REVISED AGENDA

I. CONFIRM THE QUORUM

II. REPORT OF POSTING OF AGENDA
   ■ ACTION: Receive and file

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS OF ANY CHANGES TO THE AGENDA - ADD LEGISLATIVE MATRIX – 2 BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

V. CONSENT CALENDAR – action items noted, remainder are receive & file – 12:05 pm
   A. Steering Committee – November 9, 2020 meeting minutes attached (Pages 5-9)
      ■ ACTION: Approve

   B. Resolution 2020-1 and 2020-2 to designate new SBCCOG Treasurer
      ■ With the election of SBCCOG and Hawthorne Treasurer David Patterson to the Hawthorne City Council, the SBCCOG needed to find a new treasurer. We are delighted that Joseph Lillio, El Segundo Director of Finance, has volunteered to take over the position.
      ■ Resolution 2020-1 - A Resolution of the Governing Board of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments Designating a Treasurer of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments – attached (Page 11)
      ■ Resolution 2020-2 - A resolution of the Governing Board of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments Authorizing Investment of Moneys in the Local Agency Investment Fund – attached (Page 12)
      ■ ACTION: Approve Resolutions 2020-1 and 2020-2

   C. REN (TEC) contract amendments
      ■ We have 4 different contracts with the Energy Coalition (TEC) for the SoCalREN work. These are all for time extensions through Aug. 2021.
We didn't need funding added as they over funded the contracts for 2020 and the current amount will get us through Aug at our current spend.

**ACTION:** Approve 4 attached contract amendments (Pages 13-16)

D. “Office warming” Gifts from cities
- Responses from: Carson, El Segundo, Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Lomita, Palos Verdes Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, Torrance

E. City Attendance at SBCCOG meetings
- Matrix attached (Page 17)

F. South Bay Environmental Services Center Activities Report – attached (Pages 19-23)

VI. ACTION ITEMS

G. COVID update – 12:10 pm
- Report on Health Department formation research
- Staff, with assistance of El Segundo staff, has been in touch with Beach Cities Health District and the Cities of Pasadena, Santa Clarita, Vernon, Whittier and other subregions as of 12/6/20
- Memos attached and updates at the meeting (Pages 25-30)
- **ACTION:** Provide direction

H. Items from the Transportation Committee – 12:25 pm
- Monthly Transportation Report – attached (Pages 31-36)
- Metro Highway Program Modernization Guidelines – memos to Transportation Committee attached (Pages 37-52)
- **ACTION:** Approve letter to Metro re: SBCCOG comments to guidelines

I. Selection of Website Designer – 12:30 pm
- Final evaluation underway – recommendation to be sent separately

J. Consideration of Director of Regional Planning/Development for the SBCCOG with special assessment – 12:40 pm
- Draft scope of work attached (Page 53)
- 2010-2011 special assessment categories attached as an example (Page 54)
- **ACTION:** Discuss and authorize review by Community Development Directors and City Managers

K. Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission Alternate Vacancy – 12:55 pm
- With Palos Verdes Estates Councilman Kenny Kao leaving office, there is a vacancy for the alternate position on the SMBRC. Redondo Beach Mayor Bill Brand is the delegate.
- Only member agencies of the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission (SMBRC) are eligible. They are El Segundo, Hermosa Beach, Inglewood, Manhattan Beach, Palos Verdes Estates, Rancho Palos Verdes, Redondo Beach, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates and Torrance.
- The Governing Board meets 6 times a year, even numbered months, typically the third Thursday of that month. Meetings start at 9:30 a.m.
- **ACTION:** Open nominations

L. Board Meeting agenda development – 1:00 pm
- January – LTN report, LAWA presentation on Draft EIR
- February - SCAG President Rex Richardson listening session, - Request from CSUDH to provide economic forecast
- March – General Assembly
April – AQMD REP?
At the request of Rolling Hills Councilmember Dieringer, discuss information that needs to go to the Board and attachments that need to be included in the agenda

**ACTION:** Recommend programs of interest for Board presentations and provide direction on RH Councilman Dieringer’s concerns

M. Approval of Invoices – available at the meeting – **1:10 pm**

**ACTION:** Approve invoices for payment

M.1. Legislative Matrix

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS

N. Legislative Issues – **1:15 pm**
- SBCCOG Legislative Briefing – January 14
- LCC/SBACC/SBCCOG Meet and Greet possibly in February. Looking for a date
- Status of housing papers and prep for legislative visits

O. Update on the South Bay Fiber Network – **1:20 pm**

P. Update on Homeless Program and Innovation Project Funding – **1:25 pm**
   - Next meeting – January 6, 2021

Q. Update on Senior Services – **1:30 pm**
   - Next meeting – January 26, 2021

R. General Assembly Update – March 18, 2021 – **1:35 pm**
   - Status of consultant contract options

VIII. STRATEGIC POSITIONING ITEMS/ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES

- Other updates since agenda distribution – **1:40 pm**

**NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING** – Monday, January 11, 2021 @ 12:00 pm via zoom
South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Steering Committee
FOLLOW-UP AGENDA
November 9, 2020

Attendees: Olivia Valentine, James Butts (left early) /Ralph Franklin, Britt Huff, Stacey Armato, Christian Horvath, Rodney Tanaka, John Cruikshank, George Chen/Pat Furey, Kenny Kao, Cedric Hicks, Drew Boyles (12:30)

Laura Guglielmo (PVE), Martha Guzman (El Segundo), Eli Lipmen (Move LA)

Natalie Champion, Wally Siembab, Kim Fuentes, Jacki Bacharach, David Leger, Steve Lantz

