

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee
SBCCOG Office, 20285 Western Avenue, Suite 100
Torrance, Ca. 90501

AGENDA

Monday, January 8, 2018
10:30 a.m. – 11:45 a.m.

- 10:30 a.m. Welcome / Self-Introductions**
- 10:35 a.m. Consent Calendar – Receive and file**
- a. December 11, 2017 Transportation Committee meeting notes (Attachment A)
 - b. January 2018 Transportation Update (Attachment B)
- 10:37 a. m. SBCCOG Transportation Working Group Updates**
- a. Transit Operators Working Group Update
 - b. Infrastructure Working Group Update
- 10:45 a. m. Measure R South Bay Highway Program Annual Performance Evaluation Report (to be distributed at meeting)**
- 10:50 a. m. Measure R South Bay Highway Program FY 2018-19 Metro Budget Request (Attachment C)**
- 11:00 a. m. Caltrans South Bay Projects Update – Jimmy Shih, Caltrans District 7**
- 11:05 a. m. Measure M Guidelines Development and Metro Policy Advisory Council Updates**
- a. Metro Measure M Administrative Guidelines Update
 - b. SBCCOG Multi-Year Sub-Regional Programs (SB MSP) Implementation Plan Outline (Attachment D)
- 11:15 a. m. Paid Parking Policy at Metro Rail Stations – Frank Ching, Metro Senior Director, Parking Management**
- 11:20 a. m. Green Line South Study Update – David Mieger, Metro Executive Officer, Long Range & Transit Corridor Planning**
- 11:25 a. m. Metro Green Line / Crenshaw LAX Line Operating Plan Update**
- 11:30 a. m. Metro ExpressLanes Surplus Revenue Allocation Update**
- 11: 40 a. m. Announcements**
- 11:45 a. m. Adjournment**

Next Transportation Committee meeting –February 12, 2018, 10:30 a.m.

To include an item in the agenda, e-mail to: lantzsh10@gmail.com by February 2, 2018.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee
December 11, 2017
Minutes

COMMITTEE VICE CHAIR WEIDEMAN CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 10:34 AM

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions

In attendance were the following voting SBCCOG Board Members:

Christian Horvath, Chair (Redondo Beach)	Hany Fangary (Hermosa Beach)
Kurt Weideman, Vice Chair (Torrance)	Jim Butts (Inglewood)
Suzanne Fuentes (El Segundo)	Jim Osborne (Lawndale)
Olivia Valentine (Hawthorne)	

Non-Voting Representatives

Donald Szerlip, Metro South Bay Sector Council
Stephanie Katsouleas, IWG (Manhattan Beach)

Also in attendance were the following persons:

David Leger (SBCCOG)	Jimmy Shih (Caltrans)
Jacki Bacharach (SBCCOG)	Mike Bohlke (Metro)
Steve Lantz (SBCCOG)	Isidro Panuco (Metro)
Josie Gutierrez (La County)	Mark Dierking (Metro)
Frank Senteno (Lawndale)	Ayda Safaei (Metro)
Rob Beste (Torrance)	Natasha DeBenon (Ghirardelli Assoc.)

II. Consent Calendar - Approved Weideman/Butts

- A. Minutes of November 13, 2017 meeting
- B. December 2017 Transportation Update – received and filed.

MOTION by Committee Vice Chair Weideman, seconded by Committee Member Butts, to APPROVE the Consent Calendar. No objection. So ordered.

III. SBCCOG Transportation Working Group Updates

- A. Transit Operators Working Group Update – No report given.
- B. Infrastructure Working Group Update – No report given.
- C. Caltrans South Bay Highway Projects Update
Isidro Panuco reported that the I-405/Crenshaw Blvd project is currently in design. The ITS project on PCH/Western/Hawthorne is currently in construction and is expected to be completed by summer of 2018. Mr. Panuco also reported that Caltrans had amended the bid contract for the I-110 Auxiliary Lane project and that all bidders had not received the update, so Caltrans had to re-issue the bid. This delay means that construction should be awarded by April 2018.

IV. Measure R South Bay Highway Program Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) Report

Mr. Lantz reviewed the APE report with the Committee. There were some concerns from Committee Members that projects are being delayed due to issues with Caltrans. Mr. Lantz briefly explained the specific issues in question, particularly regarding Caltrans' desire to have bike lanes/bike refuges along PCH. The process required to get Caltrans' approval of a project that does not include these elements is often time consuming which has created several of the delays. Discussions for exemptions are ongoing with Caltrans, but seem to be making progress, particularly with the alternative bike paths laid out in the South Bay Bicycle Master Plan. The report is available online at:

http://www.southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_November%202017%20APE%20Report.pdf

V. Measure M Guidelines Development and Metro Policy Advisory Council Updates

A. SBCCOG Multi-Year Sub-Regional Programs (SB MSP) Implementation Plan Development

Mr. Lantz reported that guidelines for the four South Bay MSPs will be developed over the coming three months and reviewed at a workshop to be scheduled immediately prior to the March SBCCOG Board meeting.

