

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

South Bay Transit Operators Working Group

AGENDA

Thursday, January 9, 2020
3:00 p. m. - 4:30 p. m.

Torrance Transit Administrative Offices
20500 Madrona Ave., Torrance, CA 90503

- 3:00 p. m. Self-Introductions and Approval of the November 19, 2019 Meeting Notes (Attachment A)
- 3:05 p. m. Transit Operator Issues and Concerns
- 3:15 p. m. **REVISED** Evaluation of Applications Submitted for Measure M & R Call for Projects (Attachment B)
- 3:45 p. m. Transit Operator Working Group Recommended DRAFT Selection Criteria for Measure R SBHP Transfer Policy Transit Projects (Attachment C)
- 4:00 p. m. NextGen Study status
- 4:10 p. m. "Micro by Metro" Microtransit Pilot Project Update
- 4:15 p. m. Inglewood Special Event Service Coordination Update
- 4:20 p. m. Metro Transit to Parks Initiative
- 4:25 p. m. Announcements
- 4:30 p. m. Adjournment

Next Transit Operators Working Group meeting date –?

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transit Operators' Working Group

November 19, 2019

Meeting Notes

Attendees: Joyce Rooney, Leslie Scott (Beach Cities Transit); Kim Turner, Godfrey Offoegbu, James Lee (Torrance Transit); Ernie Crespo & Dana Pynn (GTrans); Steve Lantz & David Leger (SBCCOG)

1) Self-Introductions & Acceptance of the October 22, 2019 Meeting Notes

The meeting was called to order at 3:12pm. Meeting notes were accepted as presented.

2) Transit Operator Issues and Concerns

Ms. Rooney announced that Los Angeles World Airports asked Beach Cities Transit to facilitate service into LAX during the holidays. Logistical discussions continue on the request.

3) Evaluation of Applications Submitted for Measure M & R Call for Projects

Mr. Lantz reported that the SBCCOG's Transportation Committee voted to recommend that up to \$560M be made available from the Measure R South Bay highway sub-fund to fund highway or transit capital projects in the South Bay. Mayor Butts introduced the motion which was unanimously approved by the Committee. The item will now go to the SBCCOG Board for final approval and recommendation to the Metro Board.

Mr. Lantz handed out the summary of project applications (available here:

http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transit_operators/meeting/HANDOUT_Transfer%20Request%20Summary%2011.19.19%20v2.pdf) and explained that the next step (assuming SBCCOG Board approval of the transfer) is to discuss the selection and/or prioritization of eligible projects. Mr. Lantz noted that there are concerns that some projects, such as bus replacement projects, could be considered a "maintenance" project which is not eligible under current South Bay Highway Program (SBHP) policies. Ms. Rooney explained that bus replacement is not the same as maintenance and that she would recommend replacement be eligible. It was also noted that although other funding sources exist, small operators do not fare well in bus replacement grants as 75% of the funding goes to large agencies like Metro. Funding may be awarded for partial bus replacement but would likely not fully fund even one whole bus each year, let alone replacement of multiple buses that serve a route.

Mr. Lantz also added that there must be a discussion on a matching policy. There is a current SBHP match policy that could be used; however, Mayor Butts' motion urged the SBCCOG Board to consider eliminating the match policy to be consistent with the current Measure M policy (no match required). Mr. Lantz cautioned that this will be considered but may not be enacted as it could further reduce the number of projects able to be funded. The Transit Operators were largely supportive of no match requirement but understood that it could limit the number of projects.

The Transit Operators discussed the need for reasonable selection criteria and proposed drafting transit project eligibility and selection criteria based on existing criteria already in use by other agencies/funding sources. The group will provide the proposed criteria by December 12th.

4) NextGen Study Status

No discussion on this item.

5) "Micro by Metro" Microtransit Pilot Project

Torrance Transit expressed their opposition to the idea. No further discussion on the topic occurred.

6) Inglewood Special Event Service Coordination Update

Meetings continue between South Bay Transit Operators and Inglewood staff to discuss potential service opportunities. GTrans appears to be the only South Bay service provider currently planning on partnering for game day service at this time.

7) Metro Transit to Parks Initiative

Ms. Rooney noted that this initiative was started by Metro during the summer and is a study on using transit to bring more residents to local parks.

8) Announcements/Adjournment – Next Transit Operators Working Group meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m. to January 9th, 2020.