I. CONFIRM THE QUORUM - DONE

II. REPORT OF POSTING OF AGENDA
  ■ ACTION: Received and filed

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS OF ANY CHANGES TO THE AGENDA -

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT - NONE

V. CONSENT CALENDAR – action items noted, remainder are receive & file - 12:05 pm REMOVED B & D – CRUIKSHANK/HORVATH
  A. Steering Committee – October 12, 2020 meeting minutes attached
     ■ ACTION: Approved

  B. Extension of Agreement with City of Inglewood for cash advance for South Bay Fiber Network payments
     ■ Agreements attached
     ■ ACTION: APPROVED – TANAKA/HUFF

  C. Legal Action filed by the City of Lawndale
     ■ SBCCOG’s involvement is over. All unnecessary parties have been dismissed from the legal action which included the SBCCOG

  D. “Office warming” Gifts from cities
     ■ Great response to date – El Segundo, Hawthorne, Lomita, Rancho Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills Estates

  E. City Attendance at SBCCOG meetings
     ■ Matrix attached

  F. South Bay Environmental Services Center Activities Report – attached

VII. ACTION ITEMS
  G. Contract with McGowan Consulting, LLC re: Integrated Pest Management Website – Legal issues
     ■ Memo attached
     ■ ACTION: Provide direction – SHOULD THIS CONTRACT GO TO THE BOARD OR BE DECIDED HERE? TANAKA AND BUTTS – NOT SUBSTANTIAL. VALENTINE – CONCERNED RE: EXPOSURE
     ■ CHEN – WHAT IS THE LOSS IF WE DON’T DO IT?
I. Issues – 12:20 pm
   - October 16 Legislative Briefing – no comments
   - LAWA Draft EIR – comments due December 14 – very short amount of time
   - ACTION: Send letter to LAWA requesting the comment period be extended in light of the holidays and the pandemic – VALENTINE – YES. AND DO PRESENTATION TO BOARD.

J. Housing legislative ideas – 12:30 pm
   - Subcommittee meeting November 2 to discuss ideas – to be sent separately
     - SBCCOG paper – VALENTINE – LIKES PROMOTING HOUSING PROGRAMS BY TENANTS. PRESENT NOW OR WAIT FOR NEW LEGISLATORS?
     - Contract Cities Housing Trust Fund concept - STACEY ARMATO - EXISTING ONES HAVE BEEN FAIRLY SUCCESSFUL. PRESERVE AND CREATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING. HAVE THEM MEET RHNA. SHELTER FROM CEQA PROBABLY WON'T BE INCLUDED. REGIONAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING IMPACT FEE ON NEW MARKET HOUSING – MAYBE ON SINGLE AND MULTI. ADMIN FEES. CRITERIA TO RECEIVE FUNDS FROM THE TRUST. AFFORDABLE HOUSING MULTI-UNIT – EXEMPT FROM THE FEE. LIKE CAP AND TRADE? HOUSING TO BE CREATED NOT CITY BY CITY BUT EX. WITHIN THE COG.
     - KAO – INTERESTING CONCEPT – OTHER EXAMPLES? SHARE LIST. ORANGE COUNTY – MAYBE $10 MILLION AFFORDABLE UNITS.
     - HUFF – WALLY’S WHITE PAPER IS EXCELLENT. GET IT OUT ASAP AND NOT WAIT.
     - BACHARACH – CONCERNED RE: BUREAUCRACY OF HOUSING FUND AND WALLY’S PAPER TO BET DISTRIBUTES AT MEETINGS WITH OUR DELEGATION AND THEN OTHER LEGISLATIVE STAFF
     - ARMATO - FEE TO EACH OF CITIES BASED ON POPULATION
     - SIEMBAB – HOUSING FUND DOESN’T DO SITING. AND ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS COULD BE HIGH. NEED TO LOOK AT CASE STUDIES. PLANS TO TURN HIS PAPER INTO PPT WITH PICTURES.
     - KAO – ALL CITIES INCLUDED EVEN NOT IN CCCA?
     - ARMATO - WANT FEEDBACK FROM EVERY CITY. WOULD BE STATEWIDE LEGISLATION
     - CRUIKSHANK – CCCA ASKING CITY MANAGERS FOR THEIR FEEDBACK?
     - ARMATO – YES, ALSO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORS. CAN ATTEND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS – ALL WELCOME. RPV CM WOULD PROBABLY LOVE TO PARTICIPATE.
     - LANTZ – WHAT IS REGIONAL?
     - ARMATO – LOOSE. DIFFERENT IN DIFFERENT AREAS.
     - ACTION: WALLY’S PAPER: MORE VISUAL IS GOOD IDEA. AND THEN PRESENT TO OUR LEGISLATORS. ½ HOUR MEETINGS. FRANKLIN – LEG. BREAKFASTS?
     - VALENTINE – SET UP CITY GROUPS BASED ON LEG DISTRICTS TO MEET WITH THEM
HORVATH – DEFINITELY MEET WITH OUR OWN DELEGATION FROM SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA – KAMLAGER, BLOOM, ALLEN, PORTANTINO AND THEN MAYBE A LOBBYST COULD HELP WITH APPTS. WITH NO CAL AND CENTRAL CAL LEGISLATORS. THIS ISN’T ON THEIR RADAR.

CRUIKSHANK – 11 MEMBERS ON STATE SENATE HOUSING COMMITTEE – DIVIDE AND SCHEDULE.

BOYLES – INDIVIDUAL EFFORT IS BEST. HE MET WITH ASM BURKE LAST WEEK AND PRESENTED CCCA PROPOSAL. STARTED WITH HER.

HICKS – DEAL DIRECTLY WITH THOSE WE KNOW THE BEST. HE KNOWS HIS.