B. Draft Measure M MSP Administrative Procedures

Ms. Bacharach handed out a draft letter to Metro regarding the SBCCOG's comments on the Measure M MSP Administrative Guidelines. Ms. Bacharach noted that the PAC Chair had requested additional time to review the draft guidelines from Metro CEO Phil Washington due to an incredibly short window of time to submit comments and have them reviewed by the PAC. Mr. Washington granted the request, extending the time into January 2018. MSP Administrative Guidelines are now due to be certified by Mr. Washington in January 2018. The draft letter can be viewed online at: http://www.southbacycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_DRAFT%20M%20Admin%20Guidelines%20Comments%20.pdf

Ms. Bacharach briefly reviewed the contents of the letter, particularly items such as: an explicit definition of corridor projects; the desire for a rolling five-year program (similar to the South Bay Highway Program); the suggestion to define projects as milestones/phases; and concerns on the 3% local contribution requirement for rail stations. Committee Vice Chair Weideman suggested adding a line in the introduction thanking Mr. Washington for extending the administrative deadline into January 2018.

MOTION by Committee Vice Chair Weideman, seconded by Committee Member Fuentes, to APPROVE the letter in concept with the suggested addition and recommend Steering Committee approval of the letter. No objection. So ordered.

C. **Twenty-Eight by '28, Metro's 2028 Olympics Transportation Infrastructure Acceleration Initiative**

The Committee briefly discussed the "Twenty-Eight by '28" initiative by Mayor Garcetti which aims to build 28 large infrastructure projects prior to the 2028 Olympics in Los Angeles. There are two projects in the South Bay on the list: the Green Line Extension to Torrance and the I-405 South Bay Curve project. The Committee had some questions as to what the "South Bay Curve" project is exactly. Isidro Panuco explained that since the South Bay Curve project is undefined, meaning no Project Study Report has been completed to identify specifically needed improvements, the project would most likely consist of lane conversions, ITS projects, and auxiliary lanes. The boundaries of the project are currently considered to be from Florence to the I-110. Jimmy Shih (Caltrans) added that it would probably consider conversion of existing lanes to High Occupancy Toll lanes, particularly because expansion of the freeway is not possible by 2028. Committee Member Butts added that in the end, this is all part of a political vote by the Metro Board, noting that he intends to fight for South Bay projects.

D. **Metro's early Project Delivery Strategy (third policy draft, formerly Accelerators/Decelerators)**

Steve Lantz reviewed the checklist included in the agenda packet, explaining that if a project receives 67 points or higher on the checklist, it is automatically advanced to staff analysis and Board consideration of acceleration. If the project receives between 34 and 66 points, Metro staff will review the project and determine whether it will recommend that the Metro Board considers acceleration. If projects received fewer than 34 points, Metro staff will not recommend Board consideration. There is an exception for this points structure which states that if a project acceleration can unambiguously be demonstrated by an exceptional condition regardless of scoring (such as full funding from an outside source), acceleration will be considered.

E. Visionary Project Seed Funding Guidelines

Ms. Bacharach explained that the Visionary Project Seed Funding guidelines have laid out an annual amount of \$500,000 available, which will be leveraged to spark and develop innovative concepts to be tested in LA County. Metro will enter into a funding agreement with (a) consultant(s) to provide direct research and staff support to the grantee. Applicants will submit concepts and/or problem statements for consideration of the award. The consultants Metro will have available will consist of professionals from private companies, educational institutions, and/or non-profit organizations. A 20% local match by the grantee will be required as well.

- VI. Temporary Station / Street Closure / Bus Bridge for Green Line/Crenshaw LAX Tie-In
Ayda Safaei (Metro) presented on the Green Line Station closures due to the tie-in of the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project. From January 26, 2018 to April 7, 2018, Green Line station platforms will be closed to connect and integrate with the Crenshaw LAX/Transit Project infrastructure. The station platforms to be closed will be: Aviation/LAX, Mariposa, El Segundo, Douglas, and Redondo Beach. Metro will be operating free bus shuttles between the Hawthorne/Lennox Green Line Station and the Redondo Beach Station serving all closed stations to and from Redondo Beach. The shuttles will operate at the same frequency as the Green Line trains. Metro will also have customer service representatives on the ground to assist customers during the initial two weeks of the closure. For more information, the presentation is available online at:
http://www.southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/PRESENTATION_Crenshaw%20LAX%20Project%20Connection%20to%20Green%20Line%20.pdf
- VII. FY 2017-18 Metro Long Range Transportation Plan Update
Ms. Bacharach informed the Committee that there was nothing to comment on this month, noting that the PAC will be reviewing updates as they are provided by Metro.
- VIII. Metro Express Lane Surplus Revenue Allocation Update
Ms. Bacharach reminded the Committee that the SBCCOG is concerned about Metro's plan to "borrow" surplus revenues and allocate them to other regions to help build additional toll lanes. Committee Member Butts is working to set up a meeting with Metro Board Members Hahn and Ridley-Thomas to discuss the issue.
- IX. Announcements / Adjournment - The Next Transportation Committee is scheduled January 8, 2018 at 10:30am.

