



Minutes

Measure R South Bay Highway Program Oversight Committee November 14, 2011 Minutes

Attendees: Jim Goodhart (Chair, PVE), Ellen Perkins (Palos Verdes Estates), Susan Rhilinger (Torrance), Judy Mitchell (Rolling Hills Estates), Rob Beste (IWG Chair, Torrance), Fiaz Mir (Iteris), Paul Martin (RBF Consulting), Lan Saadatnedjadi (Metro), Jacki Bacharach (SBCCOG), Steve Lantz (SBCCOG Transportation Consultant)

- I. **Introductions and Minutes from October 10, 2011 meeting – Jim Goodhart** (Attachment A)
- II. **Infrastructure Working Group & IWG Executive Committee Report – Rob Beste**

Steve Lantz made a presentation on update sheets for project progress. It was recommended that future IWG agendas include an item re: progress reports on specific projects. Robert Beste reported that Torrance is moving forward to obtain a design consultant for its transit center project.

Steve Lantz noted that Metro has issued signage guidelines that will be distributed to IWG members and included on the agenda. Jacki Bacharach asked what visibility the COG would have on the signage. The committee also discussed the COG's role in special events. – ex. 1st groundbreaking should be a media event. SBCCOG and Metro should be part of the media events scheduled for each city project.

A city has raised the question of how the SBCCOG process works (e.g.: How are new projects added? How are projects ranked on the list? Steve Lantz noted that the Implementation Plan describes the processes and ranking criteria. Jacki Bacharach suggested that we prepare a brief Frequently Asked Questions and make the topic part of our training content on the PMIS. It was also suggested that the difference between the Metro Call for Projects process and the SBCCOG SBHP process be explicitly covered. City question re: SBCCOG process re: measure r highway program – ex. oversight committee. Jim Goodhart also requested that any IWG attendees with projects be invited to make a short update at the IWG meeting. Rob Beste suggested it could be incorporated into the self-introductions at the beginning of the IWG meeting agenda.

Rob Beste discussed recent efforts by some on the Metro board to accelerate the Green Construction more than the cities and beyond Metro projects. Mike Bohlke intervened on behalf of the SBCCOG and other COGs to oppose expansion of the current program. We need to be vigilant. Although Metro staff was supposed to report back to their board on outreach in November and the South Bay was initially selected for the outreach program, nothing has been scheduled to date.

- III. **Metro Update – Metro staff - NONE**

- IV. **Metro Agreements - Status**

- a. Lead Agency / Metro SBHP Budget Request and project funding agreements status (Attachment B). Staff recommends that the Oversight Committee recommend preliminary Board Approval of the FY 2012-13 SBHP budget request to Metro with final adjustments to be considered by the Steering Committee at its December 12, 2011 meeting in order to meet Metro's December 31, 2011 submittal deadline. Iteris and Steve Lantz are finalizing schedule and costs changes from cities. The cumulative total will be about the same amount with annual

amounts changing principally to reflect schedule changes that move the budget from one year to another. Steve Lantz reported that Caltrans has requested that the I405 - SR110 projects (interchange and auxiliary lane) be combined into a single study and that the project limits for the study be lengthened to be from the 91 interchange to Torrance Blvd. Lan Saadatnejadi wants the SBCCOG to prepare a south bay systems operations plan funded with SBHP strategic positioning funds. Rob Beste said that he thought she was going to find funding outside of our allocation. Steve Lantz said Lan has offered to write the scope and then we can determine where funding comes from. The committee also discussed how much funding Caltrans needs for their ps&e based on the scope of the study not a straight percentage of the project cost which was the method used to calculate the initial funding recommendation when the Implementation Plan was initially approved. Steve Lantz also noted we need to know if Metro staff time will be charged to our program or if it will be funded from the administrative fee Metro charges off the top of Measure R.

Lan Saadatnejadi joined the meeting. She explained that Metro manages Caltrans projects through cooperative agreements rather than through the Funding Agreements Metro uses for the Call for Projects and our SBHP projects. Our SBHP program presents a new management model for Metro. After further discussion on the SBCCOG's oversight role in respect to Caltrans SBHP projects, it was decided the SBCCOG should review and approve scopes and budgets of Metro agreements with for consistency with our planning processes just to be sure we are ok with them. Lan also confirmed that no Metro costs charged to the SBHP yet and committed to get Caltrans to provide an update of its projected costs for the Annual Budget Update Request that the SBCCOG must submit to Metro in December. She also confirmed that an update of the Funding Allocation Chart should be sufficient at this time for the budget request submittal document.

- b. Metro / SBCCOG Funding Agreement Amendments / Cooperative Agreement Deliberations – Status Update – discussions with Metro are underway on a draft prepared by Metro. Should be completed in time for submittal to Metro at its February Metro board meeting and SBCCOG board meeting in January. An amendment to the current funding agreement between Metro and the SBCCOG has been received that eliminates the 5% retention provision.

V. Iteris Contract

- a. Phase II Task Orders for Funding Agreement preparation assistance – Five task orders totaling \$65,617 have been administratively approved. An initial four were approved by the Board at its October 27, 2011 meeting. Task Order 6.5 was administratively approved for a not-to-exceed value of \$9,700 to Iteris, Inc. and its subcontractors. The firms will provide technical assistance to Hermosa Beach in preparation of the Metro Funding Agreement related project F45 – Pacific Coast Highway – Artesia to Anita. This new task order is being forwarded as an information item to the SBCCOG Oversight Committee and Board. – RECEIVED AND FILED with the following correction: the initial 4 task orders were approved by the Board is incorrect. The Board just approved one task order and received and filed the other 3. For clarity, it would be more appropriate to say that the Board has received, reviewed and approved where necessary the task orders.

Iteris also reported that 2 of the 5 task orders to provide cities assistance in preparing their funding agreements are completed and have been submitted to metro.

- b. South Bay Measure R ITS Plan Task Order #7 (Attachment C)
Staff recommends that the Oversight Committee recommend Board Approval of the scope of work for Task Order #7 to the Iteris, Inc. team as described in Attachment C. The not-to-exceed cost is \$149,850. If approved by the Board on November 17, the task order work will begin December 1, 2011 and will end April 30, 2012. – Rob Beste would like to talk to Jane White first about how to proceed. There might be some gaps. Gap analysis could be important. He also feels that the “Bells and whistles” in some of the ITS projects are not as regionally important because they won't be used since he does not believe there will be local staff to actively manage the ITS systems. He felt general coordination is important

and should be funded. Steve Lantz suggested that Caltrans, City of L.A. , County of L.A., and some of our cities with current or planned ITS projects would be the people that should talk about the project scope. He also noted that Alan Clelland, of Iteris, is one of the nation's experts. Jacki Bacharach suggested that we convene the cities that would have the most interest to develop a scope with the other agencies listed above for a South Bay ITS Plan. The Committee made the recommendation to table this task order without prejudice and suggested that staff and consultants have a meeting first with the agencies to define what we might want to do and refine the study scope from there.

- VI.** Schedule -- Three Month Look Ahead / Implementation Update Calendar (Attachments D, E) – To avoid the problem that the Board does not meet in December, in future years, we should finish the annual budget update request so that it is approved at the November board meeting each year.
- VII.** Other – Lan mentioned that staff is developing a Metro Board policy re: how Metro will handle the use of Measure R funds for COG programs. Lan expects that the new policy will go to the Metro board in February for their adoption and should not be in conflict with the cooperative agreement the SBCCOG is developing with Metro.
- VIII.** Adjourn to December 12, 2011, 10:30 AM