



20285 S. Western Ave., #100
Torrance, CA 90501
(310) 371-7222
sbccog@southbaycities.org
www.southbaycities.org

December 11, 2017

Therese McMillan, Chief Planning Office
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Draft Measure M Administrative Guidelines Comments and Concerns

Dear Ms. McMillan:

This memo is written to document the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) initial comments and concerns with the revised Measure M Administrative Procedures: Multi-Year Sub-Regional Programs 5-Year Plan Process and other draft policy papers discussed at the December 5, 2017 Policy Advisory Committee meeting. These comments were reviewed and approved by the SBCCOG Transportation and Steering Committees. We expect to provide additional comments as future versions are circulated, but we wanted to submit our initial comments by December 11 as requested by Metro staff.

DRAFT MEASURE M ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES

Section 1, Step 2 – Five Year Forecast

ADDITION OF CORRIDOR PROJECT DEFINITION:

The guidelines should explicitly define corridor plans which would include several related initiatives as a project within the MSP definition. The Measure M administrative guidelines also need to include corridor program development as project development. The guidelines should include an explicit statement such as, "Development of a corridor planning document to identify a program of improvement initiatives is considered an eligible project expense to be included in the Five-Year Plan"

Utilizing a programmatic corridor approach to streamline project delivery for the Measure M MSP highway program will allow Caltrans and other local agencies to collaboratively define long-term/ultimate transportation concepts within a common corridor footprint. As mentioned during Caltrans' SB1 outreach, this concept has received broad support from both cities and Caltrans staff. The SBCCOG expects to include several corridor projects in its initial 5-year program since this approach is particularly beneficial for projects that cross local jurisdictional boundaries and those involving segments of the state highway system.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ACTION

Carson El Segundo Gardena Hawthorne Hermosa Beach Inglewood Lawndale Lomita
Manhattan Beach Palos Verdes Estates Rancho Palos Verdes Redondo Beach Rolling Hills
Rolling Hills Estates Torrance Los Angeles District #15 Los Angeles County

An additional benefit of this approach is that, once the corridor footprint is defined, any project lead agency along the corridor will only need to demonstrate consistency with the master corridor footprint for Caltrans encroachment permit processing.

Section 1, Step 2 – Preliminary list of Projects

DOCUMENTATION OF AGREEMENT ON FIVE YEAR PLAN:

The current guidelines require, "... a representation that the requestor has approval of all entities in the sub-region that are eligible to receive MSP funding." We are concerned with the practicality of obtaining approval of all eligible recipients, let alone as a pre-condition of executing a funding agreement to prepare a 5-Year plan. We recommend instead that the sub-region provide proof to Metro of an approval action by its Board of Directors to accept MSP funding and that all of the cities have been informed of the recommended approval action and have been provided an opportunity to participate in the program under which the actions are being recommended, and that the Board has taken into consideration any potentially-eligible entity's comments and concerns.

Section 1, Step 2, Sub-section V – Preliminary List of Projects & Five-Year Plan

PROJECT DELIVERY:

It may not be possible to deliver a project within a five-year program timeframe, especially if projects require environmental clearance. In the Measure R South Bay Highway program, we have determined it is more realistic to identify the scope and costs of project milestones that will be completed within a five-year period. The funding agreements are executed only for the included milestones with subsequent milestones included in funding agreements after annual updates determine their inclusion is timely.

Section 1, Step 2, Sub-section VI

EXAMPLES:

The current guidelines require project sponsors to develop a nexus finding for their project with a MSP program type. The guidelines should include examples of eligible projects for each of the types of MSP programs. Although the sub-regions will develop detailed MSP policies and procedures for the MSPs in their sub-region, it would be helpful for Metro to include a list that would provide sample project descriptions for each type of MSP program, but not limit the types of eligible projects. The list would be similar to the example lists that are included in Local Return guidelines for Proposition A, C and Measure R.

Additionally, while transportation demand management is already eligible, funding broadband infrastructure and other technologies that support trip elimination and reduction of vehicle miles travelled to encourage and enable working at home or in neighborhood centers should be listed as examples.

Section 1, Step 5 – Annual Update

UPDATE PROCESS:

The SBCCOG intends to institute an annual update process of the initial 5-year Plan. This provides the opportunity to update costs and schedules and to add and delete projects and milestones. However, we are concerned that there will be insufficient administrative funding within the 0.5% administrative cap for each of the MSP programs for this very important update. From our experience with the Measure R program, this annual update process is essential to the success of the program because it continuously involves new elected officials and staff that represent our local jurisdictions in the process.

Section 5

Similar to the comments noted above (in Section 1, Step 2, Sub-section V, the guidelines should be changed to reflect the completion of project milestones within the 5-year plan rather than completion of the entire project.

3% LOCAL CONTRIBUTION TO MAJOR TRANSIT PROJECTS

Eligible Fund Contributions

APPROVAL PROCESS:

It is unrealistic to require MSP contributions to be accompanied by documented agreement from all jurisdictions that would otherwise be eligible for those sub-regional funds. The decision-maker for allocation of these funds in each sub-region is the relevant council of governments. Each of the COGs will have to adopt its process for determining how allocations will be approved. Metro should not administratively impose a 100% affirmative vote on the use of any sub-regional allocations.

Early 3% Contributions

PROJECT REQUIREMENTS:

Two of the three local jurisdictions in the next segment of the Green Line South are working with Metro staff to develop transit centers on the prospective station sites that likely will be constructed before the rail segment is environmentally cleared. The local jurisdictions are willing to coordinate the design of the transit centers to allow subsequent integration of the rail line station and to pay the early design and construction costs needed to expedite the transit centers opening as long as the early expenditures are allowed as eligible credits to meet their required 3% contribution. The guidelines need to include process language that allows such an agreement to be timely executed by the local jurisdiction and Metro. In addition, the value of early contributions should be adjusted by the Consumer Price Index for the period between the investment in eligible project elements and the 30% final design of the project.

3% Contribution Overmatch Sharing

AGGREGATION:

The projected local investment in the two transit centers being constructed at two future Green Line South stations will likely significantly exceed 3% of the rail line. The 3% Guidelines should allow the overmatch to be shared with other local jurisdictions that have a responsibility for a 3% contribution within the rail project segment up to the 3% aggregate contribution requirement for the future rail project segment(s).

VISIONARY PROJECT SEED FUNDING

Grantees should be able to participate in the selection of their technical consultant and fellow from the bench created by Metro in order to assure that the consultant and fellows have the appropriate experience and expertise for their specific project.

Grantees' 20% match should include their in-kind costs for participating in the project.

The need for a 20% grantee match should be conformed throughout the document to consistently replace the previous 50% local match.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Kurt Weideman, SBCCOG Chair
Councilman, City of Torrance

DRAFT