Committee Chair Horvath announced that Metro will be presenting an update on the Green Line at his December 16th community meeting.

Committee Member Osborne reported that he attended the Mayor's Roundtable and noted that Metro is creating a school in South Central Los Angeles aimed at being a transportation trade tech school.

Committee Member Fangary asked if there was an update or plan to discuss the lack of a one-seat transit service to the Expo Line when the Crenshaw/LAX line opens that a constituent alerted him to last month. Mr. Lantz explained that Metro has not done the analysis for this yet and it's too early to advocate for a particular operating plan that gives priority to a particular route. Operational planning is done within 6 months of a line opening.

MOTION by Committee Vice Chair Weideman, seconded by Committee Member Valentine, to AGENDIZE the issue to discuss and submit the constituent's comments to Metro. No objection. So ordered.

MOTION by Committee Vice Chair Weideman, seconded by Committee Member Osborne, to ADJOURN the December 11 meeting of the Transportation Committee. No objection. So ordered.

Committee Chair Horvath adjourned the meeting at 11:45 am.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

January 8, 2017

TO: SBCCOG Transportation Committee
FROM: Steve Lantz, SBCCOG Transportation Director
RE: SBCCOG Transportation Update – January 2018

Adherence to Strategic Plan:

Goal A: Environment, Transportation and Economic Development. Facilitate, implement and/or educate members and others about environmental, transportation and economic development programs that benefit the South Bay.

FEDERAL

Federal Employee Transportation Expense Deductions Eliminated in Tax Reform Act

Employee transportation expenses were among the former employee benefits deductions eliminated in the federal tax reform bill. A previous tax incentive for employers subsidized their employees' transit, parking and bicycle commuting expenses by allowing companies to provide parking or transit passes worth up to \$255 a month to employees as a pre-tax benefit, and then to deduct the costs from their corporate taxes. The deductible amount was set to increase to \$260 a month on Jan. 1, 2018.

The provision, in Section 3308, is effective for amounts paid or incurred after 2017. It aligns the treatment of transportation fringe benefits with other axed employer-provided benefits including on-premises gyms and other athletic facilities, and amenities provided to an employee that are primarily personal in nature and not directly related to a trade or business with other similar tax items.

The reasoning behind the elimination of the deduction is that since the tax bill substantially lowers the corporate tax rate, smaller tax breaks that complicate the tax code are no longer necessary. Companies can still provide the parking and transit passes to employees, but they no longer get the tax deduction. And employees who pay for their own transportation costs can still use pre-tax income.

The elimination of the subsidy has transit agencies worried that fewer commuters will opt for transit. They fear that, if employers can't write it off, they won't offer it. And if they don't offer the pre-tax benefit to the employees, it could ultimately hurt the ridership.

Three Federal Policy Fixes Proposed To Dramatically Reduce Transportation Emissions

U. S. transportation now surpasses electric power as the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions. Although tailpipe-emissions reductions could accelerate if the market for electric vehicles takes off, their cumulative impact is minimal so far. So a new paper published on October 29th from Allen Greenberg of the Federal Highway Administration and John Evans from

Cambridge Systematics makes a compelling case for reducing transportation emissions with three simple changes to driving incentives. “Comparing Greenhouse Gas Reductions and Legal Implementation Possibilities for Pay-to-Save Transportation Price-shifting Strategies and EPA’s Clean Power Plan,” recommends:

1. Converting fixed pricing mechanisms for car insurance to pay-as-drive-and-you-save (PAYDAYS), which charge people a variable rate, based upon how many miles they drive;
2. Requiring employers who provide free parking for their employees to implement parking cash-out programs, which provides an equivalent cash incentive to employees who do not drive alone to work; and
3. Converting fixed-percentage sales taxes on new vehicle purchases to mileage-based taxes spread over a three-year period.

The authors estimated that the impact of changing these pricing strategies could be substantial, achieving between 37 percent and 95 percent of the emissions reductions projected from the Obama administration’s Clean Power Plan (CPP). Because the Trump Administration is not particularly supportive of addressing global warming, the authors encourage states to implement the policy changes. They estimated that if California, the nine East Coast states in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI), and the eight other states that signed up to defend the CPP in federal court all took action, they could achieve 35% of the emissions savings from the CPP.