BACHARACH PARTICIPATE IN CCCA LEG GROUP.

K. SCAG Regional Early Action Program funds to accelerate housing – 12:45 pm

REAP GAVE COGS A ROLE. NOW WE HAVE A ROLE WITH NO FUNDING FOR A PLANNER AND NO HELP FROM THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORS DUE TO THEIR LACK OF TIME

KAO – NOT OPPOSED TO HAVING A PLANNER ON STAFF. ESPECIALLY IF WE GO TOWARD A REGIONAL TRUST FUND.

FRANKLIN – CONCERNS OF DEFICITS ALREADY IN CITY GENERAL FUNDS. CRITICAL THAT THIS GOES BEFORE CITY MANAGERS – IDENTIFY THE PURPOSE AND THEN SUGGEST ASSESSMENT LIKE PREVIOUS FORMULA. AND RE-CONFIRM HOW SB2 FUNDS ARE BEING USED. ASSESSMENT WOULD BE ANNUAL FOR PROBABLY AT LEAST THE 3 YEARS OF REAP PROGRAM.

CHEN – GO TO CITY MANAGERS AND CHECK WITH THEIR USE OF SB 2 FUNDS. EACH CITY NEEDS UNIQUE PRESENTATION RE: THESE IDEAS.

SEND SOMETHING TO CITY MANAGERS RE: USE OF SB 2 FUNDS – sent 11/9/20

HORVATH – THIS IS AN AREA WHERE THERE SHOULD BE SOMEONE AT THE COG LEVEL TO DO THIS. RB COMMUNITY DEV. DEPT. IS JUST OVERWORKED. THE COG HAS THE ABILITY TO DO THIS WITH OTHER AREAS THAT WE ARE FOCUSED ON. MONEY WELL INVESTED.

VALENTINE – AT LEAST LOOK AT HIRING A PLANNING DIRECTOR. TIMELY.

TO COME BACK TO NEXT MEETING

ACTION: Recommend Board approve projects for REAP funding from SCAG

HORVATH/ARMATO

L. Board Meeting agenda development – 1:00 pm

November – Pros & Cons on Balanced Energy? – honor former chairs leaving public office (Ralph, Jim & Judy all confirmed) and volunteers (draft agenda attached)

PATH CONTRACT – ONE YEAR EXTENSION – TYPOS BEING CORRECTED – WILL GO ON BOARD AGENDA ON CONSENT

January – LTN report, LAWA PRESENTATION – 1/28

February - SCAG President Rex Richardson listening session, - Request from CSUDH to provide economic forecast

March – General Assembly

ACTION: Recommend programs of interest for Board presentations

M. Approval of Invoices – available at the meeting – 1:10 pm

ACTION: Approved invoices for payment FRANKLIN/HUFF

HUFF – NEGOTIATED LOWER RENT?

KIM – HAVEN’T ASKED FOR REDUCED RENT. WE GOT THE 2ND, 3RD AND 4TH MONTHS WERE FREE. WE CAN ASK – BUT BETTER WITH THE CONVERSATION ABOUT THE SBFN.

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS

N. South Bay Fiber Network – 1:15 pm

November 17 event – NEED SOMEONE THERE FROM EACH CITY WITH BACKGROUND OF THE CITY. WENT THROUGH THE AGENDA
Comments submitted to California Broadband Council and CPUC rule-making

O. Update on Homeless Program and Innovation Project Funding - 1:25 pm
- Successfully launched the Home Share South Bay landing page on October 15th
  - Working with city staff to get the word out to residents, post on city webpage, social media outlets, etc
  - Flyers have been developed and will be made available to city staff
  - SBCCOG Homeless webpage and Seniors webpage have been updated with link to landing page
  - Press release has generated interest; phone interview with KPCC; Torrance CitiCABLE; articles in City News Service, My NewsLA.com, LAist.com
  - 4 homeseekers have signed up; we want to attract homeowners who have a spare room in exchange for rent and/or household chores - need to build up available homes
- Homeless Services Task Force meeting on Nov 4th highlighted street medicine
- Finalizing education & training module for city staff; needs sign off from LAHSA and LA County Homeless Initiative
- LAHSA undergoing changes related to governance; Jacki, Grace, and Redondo Beach Police Lt. Wayne Windman have participated in conference calls with LA County and LAHSA consultant

P. Local Travel Network Update – 1:30 pm
- FINAL REPORT BEING WRITTEN

Q. Police Practices – 1:35 pm
- Questions to ask Police Departments sent out to Board members and City Managers – no responses shared with SBCCOG
- DID THEY TALK TO THEIR POLICE CHIEF? DID THEY GET ANSWERS AND WERE THEY SATISFIED WITH THE ANSWERS? DID THEY SHARE WITH THEIR COUNCILMEMBERS?
  - CHEN – FORWARDED IT TO THE CHIEF WHO WAS ON VACATION. WILL GET BACK TO HIM FOR BRIEFING FOR HIM OR HIS COUNCIL
  - HICKS – CHANGING THEIR CAPTAIN NOW. CAPTAIN BRIEFS THEM AT EVERY COUNCIL MEETING.
  - VALENTINE – IMPORTANT THAT THEY USE THEM FOR THEIR USE AND KNOW WHAT THEIR POLICE IS DOING AND THEY HAVE CAN ACCOUNTABILITY TO YOU.
  - HICKS – HAVE YOU TOURED YOUR POLICE DEPARTMENT – MANY HAVE.
  - CRUIKSHANK – SHERIFF HAS ACADEMY FOR COUNCILMEMBERS TO SEE ALL OF THEIR FACILITIES. SENT QUESTIONS TO ALEGRIA WHO IS ON THE REGIONAL LAW COMMITTEE. WILL ASK HIM FOR FEEDBACK.
  - BACHARACH – WILL BE ON THE BOARD AGENDA – THINK ABOUT WHAT THE SBCCOG CAN OR SHOULD DO NEXT IF ANYTHING.