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Attachment B

January 13, 2020

To: SBCCOG Transportation Committee

Previous version also provided to:

SBCCOG Infrastructure Working Group
SBCCOG Transit Operators Working Group

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

Subject: **REVISED** Evaluation of Applications Submitted for FY 20-21 Metro Budget Request

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

It is clear that there is not sufficient Measure R SBHP or Measure M MSP revenue to fully fund the \$153 million needed to complete active SBHP and MSP projects plus \$410 million requested in new transit applications and \$920 million in new highway project applications submitted by Caltrans, Metro and local jurisdictions within the next five years. However, Measure R continues through 2039 and the Measure M sales tax rate rises from a half-cent to one cent in 2039 and continues indefinitely making it possible to eventually fund at least a share of project costs from projected South Bay sub-regional sales tax revenues.

Based on anticipated cashflow reimbursements needed to fund annual project progress, it is possible that a limited number of projects can progress toward completion within annual SBHP and MSP budgets. SBCCOG staff is working with project applicants to clarify the amount of funding needed each year during the next five years to not delay their project delivery schedules beyond the funding currently allocated to the project or beyond the scope of current funding agreements. Cost-to-complete estimates for active projects and new project requests have been provided by lead agencies for FY 2020-21 and through FY 2024-25 (see Exhibits 1 and 2).

It may be necessary to delay some of the projects or to limit the Measure R SBHP or Measure M MSP funding share allocated to each project in order to balance anticipated revenues with project cashflow requirements. To better understand these potential annual funding ramifications, at the December 9, 2019 SBCCOG Transportation Committee meeting, SBCCOG staff was requested to respond to several issues, as follows:

1. Determine the amount of unallocated Measure R SBHP and Measure M MSP funding available in FY 2020-21 and through FY 2025.

Staff estimates that approximately \$152.7 million in additional SBHP funding is needed through FY 2025 to all complete active SBHP projects. Staff estimates that approximately \$2.5 million in additional MSP funding is needed through FY 2025 to complete all active MSP projects.

SBCCOG staff had provided estimates based on Metro’s most recent Long-Range Transportation Plan. However the SBCCOG was provided updated figures based on Metro’s 2019 Update of its Short Range Transportation on January 7, 2020. Based on these update numbers, the South Bay will have new sub-regional South Bay funding (beyond current program allocations) available as follows:

<u>Source</u>	<u>FY 2020-21</u>	<u>Total through FY 2024-25</u>
Measure R SBHP	\$ 31.5 million	\$106.6 million
Measure M HEOI	\$ 60.7 million	\$ 73.5 million
Measure M TSMIP I, II	<u>\$ 41.6 million</u>	<u>\$ 68.5 million</u>
Uncommitted total	\$133.8 million	\$ 248.6 million

NOTE: MSP funds can only be used for highway capital projects through at least FY 2027, when a Measure M amendment process could first create a decennial transfer process in Measure M similar to the Measure R process currently under consideration by the Metro Board. An amendment of the Measure M ordinance could make MSP funding available one time for transit or highway capital projects after 2028.

2. Consider waiving the local match requirement for new Measure R SBHP and Measure M MSP projects.

SBCCOG policy guidelines currently limit the amount of SBHP funding allocated to a project using a sliding scale as follows:

<u>SBHP Project costs</u>	<u>SBHP share</u>
Under \$2 million	100%
\$2 million to \$10 million	80%
Over \$10 million	50% (SBCCOG/Metro Boards may approve up to 80%)

Metro’s Measure M policy and administrative guidelines do not limit the MSP share of project costs and do not require matching funds from other sources.

Project allocations for any single project have not exceeded \$25 million to date. However, current applications are seeking allocations as high as \$250 million. SBCCOG could decide to limit the proportion of Measure R SBHP or Measure M MSP funds and/or cap the amount of Measure R and Measure M MSP funds allocated to a single project.

3. Recommend the project allocations to be included in the FY 2020-21 Metro Budget Request for Measure R SBHP and Measure M MSP funds.

The SBCCOG Board needs to approve any FY 2020-21 Metro Budget Requests by its February 2020 meeting in order for Metro staff to include the requests in the Metro FY 2020-21 Metro Budget item to be considered by the Metro Board in April 2020. Metro’s fiscal year begins July 1, 2020. It should be possible to include new funding to complete upcoming phases of active SBHP and MSP projects and to allocate new funds for MSP highway projects.

However, the Metro Board outlined an approval process at its December meeting that will have it consider the Measure R Transfer Policy in May 2020. The Metro sub-fund transfer item requires a 2/3 affirmative

vote by the Metro Board. Transit projects could become eligible for Measure R SBHP funding once the Measure R Transfer Policy is approved by the Metro Board.