STATE

California's New Climate Plan Uses Incentives To Cut Vehicle Emissions

California has the toughest air quality regulations of any state in the country. But they're not tough enough to satisfy a new state law that seeks to cut greenhouse gas emissions in the state by 40 percent from 1990 levels by 2030. The key to a new California Air Resources Board (CARB) plan adopted on December 14th is to get about 4.2 million electric vehicles on the road by 2030, which is pretty bold considering the state currently has less than a million.

The California Air Resources Board projects that the plan will save \$11 billion in avoided environmental damage by extending or approving new programs that offer incentives to buy zero-emission vehicles. Under the new plan, the state will offer a \$2,500 incentive for electric cars and up to \$5,000 for trucks and other vehicles. The plan also calls for doubling the number of electric chargers because studies show that people need to see these charging stations to make them feel comfortable about buying an electric car. The plan also encourages the deployment of zero-emission trucks and spending more to shift to cleaner systems for moving the large amount of freight that enters and leaves the state at California airports and ports.

The plan provides \$208 million in incentives for truck and bus fleets to cut or eliminate diesel trucks by purchasing electric vehicles. Another \$190 million will be available for electrifying freight-moving and handling equipment within the ports.

More than 602,000 heavy-duty diesel trucks operate in California, according to CARB. Although those diesel trucks account for just 2.3 percent of all on-road vehicles in the state, they emit 56 percent of key smog-forming nitrogen oxides, or NOx, and 66 percent of the soot attributable to motor vehicles.

More than 20 manufacturers offer 60 eligible models of hybrid, low-emission and zero-emission trucks and buses. However, electric heavy-duty trucks typically sell for 20 percent to 30 percent more than comparable diesel vehicles. Funded almost entirely with proceeds from California's cap-and-trade program, the state's new clean transportation funding plan makes \$20 million in truck and bus incentives available as loans. All California fleets — whether they are public or private, or operated by transit agencies, schools or airports — can participate.

The incentives will help offset the difference between diesel and electric, clean natural gas, and other green truck propulsion technologies. The plan also calls for doubling the number of electric charging stations in California.

This all comes while the Environmental Protection Agency Administrator appears set to roll back federal fuel economy rules. California is the one state that can set its own emissions rules under the Clean Air Act of 1970, subject to a federal waiver that allows the state to make tougher emission rules than the federal government. Other states can follow California's lead or the federal government's lead but they aren't allowed to strike out on their own. Pruitt has said EPA is not reviewing California's special status.

Caltrans Generates Smoothness Controversy In Its Pavement Maintenance

How smooth should highway pavement be? When Caltrans repairs state highways it uses pavement standards of smoothness that are the strictest in the country. With that standard comes high pavement grinding costs that have surprised contractors who are fighting for reimbursement and bitterly condemning a level of smoothness they say no driver would ever notice. At least one major contractor also contends the smooth pavement is dangerous, arguing that corrective measures he takes to hit the target actually shave features that are supposed to keep steep roads safe in wet weather.

The dispute has been growing since standards were toughened four years ago. Nine pavement companies wrote a letter to Caltrans Director Malcolm Dougherty last June asking him to reconsider the rule. So far, Caltrans is holding to its smoothness standard, arguing that its long-term benefits outweigh any short-term spike in construction costs.

To implement the new standard, California joined most other states in measuring new pavement smoothness with a laser-based instrument known as an inertial profiler, replacing the manual method Caltrans had used since the 1940s. The profiler helped Caltrans measure road smoothness in a common system called the international roughness index. Smooth roads get lower scores. It estimates in inches how much a vehicle suspension system would move up and down over a mile because of imperfections in a road's surface, such as bumps or small divots.

Second, using the new system of measurement, Caltrans handed contractors the toughest road smoothness standard in the country. The smooth roads, Caltrans argued, would pay for themselves over time because they're known to last longer than rougher ones, and they may improve gas mileage enough to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Caltrans directed contractors to pave to mean roughness index 60, meaning the laser profiler should not capture more than 60 inches of up-and-down movement over a mile of road.

Caltrans is alone in requiring contractors to smooth out stretches of road that don't meet that target. Other states tend to penalize contractors for rougher patches, but do not require corrections unless the profiler captures 90 inches of up-and-down movement over a mile.

The remedy for rough pavement usually involves smoothing concrete with a diamond-bladed grinder. It's a safe fix that state transportation departments use to rehabilitate old roads, extending their usefulness until the road can be replaced. However, grinding long stretches of Cajon Pass reduces the highway's wet-weather safety features such as the thin grooves in concrete that whisk water away from tires during storms. The grinding also reduces macrotexture, intentionally rough features designed to enhance traction.

California Highway Patrol records show that the number of wet-weather injury accidents increased at Cajon Pass last year to their highest level in five years. It's hard to draw a conclusion from the records, however, because of last winter's heavy rains. The contractors point to recommendations from the National Academy of Sciences, as well as Caltrans' own standards, that indicate roads are safer in wet weather when they have features to induce friction. Caltrans responds that it conducts skid tests on new roads, and refuses to open them if they lack friction.