R. Update on Senior Services – 1:45 pm
- Next meeting of the Senior Services Working Group - Tuesday, December 1 from 9:30-11:30am via zoom. At the meeting, city staff will be asked to share how they are helping seniors in their cities prepare for the holidays with COVID measures in place. HOPING TO HAVE UPDATE ON THE VACCINE STUDY WHICH HAS RE-STARTED. FLYER TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO THE BOARD TO ENCOURAGE RESIDENTS TO SIGN UP.

S. General Assembly Update – March 18, 2021 – 1:50 pm
- Proposals due November 5 – status reported at the meeting – 3 proposals received
- Due to time constraints, the recommendation will be on the November Board agenda

VIII. STRATEGIC POSITIONING ITEMS/ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES
- Other updates since agenda distribution – 1:55 pm
NEED NEW TREASURER

LA VS. HATE WEEK – POSSIBLY EL SEGUNDO

NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING – Monday, December 14, 2020 @ 12:00 pm via zoom
Resolution No. 2020 – 1

A Resolution of the Governing Board of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Designating a Treasurer of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments

The Governing Board of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments does hereby receive and order as follows:

Section 1. Pursuant to Article V, Paragraph B of the Bylaws of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (“SBCCOG”), the Director of Finance for the City of El Segundo, Joseph Lillio, is hereby designated the Treasurer of the SBCCOG starting December 15, 2020.

PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED this 14th day of December 2020.

____________________
Olivia Valentine
Chair

Attest:

____________________
SBCCOG Board Secretary
A RESOLUTION OF THE GOVERNING BOARD OF THE SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS AUTHORIZING INVESTMENT OF MONIES IN THE LOCAL AGENCY INVESTMENT FUND

WHEREAS, The Local Agency Investment Fund is established in the State Treasury under Government Code section 16429.1 et. seq. for the deposit of money of a local agency for purposes of investment by the State Treasurer; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors hereby finds that the deposit and withdrawal of money in the Local Agency Investment Fund in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. seq. for the purpose of investment as provided therein is in the best interests of the South Bay Cities Council of Governments;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors hereby authorizes the deposit and withdrawal of South Bay Cities Council of Governments’ monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund in the State Treasury in accordance with Government Code section 16429.1 et. seq. for the purpose of investment as provided therein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, as follows:

Section 1. Effective December 15, 2020, the following Board officers holding the title(s) specified herein below or their successors in office are each hereby authorized to order the deposit or withdrawal of monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund and may execute and deliver any and all documents necessary or advisable in order to effectuate the purposes of this resolution and the transactions contemplated hereby:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Lillio</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivia Valentine</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Boyles</td>
<td>1st Vice Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cruikshank</td>
<td>2nd Vice Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Horvath</td>
<td>Immediate Past Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2. This resolution rescinds Resolution No. 2019-2, adopted by the Board of Directors on June 27, 2019 and shall remain in full force and effect until rescinded by Board of Directors by resolution and a copy of the resolution rescinding this resolution is filed with the State Treasurer’s Office.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, by the Board of Directors of South Bay Cities Council of Government, Los Angeles County of State of California on December 14, 2020.

Attest:

__________________________________
SBCCOG Board Secretary
December 3, 2020

South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Attn: Kim Fuentes
2355 Crenshaw Blvd, Suite 125
Torrance, CA  90501

Re: Project Name: SoCalREN Regional Partnerships 1022A PDP
        Project No.: TEC20-0046
        Amendment No.  1

Dear Kim Furentes,

This modification letter amends and modifies the Agreement entered into between South Bay Cities Council of Government (SBCCOG) ("Subconsultant") and The Energy Coalition with an effective date of February 17, 2020 and an approved start work date of March 23, 2020.

The Energy Coalition and Subconsultant hereby agree to the following change to Contract TEC20-0046 effective January 1, 2021:

1. The period of performance is extended through August 31, 2021.

The foregoing changes are the sole modification or amendment to the Agreement, and no other express or implied modification or amendment is intended or shall be construed herefrom.  All other provisions and obligations of the Agreement and previous amendments, shall continue in full force and effect.

AGREEMENT AND ACCEPTANCE

THE ENERGY COALITION  SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT

By: _________________________________  By: _________________________________
Print:   Craig Perkins          Print:   Olivia Valentine
Title: President & Executive Director  Title: Chair, South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Date: _________________________________  Date: _________________________________
December 3, 2020

South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG)
Attn: Kim Fuentes
2355 Crenshaw Blvd, Suite125
Torrance, CA  90501

Re:  Project Name: SoCalREN Regional Partnerships 1022B DERDAC
     Project No.: TEC20-0047
     Amendment No.  1

Dear Kim Fuentes,

This modification letter amends and modifies the Agreement entered into between South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) ("Subconsultant") and The Energy Coalition with an effective date of February 17, 2020 and an approved start work date of April 23, 2020.

The Energy Coalition and Subconsultant hereby agree to the following change to Contract TEC20-0047 effective January 1, 2021:

1. The period of performance is extended through August 31, 2021.

The foregoing changes are the sole modification or amendment to the Agreement, and no other express or implied modification or amendment is intended or shall be construed herefrom. All other provisions and obligations of the Agreement and previous amendments, shall continue in full force and effect.

