policy; only willing to "not delay" Measure R projects when adding new projects.	Performance Metrics : A project with known characteristics that were determined through analysis such as an AA or technical refinement study are disadvantaged over a project that can be assigned unrealistic or enhanced attributes. This allows for newer less defined projects to rise to the top.
<i>NEW 3% Provision; SBCCOG has no recommendation yet</i>	3% local contribution to rail project is based on total centerline miles of project in the jurisdiction and only if the jurisdiction has at least one station	Some of the 3% issues are subject to further negotiation within PBM Guidelines rather than the Ordinance. The negotiations are not expected to take place until October or later.
<i>NEW 3% Provision; SBCCOG has no recommendation yet</i>	Definition of project cost is unclear.	Is it 3% of the projected cost just through the jurisdiction or 3% of costs for the proportion of centerline miles in the city within the entire project length?
What is the source, scope of the cost estimate used to determine the 3% local share? <i>NEW 3% Provision; SBCCOG has no recommendation yet</i>	The source of the cost estimate is determined at the conclusion of preliminary engineering (30% design).	Does the cost only include construction or does it also include ROW acquisition? Is there a reduction in the cost estimate for projected revenue derived from station area development or sale of surplus property?
What is the mechanism used to determine the 3% local share? <i>NEW 3% Provision; SBCCOG has no recommendation yet</i>	At the conclusion of preliminary engineering (30% plans), Metro and the local jurisdiction approve an agreement that sets the 3% contribution amount and schedule of payments. Once approved, the amount to be paid shall not be subject to further cost increases.	If the local jurisdiction does not timely execute the agreement, Metro can withhold the local jurisdiction's entire PBM Local Return allocation for up to 15 years and use the withheld revenues to pay the 3% cost. No explanation of what happens with cost savings.
What control does the local jurisdiction have over the project scope and cost? How can Metro mandate a 3% local share if the local jurisdiction has no approval / veto authority? <i>NEW 3% Provision; SBCCOG has no recommendation yet</i>		For example, could the local jurisdiction require the elimination of all stations within their jurisdiction to eliminate the need for the 3% contribution? Or, could the local jurisdiction require that the tracks be built at grade rather than grade separated over busy intersections to reduce the project costs and the city's 3% costs?

<p>What control does the local jurisdiction have over the terms of the 3% agreement. What if the local jurisdiction refuses to timely execute an agreement? <i>NEW 3% Provision; SBCCOG has no recommendation yet</i></p>	<p>Metro staff recommends that the ordinance provides the authority for Metro to withhold a local jurisdiction's <u>entire</u> PBM Local Return allocation for 15 years to pay the 3% local share. If the entire share is not paid from the withheld revenues by the end of 15 years, the balance of the 3% debt is forgiven.</p>	<p>By committing their entire PBM Local Return revenue stream for up to 15 years, the local jurisdictions may save the remainder of the 3% cost, as Metro staff states, but the local jurisdiction would have no PBM Local Return funding for local transit or local streets. Why would local jurisdictions allow this provision in the ordinance?</p>
<p><i>NEW Provision; SBCCOG has no recommendation yet</i></p>	<p>Metro Board will complete a comprehensive assessment every ten years, beginning in 2027. Any additions to the Expenditure Plan by the Metro Board would be through this dicennial process and could not delay current projects in the Plan.</p>	
<p>Cost savings from completed sub regional projects or programs should be reallocated on the diennial schedule by the sub-region governance authority responsible for implementation of sub-regional projects. <i>NEW Provision; SBCCOG has no recommendation yet</i></p>	<p>Cash savings from completed sub-regional projects or programs will be returned to the appropriate geographic subregion or system connectivity program, to maintain equity, and may also be reallocated through the diennial process by the Metro Board.</p>	
<p>Process to place ballot on November 2016 election ballot <i>NEW Provision; SBCCOG has no recommendation yet</i></p>	<p>Staff recommends a Board resolution to place measure on November 8 ballot. Staff recommends \$10.9 million be approved from current FY 16-17 budget to support costs of adding the measure to the ballot (\$8.3 mil,) and to support public education during the independent campaign (\$2.6 mil.)</p>	