California Studying How To Charge Drivers By The Mile

Policies promoting fuel efficiency are clearly beneficial for California's environment and for its efforts to combat climate change. But, achieving these goals will adversely impact the revenues collected from the current gas tax model

Concerns about the long term viability of the gas tax, SB 1077 in 2014 directed the Chair of the California Transportation Commission (CTC), in collaboration with the Secretary of the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), to create a Road Charge Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to study road charge as an alternative to the gas tax.

Shortly after enacting SB 1 in November 2016 to increase the state gas tax, California transportation officials performed a study, the California Road Charge Pilot Program report, studying ways to charge drivers based on mileage rather than the amount of fuel they use.

The report included results from a road charge experiment where more than 5,000 volunteer drivers had their mileage monitored over a period of nine months. Most volunteers used a wireless device that transmitted mileage information to a state contractor. The state then sent each driver a simulated monthly invoice, and drivers sent in online mock payments.

Officials said the test went well, but think a system based on paying per mile at the gas pump or charging station would be simpler, more cost effective and more readily accepted by the public.

Caltrans Deputy Director Carrie Pourvahidi told the news agency that, early in 2018, the state will send out a request to technology companies asking for ideas on a simple communication technology system at gas stations or electric charging stations that can instantly tell how many miles the car has driven. However, they believe it will likely take until 2025 to come up with a system.

REGION

LA Metro wants your opinion on possible changes to TAP

LA Metro Board will hold a public hearing at 1 p.m. on Jan. 17th at Metro Headquarters, 3rd Floor Board Room, 1 Gateway Plaza to take public comment on four proposed changes to the fare system. Members of the public can also email their comments by January 17th to: customerrelations@metro.net.

The proposals would:

- Eliminate paper interagency transfers. The interagency transfer fare will be automatically paid from existing Stored Value on a TAP card when boarding a second transit agency within 2.5 hours from the first boarding.
- Eliminate the sale of Metro day passes on board buses but continue the option to add stored cash value to a TAP card on the bus. The day pass costs the same as four regular base fares and it would still be available for purchase from TAP card vending machines, online and by phone – just not on the bus.
- Phase out the sale of Metro tokens. Metro hopes to transition all riders to TAP cards with stored value, which can be used to pay for transfers between Metro buses and rail lines and for non-Metro transfers.
- Standardize the cost of each TAP card at \$2 ending the introductory rate. Those who currently buy the cards at TAP vending machines and on buses will no longer get a discounted rate of \$1 that was intended as a pilot to increase TAP card use.

Bridge Support Structures Completed For Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement

A “topping-out” ceremony was held on December 20th to celebrate the end of a three-year construction process to build the two 515-foot signature towers that will be the centerpieces of California's first cable-stayed bridge for vehicular traffic. The \$1.47 billion bridge project is scheduled for completion in 2019.

When fully completed, the new bridge will include six traffic lanes and four emergency shoulders, a higher clearance to accommodate large cargo ships, more efficient transition ramps and connectors to improve traffic flow, especially for trucks. The new bridge also incorporates the Mark Bixby Memorial Bicycle and Pedestrian Path with scenic overlooks. The towers provide an iconic gateway between the South Bay and the harbor and are the tallest structures in Long Beach. The Gerald Desmond Bridge will remain in use while the new bridge is under construction.

The replacement bridge project is a joint effort of Caltrans and the Port, with additional funding support from the U.S. Department of Transportation and L. A. Metro.

TRENDS

Is An Electric Slow-Speed Veloway In Our Future?

BMW and Tongji University have developed a concept, Vision E3 Way, that gives e-bike riders their own roads above streets (think electric veloways). An automatic speed limit (in the concept, about 15.5MPH) and Artificial-Intelligence-driven traffic management would prevent the faster vehicles from crashing into scooters and Segways. And you might not even need to own a machine to use it -- BMW envisions a rental system where you'd pick up a bike at an access point if you need to get across town in a hurry.

New Study Challenges Urban And Suburban Transportation Efficiency Assumptions

Sprawl is not sustainable. That's the basic assumption shaping high-rises, infill developments, and master plans in cities around the world. But a new report by the Council on Tall Buildings

and Urban Habitat challenges one of the central tenets of urbanism. Comparing the daily patterns household-to-household, researchers found that certain transportation habits and overall energy use can be more environmentally efficient in suburban housing than residential high-rises.

To date, most research into urban sustainability—in terms of, say, gasoline guzzled, miles traveled, and water, heat and electricity consumption—have generally concluded that suburbs are less efficient. But these analyses focus on urban impacts rather than building-type impacts.