AGREEMENT AND ACCEPTANCE

THE ENERGY COALITION

By: ________________________________
Print:  Craig Perkins                By: ________________________________
Title: President & Executive Director
Date: ______________________________

SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

By: ________________________________
Print:  Olivia Valentine
Title: Chair, South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Date: ______________________________
December 3, 2020

South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG)
Attn: Kim Fuentes
2355 Crenshaw Blvd, Suite 125
Torrance, CA 90501

Re: Project Name: SoCalREN Regional Partnerships 1022C NMEC
    Project No.: TEC20-0048
    Amendment No. 1

Dear Kim Fuentes,

This modification letter amends and modifies the Agreement entered into between South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) ("Subconsultant") and The Energy Coalition with an effective date of February 17, 2020 and an approved start work date of March 23, 2020.

The Energy Coalition and Subconsultant hereby agree to the following change to Contract TEC20-0048 effective January 1, 2021:

1. The period of performance is extended through August 31, 2021.

The foregoing changes are the sole modification or amendment to the Agreement, and no other express or implied modification or amendment is intended or shall be construed herefrom. All other provisions and obligations of the Agreement and previous amendments, shall continue in full force and effect.

AGREEMENT AND ACCEPTANCE

THE ENERGY COALITION

By: ____________________________
Print: Craig Perkins
Title: President & Executive Director
Date: ___________________________

SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

By: ____________________________
Print: Olivia Valentine
Title: Chair, South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Date: ___________________________
December 3, 2020

South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG)
Attn: Kim Fuentes
2355 Crenshaw Blvd, Suite 125
Torrance, CA  90501

Re:  Project Name: SoCalREN Regional Partnerships 1022D RLF
     Project No.: TEC20-0049
     Amendment No. 1

Dear Kim Fuentes,

This modification letter amends and modifies the Agreement entered into between South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) (“Subconsultant”) and The Energy Coalition with an effective date of February 17, 2020 and an approved start work date of March 23, 2020.

The Energy Coalition and Subconsultant hereby agree to the following change to Contract TEC20-0049 effective January 1, 2021:

1. The period of performance is extended through August 31, 2021.

The foregoing changes are the sole modification or amendment to the Agreement, and no other express or implied modification or amendment is intended or shall be construed herefrom. All other provisions and obligations of the Agreement and previous amendments, shall continue in full force and effect.

AGREEMENT AND ACCEPTANCE

THE ENERGY COALITION

By:  ________________________________  By:  ________________________________
Print: Craig Perkins                  Print: Olivia Valentine
Title: President & Executive Director
Date: ________________________________

SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT

By:  ________________________________  By:  ________________________________
Print:  ________________________________  Print:  ________________________________
Title: Chair, South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Date: ________________________________
## City Attendance at Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meetings</th>
<th>Carson</th>
<th>El Segundo</th>
<th>Gardena</th>
<th>Hawthorne</th>
<th>Hermosa Beach</th>
<th>Inglewood</th>
<th>Lawndale</th>
<th>Lomita</th>
<th>Manhattan Beach</th>
<th>Palos Verdes Estates</th>
<th>Rancho Palos Verdes</th>
<th>Redondo Beach</th>
<th>Rolling Hills Estates</th>
<th>Torrance</th>
<th>County of LA Los Angeles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Managers Meeting</td>
<td>E. Lee</td>
<td>S. Lowenthal</td>
<td>A. Fields</td>
<td>R. Smoot</td>
<td>L. Guglielmo</td>
<td>A. Mirranian</td>
<td>E. Jeng</td>
<td>G. Grammar</td>
<td>A. Chaparyan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>J. Martin</td>
<td>E. Moreno</td>
<td>B. Shrewsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure Working Group</td>
<td>L. Xu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Fiber Network Working Group</td>
<td>K. Kennedy</td>
<td>R. Kulkar</td>
<td>A. Betancourt</td>
<td>T. Rahmani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Operators Working Group</td>
<td>D. Pynn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Committee</td>
<td>C. Pimentel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cities that attended**

- Carson
- El Segundo
- Gardena
- Hawthorne
- Hermosa Beach
- Inglewood
- Lawndale
- Lomita
- Manhattan Beach
- Palos Verdes Estates
- Rancho Palos Verdes
- Redondo Beach
- Rolling Hills Estates
- Torrance
- County of LA Los Angeles

- E. Lee
- S. Lowenthal
- A. Fields
- R. Smoot
- L. Guglielmo
- A. Mirranian
- E. Jeng
- G. Grammar
- A. Chaparyan
- J. Martin
- E. Moreno
- B. Shrewsbury
- A. Valoros
- D. Boyles
- Y. Slater
- V. Norris
- K. Mack
- L. Jones
- R. Chavez
- C. Bush
- M. Reyes
- C. Horvath
- J. La Rock
- W. Windman
- M. Dyberg
- J. Naughton
- G. Chen
- V. Hoang
- Z. Gent
- J. Jickis
- W. Johnson
- R. Roque (SD4)
- A. Palacios
- S. Lee
- R. Barragan
- C. Teague
- M. Wilcox
- S. Repp
- C. Tai
- B. Rindge
- K. Rukavina
- B. Forbes
- M. Elguar
- J. Naughton
- D. Santana
- K. Kennedy
- R. Kulkar
- A. Betancourt
- T. Rahmani
- S. Kim
- E. Sassoon
- C. Mallooy
- R. Barragan
- R. Beeman
- A. Pinto
- J. Armstrong
- G. Tsujiuchi
- V. Copeland
- R. Salan
- M. Chambers
- P. Puglise
- M. Wilcox
- G. Sugano
- S. Katsouleas
- T. Hackelman
- T. Birthel
- C. Tai
- H. Shi
- E. ZandMiet
- M. Kemps
- L. Guglielmo
- B. Rindge
- K. Rukavina
- L. Buchwald
- E. Jeng
- F. Fulton
- D. Santana
- E. Gallo
- J. Lee
- O. Martinez
- R. Simlote
- J. Ickis
- M. Gombert
- J. Rooney
- D. Amaya
- C. Horvath
- J. Hoefgen
- T. Semaan
- C. Benson
- B. Forbes
- G. Kim
- M. Elguar
- J. Naughton
- D. Santana
TO: SBCCOG Steering Committee
FROM: Jacki Bacharach, SBCCOG Executive Director
       Kim Fuentes, Deputy Executive Director
SUBJECT: Environmental Activities Report – November 2020

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.

