

# **South Bay Cities Council of Governments**

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

## **AGENDA**

**Monday, July 10, 2017**  
**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. June 12, 2017 Transportation Committee meeting notes (Attachment A)
  - b. July 2017 Transportation Update (Attachment B)
- 10:40 a.m. Measure R South Bay Highway Program Updates
- a. SBHP One-on-One Meetings with Lead Agencies
  - b. Annual Performance Evaluation (Attachment C)
- 11:00 a.m. Measure M Guidelines Development Updates
- a. Measure M Master Guidelines (Attachment D)
  - b. Measure M Policy Advisory Council Update
- 11:20 a. m. Update on Metro Green Line Extension
- 11:25 a.m. Playa del Rey traffic calming project Update
- 11:40 a.m. Announcements
- 11:45 a.m. Adjournment

Next Transportation Committee meeting – August 14, 2017, 10:30 a.m.

To include an item in the agenda, e-mail to: [lantzsh10@gmail.com](mailto:lantzsh10@gmail.com) by, **August 4, 2017.**

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee

June 12, 2017

Minutes

COMMITTEE CHAIR HORVATH CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 10:32 AM

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions

In attendance were the following voting SBCCOG Board Members:

Christian Horvath (Redondo Beach)

Kurt Weideman (Torrance)

Suzanne Fuentes (El Segundo)

Jim Butts (Inglewood)

Olivia Valentine (Hawthorne)

Jim Osborne (Lawndale)

Non-Voting Representatives

Donald Szerlip, Metro South Bay Sector Council

Rob Beste, IWG Vice Chair (Torrance)

James Lee, Transit Operators (Torrance Transit)

Also in attendance were the following persons:

David Leger (SBCCOG)

Josie Gutierrez (LA County Public Works)

Jacki Bacharach (SBCCOG)

Ted Semaan (Redondo Beach)

Steve Lantz (SBCCOG)

Jimmy Shih (Caltrans)

Isidro Panuco (Metro)

Christine Song (Caltrans)

Mike Bohlke (Metro)

Orlando Rodriguez (El Segundo)

Joyce Rooney (Beach Cities Transit)

Chris Carrillo (Epic Land Solutions)

Ernie Crespo (Gardena Transit)

Kathy Tegeler (Epic Land Solutions)

Godfrey Offoegbu (Torrance Transit)

II. Consent Calendar

A. Minutes of April 10, 2017 meeting

B. Meeting Notes of May 8, 2017 meeting

C. June 2017 Transportation Update

MOTION by Committee Vice Chair Weideman, seconded by Committee Member Osborne, to APPROVE the consent calendar. No objection. So ordered.

III. Measure R South Bay Highway Program Updates

A. SBHP One-on-One Meetings with Lead Agencies – Steve Lantz gave an overview of the one-on-one meetings being held with Public Works Directors/staff from each city during the month June to review their projects and establish what project milestones will be accomplished during the next year.

B. Annual Performance Evaluation

As reported last month, there is a new Annual Performance Evaluation requirement in the Cooperative Agreement between SBCCOG and Metro. SBCCOG staff will monitor the progress throughout the year, until it is time to set new milestones for the following year. 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 planned milestones.

C. Caltrans Project Permitting Improvement Strategy Update

Steve Lantz reported that he and a few South Bay Public Works Directors met with Caltrans District 7 Director Carrie Bowen and her staff on May 24th to discuss the improvement strategy. Historically, many

SBHP projects have experienced lengthy delays during the Caltrans permitting process. Two strategies were discussed at this meeting, with the main difference being who serves as the lead agency:

Strategy #1: Caltrans would become the lead agency in doing the environmental/planning work (PAED phase), and once the environmental documents are signed off, cities will be able to design their projects based on those requirements. When the city is ready for their permits, they will have already had Caltrans sign off on the design and any needed design exceptions from Caltrans design standards, through the environmental document that Caltrans prepared, so there should be no need to revise designs and re-submit to Caltrans.

Strategy #2: The city, as the lead agency, would meet with Caltrans early in the planning process and get their approval on designs or negotiate needed design exceptions from Caltrans design standards, so once they are ready to apply for the permit, they would have already had Caltrans approval of the design and any needed design exceptions, through that early collaboration. As a result, there should be no need to revise design and re-submit to Caltrans.

Chair Horvath asked about the boundaries of corridor studies and Steve Lantz responded that logical boundaries need to be established when studies are done.