The authors of the new study, Antony Wood, the executive director of the CTBUH and research professor at the Illinois Institute of Technology's College of Architecture and Peng Du, who is also a professor at IIT's College of Architecture, wanted to capture more nuance than that. They created a survey comparing transportation patterns, energy consumption, and use of public space, which they administered to 249 households in four downtown Chicago high-rises and 273 single-family homes in Oak Park, a historic residential neighborhood. Over three months in 2014, respondents answered detailed questionnaires about their daily habits, and submitted 12 months worth of utility bills.

High-rise residents actually consumed about 27 percent more energy than suburbanites. Although high-rise dwellers traveled more on public transit, walked and biked more, and made more efficient use of outdoor public space. The researchers also added up all the roads, water pipes, sewage lines, power and electricity supply required to serve the two types of households, and found that suburban development required roughly eight times more “infrastructure network length” per person than the downtown high rises.

Score one for dense urban development, right? Overall, yes. But the details get more interesting.

The building industry often assumes that suburban single-family homes require more energy to heat, light, and cool, since they have larger surface-to-volume ratios than smaller apartment units. But on a per-person basis, Wood and Du found that high-rise residents actually consumed about 27 percent more energy. On a per-floor area basis, probably because of all the shared hallways, elevators, gymnasiums, and lobbies, the downtown towers still consumed about 5 percent more energy than the suburban homes. Comparing travel habits, Wood and Du also unexpectedly found that downtown households actually traveled more miles by car every year. The high rises also had more parking spaces per capita than the suburban dwellings.

Demographic differences between the two groups in the study probably explain the surprising results. The large suburban households of Oak Park outside Chicago were full of kids, while the apartment towers held childless young professionals and empty nesters. That means, at least in a given room, more people are using the same amount of energy. Similarly, the report noted that suburban households were much more likely to have children that they bring with them during car travel while single high-rise residents took more solo trips.

Eventually Wood and Du would like to take on a larger-scale version with many more families, buildings, and neighborhood shapes. But this pilot study offers quantified evidence that demographics count when it comes to environmental efficiency.

TNCs Are Creating Unsustainable Congestion in New York City And Other Metro Areas

Bruce Schaller, a former NYC DOT official and expert on New York City street traffic and the for-hire car industry, has a new report out on just how severely the rise of “transportation

network companies” (or TNCs) has affected congestion. Using data from the New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission, Schaller studied passenger trips, vehicle speeds, and mileage per hour of taxis and TNCs in Manhattan’s core business district from 2013 to 2017.

The key takeaways: Total passenger trips increased 15 percent, even as taxi trips declined, in that time period. That means TNCs have created new demand for backseat rides in Manhattan. And they increased the amount of miles traveled by for-hire vehicles around downtown by a whopping 36 percent, over the same time period. That adds up to more than 600 million miles of motor vehicle traffic in the past 3 years alone—reflecting not only the staggering growth in rides, but also a trend toward lengthier trips and more “deadheading,” or cars traveling without passengers.

With a whopping 59 percent increase in the number of for-hire vehicles, the data makes a pretty clear statement: On-demand mobility is transforming New York City streets, and it does not appear to be for the better.

In a recent documentary, Schaller noted that for years, as New York City grew, more and more people took the subway and bus. Now, as the city grows and more and more people are taking Uber, Lyft, and Via, Schaller is concerned that this is not a sustainable way for the city to grow.

To make matters worse, Schaller’s and other research offers evidence that TNCs are drawing more affluent passengers off trains and into cars. Fewer transit riders means less revenue and demand for improved transit—disproportionately affecting low-income New Yorkers who have no choice but to remain aboard trains and buses. Clogged streets are also slowing down private vehicles, city buses, packages, and freight. It slows down first responders, repairmen, teachers, and nursing aides.

This is hardly an “Only In New York” problem. A recent [study from UC Davis](#) took a comprehensive look at Uber and Lyft’s effects on transportation systems in eight U.S. cities (including New York) and found TNCs having similar adverse effects in Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, the Bay Area, Seattle, and Washington, D.C. The reason Schaller’s traffic critique is so compelling and data-rich is because New York is one of only a few cities in the world that requires Uber, Lyft, and other such companies to share trip data for analyses like Schaller’s.

If the city wants to keep moving, Schaller suggests three key public policy moves:

- Prioritize lanes and parking space for the highest efficiency vehicles, like buses and vans, to reward and incentivize the use of shared transportation.
- Treat roads like a precious commodity, and charge drivers to use the ones in highest demand, perhaps with a special fee for TNC trips. Such a plan, known as congestion pricing, has long been proposed for the city.
- Move more freight traffic off peak hours, which may not be possible in a vertical city – even one that never sleeps.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

January 8, 2018

TO: SBCCOG Transportation Committee – 1/8/18 meeting
SBCCOG Infrastructure Working Group – 1/10/18 meeting
SBCCOG Board of Directors - 1/25/18 meeting

FROM: Jacki Bacharach, Executive Director
Steve Lantz, Transportation Director

SUBJECT: South Bay Measure R Highway Program (SBHP) 2018-2019 Metro Budget Request (MBR)

Adherence to Strategic Plan:

Goal A: Environment, Transportation, and Economic Development. Facilitate, implement, and/or educate members and others about environmental, transportation, and economic development programs that benefit the South Bay. Strategy 5 – Actively pursue opportunities for infrastructure funding for member agencies.