I. PROGRAMS - TECHNOLOGY, PLANNING, & RESEARCH

Energy Efficiency
Energy Efficiency Partnership Program – Regional Energy Network (REN)

Contract year is January 1-December 31, 2020.
Contract goals: Registration: 10 -13 agencies Status: 7 registered
Enrollments: 6-8 agency Status: 6 enrolled GOAL MET
Re-engagements: 1 agency Status: 1 re-engagement GOAL MET
Program presentations: 4 Status: 8 presentations GOAL MET

SBCCOG staff, in coordination with the utilities, is working with enrolled cities to obtain energy data so that the SoCalREN team and complete facility assessments. These assessments are the foundation for identifying potential projects. SBCCOG staff continues to follow up with the cities of Lomita and Rancho Palos Verdes to complete enrollment which is required to access SoCalREN benefits such as energy use analysis and incentive support. To date the following cities are enrolled in the SoCalREN program: Carson, Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Rolling Hills Estates, and Torrance. In addition, SBCCOG staff worked with LA County to identify additional funding to support energy efficiency programs which would be done in coordination with the SoCalREN. It appears that there may be additional funding for programs in 2021.

Energy Efficiency Partnership Program – Southern California Gas Company (SCG)
SBCCOG staff, along with the energy engineer, met with El Segundo School District to discuss SoCalGas project potential. The district is interested in having an analysis of their energy use which would be done the first of 2021. The team also continues to work with cities to obtain gas accounts data for benchmarking facilities.

Water Conservation
West Basin Municipal Water District Programs (West Basin)

Contract year is July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021

Task - Educational Outreach Support
Exhibit Events
Contract goal: 100 exhibit events, presentations, workshops, networking opportunities, etc.
Status of goal: 54 exhibit events, presentations, workshops, networking opportunities, etc. as of the month of September 2020

Staff continues to work with West Basin and community event planners to identify opportunities to provide information virtually.

**Water Bottle Filling Station Program**

*Contract goal:* To assist with identifying locations for stations.

*Status:* Public sites are eligible to install two (2) water bottle filling stations per Tax ID.

In November, SBCCCOG staff met with West Basin staff to discuss the status of the program and outreach efforts. SBCCCOG staff continue promoting the program through social media and SBCCCOG working groups. Direct calls to agencies will be conducted in Jan. 2021.

**Task - Support for Workshops, Events, & Webinars**

*Educational Classes*

*Contract goal:* 10 classes or webinars

*Status of goal:* 5 completed (virtual classes); 1 class/webinar was held in November; in-person classes are on hold

Staff continues to work with West Basin staff to hold classes via webinar or Zoom.

*Rain Barrel Giveaway*

*Contract goal:* minimum of 5 and maximum of 6 events

*Status of goal:* rain barrel events are on hold at this time

West Basin is executing a contract to provide delivery options as opposed to holding the standard drive-through event. The SBCCCOG staff will help coordinate with residents to schedule delivery of the rain barrels. Rain barrel distribution will hopefully begin again in early 2021. The next planning call with West Basin, LADWP, Torrance, and the SBCCCOG will be scheduled the first of 2021.

**Task - Cash for Kitchens**

*Contract goal:* distribute pre-rinse spray nozzles, sink flow restrictors, window clings, & program materials to 86 prior survey sites

*Status of goal:* no surveys were conducted in the month of November. The outreach to business and agencies was on hold per West Basin but is scheduled to be relaunched in January.

West Basin staff is moving forward with a Cash for Kitchens online portal and is planning to relaunch this program in January. West Basin staff is expecting to distribute equipment through the mail.

**Task - Change & Save (DAC) Program**

*Contract goal:* Receive, document, and track customer calls; assist customers with online survey and applying for $500 High-Efficiency Clothes Washer Rebate

*Status:

  Number of calls: 20 in November
  Number of surveys completed: 500 surveys completed - GOAL MET
  Number of customers assisted with rebate application: 0 in November

SBCCCOG staff answered resident calls checking on rebate status. SBCCCOG staff continues to work with West Basin to help customers estimate their rebates prior to purchase of new units. SBCCCOG will be attending West Basin's program relaunch meeting on Monday, December 7th. The program
has been so successful that West Basin is implementing a second outreach effort that includes program enhancements based on lessons learned. SBCCOG staff will have an increased role with a resident application process in this second phase. Staff has also been working to tailor promotional language for e-blasts.

Torrance Water  
*Contract year is July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021*

Torrance staff is in the process of reviewing Cash for Kitchens marketing materials. The goal is to begin outreach in January 2021.

Water Replenishment District of Southern California (WRD)  
*Contract year is July 1, 2019-December 31, 2020.*

Ongoing promotion of WRD programs continues through the SBCCOG’s e-newsletters and other social media channels.

Sanitation Districts of LA County (LACSD)  
*Contract year is July 1, 2020-June 30, 2021*

Task 1. Educational Outreach Support  
**Exhibit Events**  
*Contract goal: 100 exhibit events, presentations, workshops, networking opportunities, etc.*  
*Status of goal: 54 exhibit events, presentations, workshops, networking opportunities, etc. as of the month of November 2020*

SBCCOG staff has distributed information on Sanitation programs and virtual events via social media and e-blasts.