#### IV. Measure M Guidelines Development Updates

##### A. Guideline development coordination with other COGs in L.A. County

##### B. Measure M Policy Advisory Council (PAC)

Jacki Bacharach began the update by reporting on the recent Measure M Policy Advisory Council meeting and announced that Metro Staff accepted most of the recommendations made by the PAC. Metro staff indicated they are looking for broad Master Guidelines at this point and will then begin working on the detailed administrative guidelines over the next 6-12 months. Ms. Bacharach mentioned that the Committee may want to approve the proposed letter to Metro thanking them for working to incorporate many suggestions from the PAC, but that further clarification is still needed on some of the guidelines.

Ms. Bacharach then brought the Committee's attention to a handout on the Measure M Guidelines provided by Metro Deputy Mike Bohlke. Items from the handout that were discussed include:

-Local Return: Metro staff recommended that Local Return be calculated based on resident population and included no mention of a minimum "Local Return floor". Metro staff recommended that, subject to eligibility, subregional funds could be used to supplement Local Return allocations for smaller cities.

-3% Rail Contribution: Clarifications were made on what could constitute a local contribution and how a "betterment" is defined. The calculation of the 3% local funding contribution occurs at 30% of final design. Metro also noted that "in kind" contributions are allowed from a local jurisdiction as long as those contributions are included in the project cost at the time 30% final design is completed.

-Multi-Year Subregional Programs: the guidelines were amended to reflect the SBCCOG/PAC's request that MSP funds receive equal funding priority as other capital. Subregional entities (COGs) will administer the sub-regional programs and are now allowed to use up to 0.5% of each MSP funding category for administration of those programs.

For more detail, the handout can be viewed online at:

[http://www.southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation\\_committee/HANDOUT\\_Metro%20Board%20Staff%20Briefing%20on%20Measure%20M%20Guidelines.pdf](http://www.southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_Metro%20Board%20Staff%20Briefing%20on%20Measure%20M%20Guidelines.pdf)

Ms. Bacharach discussed a proposed letter to Metro regarding remaining SBCCOG concerns on the revised Measure M Guidelines and focused on a few issues mentioned in the letter including:

-Multi-Year Subregional Highway Funds: the SBCCOG believes that these funds should be available for projects that are more than one mile from a State Highway or Freeway. The one mile limitation was added after the Measure M Guidelines were first proposed and the SBCCOG feels it should be removed as it eliminates eligibility for some of our cities.

-Project Acceleration: acceleration of projects must not delay current regional and sub-regional projects and surplus funding from completion of accelerated projects should be available the next fiscal year.

A memo and draft letter were handed out to the Committee and is available online at: [http://www.southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation\\_committee/HANDOUT\\_6.12%20memo%20and%206.17%20letter%20to%20Metro%20re%20revised%20guidelines.pdf](http://www.southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_6.12%20memo%20and%206.17%20letter%20to%20Metro%20re%20revised%20guidelines.pdf)

Committee Member Weideman stated that he was encouraged that the PAC and Metro took the SBCCOG's comments in previous letters to heart and incorporated many of those suggestions. He also asked for a "letter of no prejudice" policy to be requested in the letter. The policy would help cities get credit towards their 3% rail contribution requirement for projects done before the rail project commences. This could be very important with the Green Line extension work in Redondo Beach and Torrance. Metro staff is meeting with each city on the Metro Green Line extension now in preparation for the EIR to be released in the fall, ex. September. Then the process should take a year or year and a half.

Don Szerlip mentioned that during the South Bay Service Council's recent meeting with Metro CEO Phil Washington, Mr. Washington stated that Metro is considering P3's (Public-Private Partnerships) as a financing mechanism for funding the acceleration of projects such as the Orange Line conversion from a busway to a light rail line. Mr. Bohlke commented that any acceleration must be done with outside funds. Mr. Lantz noted that P3's use "vendor financing" meaning that the vendor gets reimbursed by Metro when the funds were originally going to be available. He clarified that a P3 is a delivery and financing option, not a funding mechanism.