In anticipation of a new Metro Measure R SBHP Transfer Policy, the SBCCOG Transit Operators Working Group has recommended draft transit project eligibility and selection criteria for transit projects (see Attachment D). A transit project eligibility and selection criteria will be addressed after Metro adopts the Measure R SBHP Transfer Policy. Consequently, funding commitments for South Bay transit and highway projects to be funded under the new transfer policy may be delayed until the Metro Board amends its FY 2020-21 budget in January 2021.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the SBCCOG Board consider the following recommendations:

1. Nine active projects have a need for additional funding in the next 5 years. For FY 20/21, it appears that there is not quite enough funding from Measure R SBHP for these projects. SBCCOG staff recommends using a combination of Measure R and Measure M funds to meet these commitments for current projects in the FY 20/21 budget request.
2. Rather than waiving the current SBHP matching requirement clarify that it includes potential regional, state, federal and private dollars as well as any local contribution:
 - a. Modify the current SBHP policy to incorporate a maximum individual or combined share of SBHP and MSP of total project costs according to the following sliding scale:

<u>Total Project Costs</u>	<u>Maximum SBHP/MSP Share</u>
Less than \$10 million	100%
Between \$10 million and \$25 million	75%
Between \$25 million and \$50 million	50%
Between \$50 million and \$75 million	25%
Between \$75 million and \$250 million	20%
Above \$250 million	0%

For projects costs between \$75 million and \$250 million, allow a project applicant to appeal to the SBCCOG and Metro Boards for an increase in the SBHP/MSP share from 20% to 25% based on the regional benefit of the project by reducing vehicle delay or vehicle miles travelled in the corridor segment served by the project.

- b. If project scoring is required in the project selection process, to encourage leveraging of SBHP and MSP funds, award up to 10 points in the evaluation scoring methodology for the cumulative SBHP/MSP share of the total project costs, as follows:

- 10 points for less than a 10% share of SBHP/MSP funds
- 8 points for less than a 20% share of SBHP/MSP funds
- 6 points for less than a 30% share of SBHP/MSP funds
- 4 points for less than a 40% share of SBHP/MSP funds

2 points for less than a 50% share of SBHP/MSP funds
0 points for more a 50 % share of SBHP/MSP funds

3. Apply the modified SBHP matching and cap requirements to all active and future SBHP and MSP projects.
4. Implement a 2-phase FY2020-21 Metro Budget Request. Phase 1 would include funding allocations to advance active SBHP and MSP projects. Phase 2 would allocate MSP funds and Measure R SBHP for new transit and highway projects that are eligible under new guidelines developed in Metro's Measure R Transfer process after the Metro Board approves the transfer.

Exhibit 1 – Cost to Complete Active SBHP Projects

Exhibit 2 – New Project Applications

Attachment B, Exhibit 1: Estimated cost to complete active projects (non-funded phases)

Phase: PAED Design Right of Way Construction	Project Title/Description	Funds Requested	20-21 Total	FY20-25 Total
Measure R SBHP				
C	Caltrans I-405/Crenshaw on/off ramps project (EA 29360) (CONSTRUCTION FUNDS)	\$60,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$60,000,000
C	Caltrans PCH (I-105 to I-110) Overlay Asphalt Concrete, add turn lanes and pockets at various location. (City Projects) (EA 32580)	\$8,400,000	\$4,400,000	\$8,400,000
MR312.57 D, ROW	City of El Segundo Park Place from Nash St. to Allied Way, Roadway gap closure and railroad grade separation	\$5,000,000	\$600,000	\$5,000,000
MR312.57 C		\$60,000,000	\$0	\$24,000,000
MR312.69 C	City of Hawthorne El Segundo Blvd. Phase 2	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$3,000,000
MR312.48 C	City of Los Angeles Alameda St. (South) Widening from Anaheim St. to Harry Bridges Blvd.	\$15,000,000	\$0	\$15,000,000
MR312.74 C	City of Los Angeles State Route 47/Vincent Thomas Bridge & Front St./Harbor Blvd. Interchange Reconfiguration	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000
MR312.32 C	Port of Los Angeles State Route 47/Vincent Thomas Bridge & Front St./Harbor Blvd. Interchange Reconfiguration	\$25,170,760	\$500,000	\$25,170,760
MR312.38 C	City of Redondo Beach PCH at Anita St Improvements (left and right turn lanes)	\$2,100,000	\$0	\$2,100,000
		\$188,670,760	\$30,500,000	\$152,670,760
Measure M HEQIP/TSMIP				
MM5502.05 C	SBCCOG South Bay Fiber Network	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
		\$160,570,760	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Attachment B, Exhibit 2: New Highway Project Requests