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)  
*Contract year is January 1-December 31, 2020.*

**Contract goals:**  
- 8-12 targeted special exhibit events - *Status of goal: 8 completed - GOAL MET*  
- 1 training for SBCCOG Volunteers on LADWP programs - *Status of goal: GOAL MET*  
- 6-8 commercial kitchens to be identified for water assessment and conservation training  
*Status of goal: SBCCOG staff is moving forward with Commercial Kitchen Assessments and is planning to conduct outreach and drop-off water savings devices in the month of December.*

SBCCOG staff is following the LA County guidance regarding COVID-19.

PACE  
SBCCOG continues to promote PACE financing for homeowners through Ygrene and HERO. 2020 Q3 payments will be reported in January 2021.

CA Green Business Network (CAGBN) & South Bay Green Business Assist Program (GBAP):  

CAGBN –The new goal is to certify 10 businesses in each city. SBCCOG staff continue to identify, certify, and assist businesses as well as promote the program through social media.

*Contract goals - City of Hawthorne: 10 certified green businesses; Status of goals: 4 certified businesses*
SBCCOG staff continue to assist CAGBN (California Green Business Network) cities of Hawthorne and Torrance with certifying businesses and continue to conduct outreach. During the month of November, SBCCOG staff conducted assessments for businesses in Hawthorne and Torrance. The first progress report was prepared for each of the respective cities. In addition, SBCCOG staff will attend the statewide CA Green Business Network conference via Zoom.

GBAP - SBCCOG continues to provide information to local businesses on opportunities to implement sustainability programs. In addition, businesses received information on the status of our utility partners’ operations during the COVID-19 pandemic.

As businesses are certified through CAGBN, they also become GBAP participants. GBAP by city: Torrance (61), Lawndale (27), Hawthorne (45), Redondo Beach (16), El Segundo (15), Gardena (15), Carson (12), Inglewood (10), Manhattan Beach (8), Palos Verdes Estates (7), Rancho Palos Verdes (7), Hermosa Beach (5), Rolling Hills Estates (4), Lomita (3), Lennox (2), and Los Angeles County – Community of Westmont (1) for a total of 238 businesses in the program as of the end of November 2020.

**Transportation**

Shared Mobility Program (Contract period July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2022)

*Contract goals*: 72 outreach events; 36 vanpool, rideshare, telework meetings or events; 8 Marketing/Media Survey Engagements

*Status of goals*: 118 outreach events; 6 vanpool or rideshare meetings; 3 Survey Engagement

SBCCOG staff attended METRO’s Employee Transportation Coordinator (ETC) briefing on the November 18th. The topics were Compliance, AVR Surveys, ETC Access, and AVR Reports. SBCCOG staff continued its public outreach efforts through virtual platforms. Metro Shared Mobility materials and emergency updates to rideshare and vanpool programs along with resources for teleworking were shared through 8 different online meetings. SBCCOG staff updated the telework page on the SBCCOG website. SBCCOG’s Shared Mobility team began a marketing outreach effort to distribute new guidelines for vanpool and rideshare programs to local ETCs. Preliminary planning continued for a new series of “online” workshops for South Bay ETCs to be produced starting in early 2021.

**Metro Express Lanes (MEL)** (Contract period Nov. 15, 2019 – Nov. 14, 2020)

Work continues to organize and plan for a virtual calendar of events where Metro’s MEL program materials will be distributed. During this period, MEL materials were distributed as part of the SBCCOG information packets at 8 SBCCOG virtual outreach events and meetings.

II. MARKETING, OUTREACH, & IMPLEMENTATION

**Outreach Events**

In November

1 - Virtual Community Event
1 - Virtual Business Event
6 - Virtual Networking Meetings
0 - Virtual Workshops

Totals for the period July 1, 2020 – November 30, 2020:

9 – Community Events
5 – Business Events
Media

Social Media (during the month of November)

- SBCCOG -- Totals for Social Media (SBCCOG) (top tweet – right)
  - Twitter: 284 followers total, 2,500 impressions* 7 posts
  - Facebook: 139 likes total, 740 impressions 12 posts

- SBESC -- Totals for Social Media (top tweet – right)
  - Twitter: 560 followers total, 2,600 impressions* 3 posts
  - Facebook: 755 likes total, 192 impressions 5 posts
  - LinkedIn: 141 followers total, 91 impressions 1 post

* Impressions: the number of times a post has been viewed during the specified month

Earned Media/Articles/Network TV


Volunteer Program

Status of Program: 10.00 hours November 2020

Grand total as of 11/30/2020 - 20,323 (starting April 2008)

Volunteer participation remains low due to COVID-19.

The SBCCOG held the annual Volunteer Recognition on November 19th to honor our volunteers. The event was a great success, and the volunteers expressed their thanks.
TO: SBCCOG Steering Committee
FROM: Jacki Bacharach, SBCCOG Executive Director
RE: Research into Forming a Health Department

Adherence to the Strategic Plan
Goal B: Regional Advocacy. Advocate for the interests of the South Bay.

The information in this memo is as of December 6. It will be updated at the meeting. The following contacts have been made and information obtained

Whittier and several other cities in the region have asked their staff to look into forming a health department but in Santa Clarita, the council voted to spend $25,000 to formally study the formation of a health district. The city manager has reported that they have hired a consultant and expect the results around February.