V. Playa del Rey traffic calming project

Steve Lantz provided an update and overview on the Playa del Rey traffic calming project. Mr. Lantz explained that the City of Los Angeles has narrowed Vista del Mar, Pershing Drive, Jefferson Boulevard, and Culver Boulevard to one lane in each direction as part of a "road diet" aimed at calming traffic and reducing the use of those streets as a thoroughfare between the South Bay and West Los Angeles/Santa Monica. Mr. Lantz noted that the Vista del Mar project was being implemented as an emergency matter in response to a settlement from a lawsuit over a pedestrian-related traffic death. According to Councilman Bonin's office, the projects on all streets except Vista del Mar are considered "pilot" projects and will be revisited periodically over the next several months. Mr. Lantz mentioned that the SBCCOG is concerned with the process through which these projects were carried out, noting that there was no public comment/outreach or review of the projects prior to their implementation.

Board Member Fuentes added that El Segundo, Hermosa Beach, and Manhattan Beach are working together to explain to L. A. City Councilman Mike Bonin's office how these projects have negatively impacted the residents of those South Bay cities and to potentially propose a viable solution(s) to the issue. She went on to thank Mr. Lantz and Ms. Bacharach for their efforts to make sure the three cities are well-informed during their meetings with the City of LA.

Mr. Lantz reported that there will be a meeting on June 20<sup>th</sup> with Los Angeles Department of Transportation and leaders from the cities of El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, and Hermosa Beach.

Announcements / Adjournment - **Next meeting date/time – July 10, 2017 at 10:30am.**

MOTION by Committee Vice Chair Weideman, seconded by Committee Member Osborne, TO ADJOURN THIS MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE. No objection. So ordered.

Committee Chair Horvath adjourned the meeting at 11:52 AM.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

## South Bay Cities Council of Governments

July 10, 2017

TO: SBCCOG Transportation Committee

FROM: Steve Lantz, SBCCOG Transportation Director

RE: SBCCOG Transportation Update – July 2017

### **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**

#### **House Bill Aims For Dedicated Freight Infrastructure Revenue Source**

Congressman Alan Lowenthal introduced bipartisan legislation, HR 3001, on June 22<sup>nd</sup> to create a Freight Transportation Infrastructure Trust Fund, funded through a national 1% “waybill fee” on the transportation cost of goods.

If enacted, the bill would raise roughly \$8 billion a year dedicated to freight-related infrastructure projects throughout the nation with a focus on multimodal projects and projects that rebuild aging infrastructure while relieving bottlenecks in the national freight transportation system, and addressing the negative impacts of goods movement on freight adjacent communities.

To invest the funds, the new bill would launch two freight-specific grant programs: A formula grant in which each state would receive funds each year based on the amount of existing infrastructure within the state, and a competitive grant program what would be open to all local, regional, and state governments.

#### **White House Releases Some Details of Proposed Infrastructure Plan**

The Trump Administration offered new details on June 8<sup>th</sup> about how it plans to divvy up some of the money in President Trump’s \$1 trillion infrastructure package. Officials have touted injecting \$200 billion into the country’s infrastructure to spur an additional \$800 billion in investment through public-private partnerships and regulatory reforms.

In a fact sheet posted online, the White House proposed allocating \$100 billion to let states and local entities prioritize their own infrastructure needs, \$25 billion to grants for rural infrastructure projects, and \$15 billion to incentivize “transformative” projects. Although there was no detail on the remaining \$60 billion, earlier fact sheets identified loans for regionally or nationally significant projects and a “skill-based” workforce education initiative, with the goal of training 1 million apprentices over two years.

#### **House Lawmakers Push For Highway Trust Fund Fix**

More than 250 House lawmakers want to see a fix for the ailing Highway Trust Fund (HTF) included in any tax reform package this year. In a bipartisan letter to the House Ways and Means Committee on June 16<sup>th</sup>, lawmakers — including 119 Republicans — urged the panel to come up

with a long-term funding solution for the Highway Trust Fund when they pursue a major overhaul of the tax code this year.

Federal fuel taxes haven't been raised in more than 20 years. They noted that all trust fund revenue enhancements in the past 30 years have come as part of a larger deficit reduction or tax reform package. Congress provided funding for the Highway Trust Fund in the last surface transportation bill using a series of budgetary gimmicks. But the fund will face another shortfall in 2020, when the highway bill's current funding expires. Some of the funding ideas that have been floated include charging fees based on the number of miles a vehicle travels, raising the federal gas tax and increasing existing sales and tire taxes.

### **USDOT Seeks Input on Unnecessary Rules and Policies Regarding Transportation Projects**

The U. S. Department of Transportation on June 9<sup>th</sup> requested interested stakeholders to identify specific administrative and regulatory requirements that impede project development and approvals and to present ideas on how these impediments can be eliminated. The comment period is open until July 24, 2017.