BACKGROUND

Over the past four months, SBCCOG staff and consultants have worked with the L. A. Metro staff, SBCCOG Infrastructure Working Group, and SBHP project lead agencies to determine the cash flow needs for existing and new South Bay Measure R Highway Program (SBHP) projects during the upcoming fiscal year and over the life of each project. SBCCOG staff, Metro staff, and South Bay lead agencies have compiled the FY 2018-19 Metro Budget Request (see Exhibit A which will be distributed at the meeting) consistent with policies approved by the SBCCOG Board of Directors in 2015. In addition to adjusting cash flow projections on existing projects to reflect changes from lead agencies, SBCCOG staff incorporated 12 new project requests in the MBR.

SBCCOG Board approval of the SBHP MBR is considered a recommendation to Metro and is subject to Metro's review and concurrence as to the eligibility of the requested projects and the Measure R SBHP funding share of project costs.

Metro staff is expected to make its recommendations to the Metro Board of Directors in the Spring of 2018. The Metro Board approved SBHP Budget Request (MBR) will be incorporated into the Metro 2018-19 budget (effective July 1, 2018). If the Metro staff decides to make recommendations to the Metro Board that differ from the SBCCOG Board approved recommendations, we will request that the SBCCOG be notified before they go to the Metro Board so that we have time to bring the differences to the SBCCOG Board for possible further action.

In addition to the MBR, SBCCOG staff and consultants have worked with lead agencies to compile a comprehensive list of project and study Measure R reimbursements that can be anticipated to be complete for the current and new project commitments between FY 2019 and FY 2023 (see Exhibit B which will be distributed at the meeting).

FY 2018-19 SBHP METRO BUDGET REQUEST

The SBHP MBR (see Exhibit A) identifies projected Measure R South Bay Highway Program cash flow requirements for FY 2018-19. The MBR includes a schedule of projected reimbursement costs for SBHP projects, program development, project oversight, intergovernmental relations, and administrative expenses. The Metro Budget Request for FY 2018-2019 totals \$73.6 million.

Only one of the projects in the MBR will require a funding agreement amendment. The City of Torrance has an intersection improvement project (MR312.60) on Crenshaw Blvd at the entrance of their Transit Center Project. The City has received construction bids that are \$1.75 million higher than projected. The City proposes to provide a local match of \$350,000 (20% of the increased project cost), and the City requests an additional \$1.4 million in Measure R SBHP funds. This additional request will require a funding agreement amendment. Since the project is ready for construction, the additional funds are included in the FY18-19 MBR.

SBCCOG Staff received a letter dated November 2, 2017 from the City of Hermosa Beach requesting deferral and de-obligation for two of the City's SBHP projects. The City asked to defer without prejudice projects MR312.38 (\$872,000 in SBHP funds allocated) and MR312.63 (\$1,800,000 in SBHP funds allocated). The City has not executed a funding agreement for either project nor have they expended any funds, and has asked to defer these projects without prejudice. The Projects have been moved to the "Completed Projects" category in the MBR and the remaining funds have been removed from the request.

FY 2018-2022 COMPREHENSIVE SBHP LIST

SBCCOG staff also has worked with lead agencies to compile a more comprehensive magnitude-of-cost estimate of the cash flow needed in future years to complete the projects in Exhibit A. (see Exhibit B). The estimate is helpful to understand future annual cash flow needs in Metro's Measure R Long Range Transportation Plan annual allocation forecast for the 2008 Measure R Expenditure Plan (Line 33 – South Bay Ramps and Interchange Improvements: I-405, I-110, I-105, and SR-91).

The FY 2019 - 2023 SBHP program reimbursements are expected to total \$226.6 million. The total committed to the SBHP between 2010 and 2023 will be \$316.3 million. Since Metro only approves Budget Requests a year at a time, any projected outyear shortfall can be addressed by Metro, SBCCOG and the South Bay lead agencies in subsequent Metro Budget Requests or in Metro's 2019 Update of the LRTP.

Recommendations

1. Recommend SBCCOG Board approval of the FY 2018-19 Measure R SBHP Metro Budget Request as reflected in Exhibit A to enable transmittal of the request to Metro by January 31, 2018; and
2. Recommend that the SBCCOG Board receives and files the magnitude-of-cost cash flow funding estimates to complete the Measure R SBHP projects identified in Exhibit B.