PAED Design Right of Way Construction Purchase		Funds Requested to Complete Project	20-21 Total	FY20-25 Total
	Project Title/Description			
PAED	Caltrans Interstate 110 (I-110) southbound off-ramp to Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) by widening the mainline to add one auxiliary lane and widening the off-ramp to provide a two-lane exit. (EA 34810)	\$1,850,000	\$1,850,000	\$1,850,000
D		\$3,931,000	\$0	\$3,931,000
ROW		\$6,445,000	\$0	\$6,445,000
C		\$30,774,000	\$0	\$10,550,000
C	Caltrans I-405/Crenshaw on/off ramps project (EA 29360) (CONSTRUCTION FUNDS)	\$60,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$60,000,000
PAED	Caltrans On I-405 N/B construct auxiliary lanes from El Segundo to Imperial Highway (Route 105). Widen the northbound off-ramp to two lanes at the exit to provide two left-turn lanes and a separate right-turn lane. (EA 36570)	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
D		\$12,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$12,000,000
ROW		\$2,200,000	\$1,150,000	\$2,200,000
C		\$138,000,000	\$0	\$103,400,000
PAED	Caltrans Construct Transition Lanes along N/B and S/B on Route 405 between Artesia Blvd and El Segundo Blvd.(EA 35310)	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000
D		\$10,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$10,000,000
ROW		\$2,100,000	\$2,070,000	\$2,100,000
C		\$130,500,000	\$0	\$103,500,000

PAED Design Right of Way Construction Purchase		Funds Requested to Complete Project	20-21 Total	FY20-25 Total
	Project Title/Description			
PAED	Caltrans At 405/110 Separation, add auxiliary lanes and widen connectors from Northbound and Southbound 405 to Route 110. (EA 35710)	\$6,500,000	\$3,000,000	\$6,500,000
D		\$15,000,000	\$0	\$15,000,000
ROW		\$12,500,000	\$0	\$12,500,000
C		\$166,000,000	\$0	\$22,000,000
PAED	Caltrans Construct Eastbound and Westbound Auxiliary Lanes between I-110/ Main Street and Wilmington Ave on I-405. (EA 35940)	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000	\$3,200,000
D		\$10,000,000	\$3,800,000	\$10,000,000
ROW		\$2,100,000	\$800,000	\$2,100,000
C		\$130,500,000	\$0	\$130,500,000
C	Caltrans PCH (I-105 to I-110) Overlay Asphalt Concrete, add turn lanes and pockets at various location. (City Projects) (EA 32580)	\$8,400,000	\$4,400,000	\$8,400,000
D, C	Metro I-105 Integrated Corridor Management	\$23,309,750	\$650,000	\$19,509,750
D, C	City of Carson Carson Street ITS Project	\$700,000	\$700,000	\$700,000
D, C	City of Carson Avalon Blvd. TSSP Project	\$1,530,000	\$1,530,000	\$1,530,000
D, C	City of Carson Sepulveda Blvd. Widening from Alameda Street to ICTF	\$7,360,000	\$1,072,000	\$7,360,000
PAED, D, C	City of Gardena Redondo Beach Blvd Arterial Improvements	\$4,853,600	\$815,000	\$4,853,600

PAED Design Right of Way Construction Purchase		Funds Requested to Complete Project	20-21 Total	FY20-25 Total
	Project Title/Description			
PAED, D, ROW, C	City of Hawthorne Rosecrans Avenue Moility Improvement Project Phase II from Prairie Ave to Crenshaw Blvd.	\$4,500,000	\$20,000	\$640,000
PAED, D, ROW, C	City of Hawthorne Crenshaw Blvd. Signal Improvement and intersection capacity enhancements from 120th St. to Rosecrans Ave.	\$9,000,000	\$20,000	\$580,000
PAED, D, C	City of Hermosa Beach Pacific Coast Highway Mobility and Accessibility Improvement Project	\$11,600,000	\$500,000	\$11,600,000
D, C	City of Inglewood Downtown ITS	\$11,100,000	\$0	\$11,100,000
D, C	City of Inglewood Manchester Blvd. Improvements	\$17,000,000	\$0	\$17,000,000
D, C	City of Inglewood First/Last Mile Improvements	\$6,500,000	\$4,500,000	\$6,500,000
D, C	City of Inglewood Prairie Ave. Improvements	\$9,000,000	\$0	\$8,000,000
D, C	City of Inglewood CMS and CCTV Project	\$7,000,000	\$0	\$7,000,000
PAED, D, C	Los Angeles County Westmont/West Athens Community Pedestrian Plan Implementation (Phase 2)	\$1,165,000	\$84,000	\$1,165,000
PAED	City of Palos Verdes Estates Palos Verdes Drive West Corridor Expansion Project	\$676,500	\$520,000	\$676,500
D		\$960,000	\$0	\$960,000
C		\$10,150,000	\$0	\$10,150,000
C	Port of Los Angeles State Route 47/Vincent Thomas Bridge & Front St./Harbor Blvd. Interchange Reconfiguration	\$25,170,760	\$500,000	\$25,170,760