The comments can address any DOT requirement that unjustifiably delays or prevents surface, maritime and aviation projects, whether issued by the Office of the Secretary of Transportation or any of the modal administrations. Although the USDOT is primarily seeking proposals for administrative changes, it also has invited commenters to submit recommendations for legislative changes "if non-statutory changes are insufficient to address a specific obstacle to transportation infrastructure projects." DOT is seeking the following information from commenters:

- Specific references to the policy statement, guidance document, regulation or statute that imposes the unnecessary burden
- A description of the burden and how the policy, guidance or rule imposes, including data and specific examples
- A description of less burdensome alternatives
- Examples of affected projects

Comments can be submitted to: <http://www.regulations.gov> referencing DOT Docket Number DOT-OST-2017-0057.

### **US DOT Revamps FASTLANE Grant Program With New Name And Goals**

The Department of Transportation (DOT) issued a Federal Register notice on June 29<sup>th</sup> describing changes in the existing FASTLANE federal transportation grant program. FASTLANE was authorized in 2016 by Congress to provide \$4.5 billion over five years for freight and highway projects.

The program will now be known as the Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) program. Consistent with the Administration's \$1 trillion infrastructure proposals, the retooled program will focus on projects that match federal funding with the private sector or other non-federal sources, as well as projects that address rural infrastructure needs.

Although the revamped program will still focus on projects that promote national or regional economic, mobility and safety, INFRA will now place an emphasis on projects that leverage non-federal funding — which could include money from the private sector, states or cities — and projects that use innovative approaches to permitting and project delivery to speed up project delivery and reduce construction costs.

To appeal to rural regions that might not attract public/private partnerships, INFRA will retain a statutory requirement to award at least 25 percent of funding for direct funding of projects in rural regions.

## STATE

### **California Court Leaders Propose Decriminalizing Most Traffic Tickets**

California's court leaders are proposing legislation to make traffic violations civil offenses, removing them from the criminal arena. The plan would protect drivers from possible arrest and massive fines for failing to show up on the date written on a ticket.

A person would have to pay the ticket if the evidence showed he or she "more likely than not" committed the traffic infraction. Current rules require the evidence to show guilt "beyond a reasonable doubt." The intention is to have minor traffic citations decided in civil court, so the penalties, the consequences, and maybe the emotions, won't run so high.

Several other states handle traffic infractions as civil matters. Examples of infractions include: running a stop sign, making an unsafe lane change, speeding up to 15 mph above the speed limit, and driving without a working tail light. Tickets for offenses that are misdemeanors would continue to be handled in the criminal system. These include citations for driving under the influence and knowingly driving with a suspended license for a DUI conviction.

Drivers also would be able to contest tickets in writing without having to appear in court. But if they lose, they would not get a second trial before a judge. They still would have the right to appeal. Judges would continue to have discretion to issue fines above the amount on an unpaid ticket and to take into consideration a person's ability to pay when deciding whether to reduce fines. But a person no longer would face the loss of a driver's license or a \$300 additional assessment for failing to appear on the date on the ticket.

### **New Caltrans Traffic Radar Aims To Stop Wrong-Way Drivers Before They Enter Ramps**

Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol have partnered since last January in a pilot program in Sacramento and San Diego to stop wrong-way accidents. The agencies have installed giant "Do not enter" signs and red reflectors where the exit ramp intersects with the street. In addition, six off-ramps on Highway 50 in Sacramento are equipped with a solar-powered radar system that detects a car heading the wrong way then triggers a series of actions: the signs flash LED lights, cameras start to record video and pictures to capture the car's license plates, and an audible alarm alerts highway patrol on computers and cell phones at the Bay Area Traffic Management Center.

Since the two-year project started in January, it has detected two wrong-way drivers. One got into a minor crash and the driver was arrested on charges of driving under the influence. In the second case, a car appeared to catch the warnings, and turn around. A passing police car guided it off the ramp.