South Bay Measure M Multi-Year Sub-Regional Program (SB MSPs)

2018 Implementation Plan Outline

Table of Contents

- 1 INTRODUCTION
- 2 VISION, MISSION, GOALS for MOBILITY AND SUSTAINABILITY
- 3 BACKGROUND
 - 3.1 South Bay Mobility and Sustainability Networks
 - 3.1.1 South Bay MSP Boundaries
 - 3.1.2 Freeway/Highway/Strategic Arterial Road Network
 - 3.1.3 Bus/Rail Network
 - 3.1.4 Transit Centers, Park & Ride Lots, Bus/Rail transfer locations
 - 3.1.5 Neighborhood-Oriented Development Network
 - 3.1.6 Active Transportation/Bicycle Network
 - 3.1.7 Broadband Network
 - 3.1.8 Goods Movement Network/ Strategic Truck Arterial Network
 - 3.1.9 Technology and Innovative Strategies (AV)
 - 3.2 Description of Measure M Ordinance
 - 3.3 Overview of Metro’s Countywide Measure M Policies and Administrative Guidelines
 - 3.4 Measure M Multi-Year South Bay Sub-Regional Programs
 - 3.4.1 SB MSP – General Purpose
 - 3.4.2 SB MSP - Highway Operational Improvements Program
 - 3.4.3 SB MSP - Mobility and Sustainability Improvements Programs (Short and Long term)
 - 3.4.4 SB Sub-Regional Equity Program
 - 3.5 MSP Roles and responsibilities
 - 3.6 MSP Administrative agreements
 - 3.7 MSP Process
 - 3.7.1 Eligibility and Nexus
 - 3.7.2 MSP program development and administration
 - 3.7.3 MSP project development and funding
 - 3.7.4 MSP project delivery and oversight
- 4 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
 - 4.1 Metro
 - 4.2 COG
 - 4.3 Local jurisdictions/lead agencies
- 5 MSP POLICIES
 - 5.1 Metro Board Policies
 - 5.1.1 Metro Staff Administrative Guidelines
 - 5.1.2 Delegation of Authority
 - 5.2 MSP Program-specific Project Selection / Performance Evaluation Metrics
 - 5.3 Program Eligibility Criteria

- 5.3.1 MSP Highway Operational Improvements
 - 5.3.2 MSP Mobility and Sustainability Improvements (Short and Long Term)
 - 5.3.3 Sub-Regional Equity Improvements
 - 5.4 MSP Project Allocation / Reimbursement Policies
 - 5.5 MSP Funding Agreements
 - 5.6 MSP Project Funding Retention
 - 5.7 MSP Project Matching Fund Ratios
 - 5.8 MSP Communications / Outreach
- 6 MSP PROGRAMS MANAGEMENT
- 6.1 MSP Corridor Planning
 - 6.2 MSP Project Development
 - 6.2.1 MSP Project Description / Identification of Need / Problem to be solved
 - 6.2.2 MSP Lead Agency Determination
 - 6.2.3 MSP Project Selection Criteria
 - 6.2.4 SB MSP – 10-year funding allocations
 - 6.2.5 Leveraging SB MSP with other funding programs
 - 6.2.5.1 Measure R South Bay Highway Program
 - 6.2.5.2 Metro Call for Projects
 - 6.2.5.3 Measure M Active Transportation Program
 - 6.2.5.4 Metro Sustainability Program
 - 6.2.5.5 Metro Extraordinary Innovation Programs and Technology projects
 - 6.2.6 MSP Budget Development - Annual and Life of Project
 - 6.2.7 MSP New Project Approval / Funding Authorization
 - 6.2.8 MSP Progress Reporting / Risk Identification
5. MSP PROJECT DELIVERY MANAGEMENT
- 5.1 MSP Project Scope, Schedule and Budget Description
 - 5.2 MSP Funding Agreement Execution
 - 5.3 MSP Project Delivery
 - 5.4 MSP Project Oversight
 - 5.5 MSP Project Invoicing, Reporting and Progress Monitoring
 - 5.6 MSP Project Audit / Closeout
 - 5.7 MSP Project Risk Management and Mitigation
 - 5.8 Change Management in adopted MSP Scope, Schedule or Budget
 - 5.9 MSP Project Deferral / Deobligation
 - 5.10 MSP Project Conflicts of Interest
 - 5.11 MSP Project Management Training
- 6 APPENDICES
- Appendix A: Measure M Ordinance
 - Appendix B: Metro Measure M Expenditure Plan
 - Appendix C: L. A. Metro Board Policies
 - Appendix D: L. A. Metro Staff MSP Administrative Guidelines
 - Appendix E: Measure M MSP Construction Signage
 - Appendix F: South Bay Arterial Performance Measurement
 - Appendix G: Next Gen Bus Study