PAED Design Right of Way Construction Purchase		Funds Requested to Complete Project	20-21 Total	FY20-25 Total
	Project Title/Description			
PAED, D, C	City of Rancho Palos Verdes Western Avenue Congestion Improvement Project from 25th Street to Palos Verdes Drive North	\$3,330,000	\$90,000	\$3,330,000
PAED, D, C	City of Redondo Beach Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) Improvements at Palos Verdes Boulevard	\$4,700,000	\$500,000	\$4,700,000
C	City of Redondo Beach North Redondo Beach Bikeway (NRBB) Extension – Felton Lane to Inglewood Avenue	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	\$1,000,000
D	City of Redondo Beach North Redondo Beach Bikeway (NRBB) Extension – Inglewood Avenue	\$200,000	\$60,000	\$200,000
PAED, D, C	City of Redondo Beach Traffic Signal Communications and Network System	\$2,000,000	\$200,000	\$2,000,000
		\$920,005,610	\$ 77,731,000	\$677,101,610

Transit Operator Working Group Recommend DRAFT Selection Criteria for Measure R SBHWP

Local Match Requirement

- 85% Measure R SBHWP/15% Local Match for “Clean Fuel” or “Alternative Fuel” buses compliant with Clean Air Act
- 90% Measure R SBHWP/10% Local for Vehicle Related Equipment and Facilities for Clean/Alternative Fuel Vehicles

Potentially eligible Project Examples (Transit Operator Working Group):

- Bus Signal Priority/Signal Synchronization /ITS/Autonomous Vehicle Infrastructure System and local interchange modifications
- Transit Improvements related to Transit Enhancements including –
- Transit Centers, Park and Ride Lots/Parking Structures
- Paratransit (Dial-a-Ride, Senior / Disable Capital Projects)
- Metro / Municipal Transit Capacity Expansion, Technology Conversion/Enhancement
- Transit Centers / Park and Ride Lots and Transit Related Parking Structures
- Bus Lanes
- Transportation Enhancement / Beautification Elements of Transportation Improvements
- Transit Stop Enhancements
- Vehicle Conversion
- Fueling Infrastructure and Energy Storage – including Zero-Emission and Alternative Fuel
- Vehicle Related Equipment or Facilities – including Clean Fuel or Alternative Fuel
- Construction of New or Modification/Expansion of Existing Transit Related Facility
- Bus Layover, Transit Stops and Bus Turnouts

Assessment Criteria	Measures	Weight
1 Mobility/Accessibility Improvement	Project increases travel by transit, paratransit, bicycle and pedestrian modes; improves travel times. Improves effectiveness & reliability for core riders. Increases reliability of service, improved headways and/or eliminating gaps in the current transportation network.	20%
2. Project Readiness	Project definition of scope, total budget and proposed funding sources, and Measure R reimbursement schedule sufficient to initiate the environmental clearance, Caltrans Project Development documents, or project design. Governing Body/City Council resolution or equivalent in support of project/application. Agencies requesting year 1 or 2 Measure R SBHWP funding reimbursements must be ready to execute a funding agreement with Metro. Requests for funding	15%

	reimbursements during years 3-5 must document project progress needed to enable signing a funding agreement by year 3.	
3. Project Need & Benefit to Transportation System Accessibility	Sub-regional mobility benefits, VMT reduction, reduced safety incidents, improved personal safety. Improved transportation options; improved service to transit; improved first / last mile connections to transit.	15%
4. SBHWP leverage & Cost Effectiveness	Qualitative assessment of project cost versus benefit, lead agency commitment to life-cycle O&M expenses, percentage of cost provided by non-MSP funding allocated to project. Document good faith effort to secure matching funds. Lead Agency support costs capped at 10%.	10%
5. Land Use, Environmental Compatibility and Sustainability	Supports local land use and environmental policies, GHG emissions reduction. Identify consequences of not implementing project.	10%
6. Regional or Multi-jurisdictional benefit or effort	Project or project benefit crosses boundaries with other jurisdictions or project improves connectivity; or closes a network gap; or improves access to activity centers; or improves cost efficiency/supports Transit service delivery.	10%
7. Economic Vitality	Supports job creation & retention; reduces household transportation costs.	10%
8. Sustainability & Quality of Life	Improves environmental quality; improves public health; improves quality of life.	10%
Total		100%