### **Aggressive Enforcement Needed To Keep Driver-Only Clean Vehicles In HOV Lanes**

Carpool and toll lanes in California have gotten so popular that 58 percent of the Bay Area's carpool lanes have failed to achieve the minimum federal performance standard of 45 mph speeds at least 90 percent of the time. In Los Angeles, performance was even worse at 68 percent. If the slowing trend continues, something will need to be done to free up capacity and increase average speeds in the carpool lanes

Caltrans must report back to federal officials by Dec. 1 on what options it might consider, otherwise the state could lose federal highway funds. Continued failure to achieve the federal performance standard could mean ending the popular clean vehicle sticker program that allows driver-only clean vehicles to use the lanes. One option is to restrict the lanes to three or more people to qualify as a carpool.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in the Bay Area is trying to address the scofflaws to keep the lanes open to clean vehicles. The agency found an average 24 percent violation rate in the afternoon commute. They believe the congestion in the “managed” lanes could be mitigated by more aggressive ticketing of scofflaws who are willing to risk a \$491 ticket because they don’t fear getting caught.

MTC is seeking to amend AB 544, a bill to extend the popular clean vehicle carpool lane sticker program from its current expiration date on January 1, 2019 to 2025, to address enforcement. The MTC amendment would earmark CHP patrols exclusively dedicated to carpool lane enforcement during the hours when carpool rules are in effect. The incremental costs would be partially offset by doubling the cost of carpool decals from \$22 to \$44 to raise nearly \$350,000 annually.

### **California Transportation Commission Seeks Shovel-ready Active Transportation Projects**

California’s Active Transportation Program (ATP) is about to receive an infusion of more than \$100 million statewide each year from the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) and SB 1. The GGRF funds are available now and the SB 1 funds may be available by November 2017.

As a result, the California Transportation Commission staff is looking for a few good bicycle and pedestrian projects that are ready for funding now. The Commission is first looking to fund projects that did not get funding in previous GGRF rounds. In addition, ATP staff is encouraging sponsors with projects that were awarded funding in CCRF Cycle 3 and are ready to begin work, to apply for the S.B. 1 funds since the S. B. 1 funding will be available by the end of 2017 and the CCRF Cycle 3 funds won’t be available until 2019-21. Detailed information on the GGRF funds can be found [here](#), and for the S.B. 1 funds [here](#).

Program staff also is proposing a change for future funding rounds to allow project managers a third year to complete their projects. Right now, ATP funding cycles force projects to be environmentally cleared, designed and constructed within two years of receiving their grant.

### **TRENDS**

#### **Meet IVO, The Robot That Could Turn Your Vehicle Into A Self-Driving Car**

An intriguing future of autonomous vehicles may not be a car at all, but instead a portable robot that can fit inside a handheld suitcase before taking its place in the driver's seat. Developed by Oded Yechiel, a graduate student in robotic engineering at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev in Israel, the new autonomous driving system, called IVO (short for intelligent vehicle operator), uses a handful of cameras, simple motion sensors and a few mechanical devices to depress the brakes and turn the steering wheel. The system compensates for its relatively simple sensors with highly sophisticated computer algorithms.

The current prototype, which looks a bit like a very stripped-down version of the robot Johnny 5 from the movie "Short Circuit," weighs less than 30 pounds and costs about \$1,600 to produce. By contrast, other high-profile autonomous vehicles (such as Google's or Uber's self-driving cars) can require converting the entire vehicle into an autonomous operator, and can add tens of

thousands of dollars to the final sticker price. The designers anticipate finishing beta by the end of this year.

### **Driverless, Trackless Train Unveiled In China**

Chinese rail-maker CRRC Zhuzhou Locomotive on June 2<sup>nd</sup> unveiled a streetcar/train that doesn't run on physical tracks and that has no driver. The Autonomous Rail Transit (ART) combines bus and train transportation systems. The ART uses sensors to detect road dimensions and is guided by **autonomous driving technology** that enables the vehicle to follow routes without needing rails.

A three-carriage ART is more than 100 feet long and can carry up to 307 passengers. One significant limitation is the range of the electric train. Although the train can reach a top speed of 43 m.p.h., after 10 minutes of charging, it can only travel 15 miles (25 km).

The ART has been in development since 2013, and CRRC plans to deploy the system in 2018.

### **Helsinki launching self-driving bus into regular service**

Helsinki, Finland announced on June 15<sup>th</sup> that it will launch its new RoboBus transit line in the fall operated with one self-driving bus. The regular service follows two years of testing using two driverless minibuses in real traffic conditions in Helsinki and other Finnish cities. With an operator on board in case of an emergency, the buses traveled at 7 mph, learning the route and accruing knowledge about autonomous bus operation. The ultimate goal is to increase public transit use and so to reduce cars and needs to drive in the city.

The vehicle for RoboBusLine will be an electric mini-bus. The planners envision a niche role for the autonomous electric mini-buses. Self-driving buses could offer a solution to the last mile of public transit in Helsinki — taking riders from a regular public transit stop to their homes. Automated, remote-controlled bus service could markedly reduce the costs of the last-mile service and improve access to public transit.

The project, known as Sohjoa, is being implemented by the six largest cities of Finland, Finnish universities, and transportation authorities to prepare for new public transit services and autonomous vehicles. The project is funded within the EU-financed mySMARTLife program, in which European cities develop smart, energy-efficient mobility and lifestyles. The mySMARTLife program goal is to reduce energy consumption in cities by 10% to 15%. mySMARTLife is part of the EU's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program, which includes development of new urban solutions to mitigate climate change.

### **Metro Wants An All-electric Bus Fleet – Sets Goal For 2,200 Electric Buses By 2030**

The nation's second largest public transit agency – the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority – is going electric. On June 22<sup>nd</sup>, Metro announced it plans to begin phasing out its 2,200 natural gas buses and replace them with electric battery engines by 2030.

Currently, Metro uses natural gas buses and does not have any electric buses in its fleet. The plan is to begin by electrifying the Orange Line, a bus line that runs from North Hollywood through the San Fernando Valley, and the Silver Line, which runs from downtown LA to San Pedro. The electric bus technology available today will work on these lines, which are flatter and less demanding on the bus than many of LA County's other bus routes. If that goes well, the Metro board will decide in 2019 whether to proceed with phase two: replacing the rest of the natural gas fleet. There's not currently an electric bus on the market that can meet Metro's needs for its rapid or local service, where buses run 250 miles a day. Metro expects those vehicles will become available around 2020 or 2022.

Electric buses have 30 percent fewer greenhouse gas emissions and 20 percent fewer smog-forming nitrogen oxide emissions than the cleanest natural gas bus, according to the Union of Concerned Scientists. (The natural gas industry disputes this.) And as the California power grid becomes more reliant on renewable energy and less on fossil fuels, the climate benefits will increase.

As expected, the natural gas suppliers are skeptical. Their lobbyists cautioned that the electric buses – which currently cost upwards of \$200,000 more than a comparable natural gas bus – may not come down in price. They asked the board to consider where the money would come from to pay for the \$3 billion they estimate is needed to switch over Metro's entire fleet and build the charging infrastructure.

### **Want To Be Green? Work At Home**

In a June 20<sup>th</sup> Op Ed, piece Joel Kotkin suggested that suburbs should be expanding telecommuting as an alternative to transit. He noted that, outside the large metropolitan core areas, as many people are already working from home as are using transit.

Kotkin reported that, even among the 21 metropolitan areas that have opened substantially new urban-rail systems since 1970, mass transit's share of work trips has declined, on average, from 5.3% to 5%. Meantime, in the **greater Los Angeles area**, the number of people working at home has risen significantly in the last generation, from roughly 1.5% of people in 1980; to about 5% today.

Kotkin theorized that perhaps older, well-connected people are more inclined to avoid miserable commutes, given the chance to do so. He projected that, as the American population skews older, the economy will likely see more workers making such choices and home-based work could be the logical extension of a dispersal from the urban centers to the suburbs.

Kotkin's takeaway? Some see these developments as ominous, but greens and urbanists shouldn't: Telecommuting will, among other things, reduce pollution. It may be that the shift to home-based work will prove the ultimate in mixed use.

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

July 10, 2017

TO: SBCCOG Transportation Committee

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

RE: SBHP Annual Performance Evaluation (APE)

**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.

**BACKGROUND**

The SBCCOG and L. A. Metro have entered into a 5-year cooperative agreement under which SBCCOG will provide assistance to Metro related to the Measure R South Bay Highway Program administration, program development, project oversight and intergovernmental relations.

One of the new provisions of the agreement requires the SBCCOG to develop and implement an annual performance evaluation for each of the SBHP projects of the annual progress planned versus the actual progress made by the project lead agencies, with the exception of Caltrans projects. The new annual planning and reporting process began July 1, 2017. The first-year APE goal is for 80% or more of the SBHP projects to meet or exceed their planned project progress as of June 30, 2018.

SBCCOG and Metro Highway staff have met with each of the cities to provide an individual orientation related to the new APE monitoring and reporting requirements and tools. The meetings also included a review of the current status of each project to provide a baseline for the project planning.

The new requirement also necessitates a change in the quarterly reporting to the SBCCOG Transportation Committee and Board. A draft of the new quarterly report will be prepared that summarizes the project reporting worksheets and shown at the meeting. The new summary will highlight the actual vs planned project progress during the annual evaluation period and the cumulative expenditures related to the actual progress for each SBHP project.

**RECOMMENDATION**

The Transportation Committee may receive and file this report.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

July 10, 2017

TO: SBCCOG Transportation Committee

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

RE: Measure M Master Guidelines

**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.

**BACKGROUND**

L.A. County taxpayers will begin paying Measure M's half-cent sales tax on July 1<sup>st</sup>. In approving the Measure M Master Guidelines on June 22<sup>nd</sup>, the Metro Board considered a revised draft that incorporated staff significant modifications and six Board motions were approved.

**KEY POLICY CHANGES**

Some of the key changes incorporated by Metro Staff the final Measure M guidelines that will impact the SBCCOG include:

- There will not be a Local Return supplemental allocation floor for cities that have resident populations smaller than their employment populations. The Local Return allocations will be based solely on each jurisdiction's per-capita share of countywide resident population.
- The COGs will administer Sub-Regional programs of projects and will be able to use up to 0.5% of each sub-fund's annual allocation for project development and administration.
- The Multi-year Sub-regional Programs and Sub-regional Equity Program will require a transparent prioritization process for these funds using an initial 5-year program of projects with subsequent annual updates. Each COG will be required to meet minimum standards for public participation in the development of these lists. The resulting five-year project lists, updated annually, will be adopted by each COG board and the Metro board at public meetings. The specific administrative details of this process will be developed over the next six months.
- A restriction from Measure R that Measure M sub-regional highway funds be spent on streets within one mile of a state highway was modified to allow projects outside the 1-mile boundary to be funded on a case-by-case basis subject to project-specific conditions.
- Private organizations will be eligible to receive "Visionary Project" seed funding;
- Metro will identify non-local-return funding sources for local jurisdictions' three percent match for major rail transit projects.
- Relinquished state highways are eligible for Measure M highway funding.
- The percentage of funding for ADA paratransit and student and senior pass discounts will be 75% and 25% respectively.

- Active transportation, complete streets, and greenway projects are eligible for highway funds. By explicitly referencing Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, the full range of appropriate project elements that enhance walkability are now eligible.
- Safety for all road users is now a core objective for highway expenditures.
- Metro staff had initially proposed that Level of Service (LOS) improvement be used to evaluate “highway category” projects (which includes projects not just on freeways, but also on surface streets, especially arterials). Board motion 38.3 replaced the LOS performance measure with Vehicles Miles Travelled (VMT) in all Measure M funding categories, including the highway categories.

The switch from LOS to VMT significantly changes the way in which the effectiveness of proposed Measure M investments will be evaluated. The change is significant because LOS measures the reduction of vehicle delays at intersections (aka congestion) while VMT measures the broader improvement in mobility of all travelers, whether travelling alone in a car, or in a carpool, van, truck, bus, train, or on a bike or on foot.

As a result of the shift from LOS to VMT, the types of projects to be funded using Measure M will likely be considerably different than the traditional intersection improvements and signal synchronization projects funded in the Measure R South Bay Highway Program. Measure M projects will be able to include “complete streets” improvements that incorporate elements such as road diets, bikeways, widened sidewalks, pedestrian improvements and safety medians which are not eligible elements of Measure R SBHP projects since they typically increase vehicle delays. Although VMT will be used for the Measure M South Bay highway operational improvements, LOS continues to be used as the performance measure methodology for Measure R South Bay Highway Program operational improvements.

Metro is not transitioning from LOS to VMT methodology in isolation. The state legislature passed SB 743 in 2013, which required the establishment of a new method, aside from LOS, to determine the significance of transportation impacts of a project under CEQA documents. The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has recommended that VMT replace LOS as the primary measure of transportation impacts in CEQA reviews. OPR expects to submit a revised proposal for changes to the CEQA Guidelines to the Natural Resources Agency in June or July of 2017 to commence the formal rulemaking process, after which time jurisdictions will likely have up to two years to complete changes to their policies and practices to comply with State law.

San Jose has a fact sheet on the city’s transition from using LOS in CEQA documentation to using VMT (available at: <https://sanjoseca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/69659>).

### APPROVED METRO BOARD MOTIONS

In addition to the staff changes in the draft guidelines, six board member motions were approved, as follows:

38.1 - SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY HAHN, BUTTS AND GARCIA REGARDING MEASURE M REVISED LOCAL RETURN GUIDELINES WE THEREFORE MOVE TO AMEND the Measure M Guidelines to allow for consideration of projects that fall outside of the "1 mile restriction" in the Highway Operational Improvement Sub-funds Category on a case-by-case basis. The process should be included in the administrative procedures for Multi-year Sub-regional Programs.

NOTE: When Board Motion 38.1 was considered by two Metro committees in mid-June, the motion included a Local Return supplemental allocation (known as the Local Return Floor) for cities that had a resident population lower than their employment population. Between the Committees and the Board, the co-authors eliminated the language pertaining to supplemental Local Return funding. As a result, Local Return allocations will be based on each local jurisdiction's population share of countywide resident population. This methodology is consistent with Proposition A, Proposition C, and Measure R.

**38.2 - MOTION BY DIRECTORS GARCETTI AND BUTTS REGARDING MEASURE M MASTER GUIDELINES - VISIONARY PROJECTS WE MOVE** that the MTA Board direct the CEO to: A. Allow private organizations to be eligible for Visionary Project Seed funding for predevelopment purposes. An MTA policy shall be established to oversee the use of these funds. B. To maximize pioneering transportation solutions, include under the "Eligible Projects" section, the following criteria: 1. Connectivity to major trip generators 2. Use new and innovative technology solutions, beyond transit solutions. 3. Provides innovation and reduces project costs compared to conventional delivery methods. C. Allow the use of unsolicited proposals using MTA existing policies. D. The criteria and selection process shall be developed and adopted within 6 months.

**38.3 - SUBSTITUTE MOTION BY GARCIA, BONIN, SOLIS AND HAHN REGARDING MEASURE M MASTER GUIDELINES HIGHWAY SUBFUNDS WE THEREFORE MOVE** to remove any reference in this section of the guidelines to "Level of Service". We intend that, in accordance with Metro's Complete Streets policy, Multi-Year Highway Sub-funds shall prioritize the movement of people traveling on foot, by bike, or by transit, in addition to automobile travel, in order to optimize the safe movement of people by all modes. WE FURTHER MOVE to allow the Gateway Cities COG to discuss and prioritize Active Transportation and Complete Streets during the Measure M Guidelines Administrative Development, including a report back to the Board of Directors at the conclusion of the development of these procedures. WE FURTHER MOVE to direct Metro staff to include Active Transportation and Complete Streets, Innovative Mobility Technology, and Greenways in the Measure M Guidelines Administrative Development for the Highway Sub-fund 2%.

**38.4 - MOTION BY GARCIA, BUTTS AND HAHN REGARDING MEASURE M MASTER GUIDELINES - 3% LOCAL CONTRIBUTION FOR TRANSIT SYSTEM CONNECTIVITY PROJECTS WE THEREFORE MOVE** that, during its continued development of Measure M Master Guidelines noted in the guidelines' Attachment D, Metro develop further options for the identification and utilization of funding sources, separate from Local Return, that could be available to any local jurisdictions to partially or fully fund the 3% local match for those major transit projects designated for system connectivity purposes.

**38.5 – MOTION BY SOLIS, FASANA, RIDLEY-THOMAS, HAHN AND GARCIA REGARDING MEASURE M GUIDELINES – RELINQUISHED STATE HIGHWAYS I THEREFORE MOVE** that we expand the Highway Sub-fund eligibility to include state highways that have been or will be relinquished to local jurisdictions.

**38.6 – MOTION BY KREKORIAN** established the percentages for ADA Paratransit for the Disabled / Metro Discounts for Seniors and Students be set as 75% for ADA paratransit and 25% for low income student and senior pass discounts.

### NEXT STEPS

Metro staff expects to issue Measure M administrative guidelines within the next 6-18 months for each the various sub-funds. Metro staff also intends to update the Metro Long Range Transportation the next two years to incorporate the new Measure M revenues, programs and projects. The Measure M Policy Advisory Committee will continue to provide policy input to the Metro staff and Board during the development of the Measure M administrative guidelines and the Long-Range Transportation Plan.

### RECOMMENDATION

The Transportation Committee may receive and file this report.