Martha Guzman Hurtado, El Segundo’s Legislative Affairs Manager, offered to help with contacts. She spoke with Manuel Carmona – Deputy Director of Pasadena's Health Department. Their budget that shows that the department does not use General Fund dollars. Further information:

- 60% of the department's budget comes from grants
- Other funding comes from the Health Realignment fund that was established in 1992
- The Health Realignment fund uses a state calculation from sales tax and motor vehicle license fees, although this revenue stream has been decreasing and expected to worsen as a result of the pandemic
- Each health officer is an extension of the state, they can issue health orders more restrictive than the state, but not less restrictive
- Mr. Carmona suggested that we reach out to the state to find out if there is a process to start a health department since they were already in existence when they were recognized by the state in the 1940s; He was not aware of a process
- Pasadena's jurisdiction is limited to city limits. In order to extend its jurisdiction to allow for contract cities, the state would need to change its current model to recognize local jurisdictions
- It appears that Pasadena is not interested in expanding; Deputy Director did not want to speak on behalf of the City but said they have a lot going on
- Mr. Carmona mentioned that health departments are required to provide a whole basket of services and are not narrowly focused; although he shared that Vernon has a Health and Environmental Control Department
- Mr. Carmona was not sure who to contact at the state; he mentioned CPDH or the Governor's office
Ms. Guzman Hurtado also forwarded the following information to me on the Vernon Health and Environmental Control Department from research that she did online. The department is narrower than others and only focuses on environmental issues and offers programs to assist businesses with conservation resources, minimizing waste and protecting the environment with the following programs:

- Hazardous Material
- Food Program
- Storm Water Program
- Solid Waste Program
- Garment Program
- Water/Wastewater Systems
- Animal & Vector Control
- General Environmental Health

SBCCOG staff will be meeting with Beach Cities Health District staff on December 9 to discuss their research further. Attached is a memo that they prepared on this topic previously.

**RECOMMENDATION**
After any updates to this memo, provide direction re: any further action.
Public Health Department Research
Prepared by Beach Cities Health District

The rationale for county wide public health enforcement model was to reduce duplication and improve efficiency of services for area-wide problems. Only 4 cities in CA have own health department (Berkeley, Vernon, Long Beach, Pasadena)

Arguments for establishing city public health department:

- Ability to build programs tailored to the community and create targeted interventions
- Focus on residents of highest need in the city without resources split among vulnerable populations across the county
- Authority to create their own budgets, establish taxes and fees for public health, issue health order without state approval

Arguments against:

- Potentially create duplicative administration infrastructure and fragmented or redundant public health services
- Delays in managing cross-jurisdictional disease investigations and inefficient use of resources for disease surveillance and emergency preparedness
- Transfer financial responsibility for public health services to County tax base

Local Health Agency Requirements

Minimum requirements, responsibilities, and functions of a public health department pursuant to California Health and Safety Code, Section 1276 of Title 17:

- **Collection, tabulation and analysis of public health statistics** including population data, natality, mortality & morbidity records as well as evaluation of service records.
- **Health education programs**
- **Communicable disease control services** including availability of adequate isolation facilities, the control of the acute communicable diseases, and the control of tuberculosis and the venereal diseases
- Medical, nursing, educational, and other services to promote **material and child health**
- **Environmental health and sanitation services** for food, housing and institutions, radiological health, milk and dairy products, water, vector control, waste management and air sanitation
- **Public health laboratory services** for populations more than 50,000
- **Nutrition services** including appropriate activities in education and consultation for the promotion of positive health, the prevention of ill health, and the dietary control of disease.
- **Chronic disease prevention or mitigation services**
- Services directed to the **social factors affecting health**
- **Occupational health promotion**
- **Family planning services**
- **Public health nursing services**
## Budgets and Departmental Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Annual budget</th>
<th>Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Los Angeles County Department of Public Health  | $900 million  | • Environmental Health  
• HIV and STD Program  
• Acute Communicable Disease Control  
• Community Health Services  
• Health Assessment and Epidemiology  
• Emergency Preparedness and Response  
• Vaccine Preventable Disease Control  
• Substance Abuse Prevention and Control  
• Veterinary Public Health  
• Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention  
• Maternal, Child and Adolescent Health |
| Berkeley Public Health Division                 | $10.5 million, 45% from general fund, 38% from state, rest from grants from County Health Department | • Childhood Health, MCAH  
• Communicable Disease Control  
• Clinical Services  
• Vital statistics and Epidemiology  
• Health Promotion |
| Long Beach Department of Health                 | $117 million  | 99% funding comes from Federal, State, County and private funds  
• Communicable Disease Control  
• Emergency Preparedness  
• Environmental Health  
• Healthy Living  
• Housing and Homeless Services  
• Material, Child and Family Health Services  
• Medical Specialty Clinics  
• Public Health Laboratory  
• Public Health Nursing |
| Pasadena Public Health Department                | $15.2 million  | county, state, federal grants  
• Communicable Disease Prevention & Control  
• Immunization  
• Maternal Child and Adolescent Health  
• Substance Use and Treatment Services  
• Mental Health Services  
• Environmental Health  
• Food Protection  
• Animal Care & Control  
• Vector Control  
• Vital Records  
• Public Health Emergency Preparedness  
• Health Promotion and Policy |
| Vernon Health and Environmental Control Department (not a certified public health department) | $1.4 million  | • Food Program  
• CUPA  
• Storm Water Program  
• Solid Waste Program  
• Animal and Vector Control |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COVID-19 Response Comparisons</th>
<th>LA County</th>
<th>Pasadena</th>
<th>Long Beach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safer at Home</strong></td>
<td>Initially issued March 16, latest issued May 13. All non-essential businesses can open for pick up/delivery; recreation facilities including beaches, tennis and pickleball, equestrian centers and community gardens open</td>
<td>Initially issued March 19 updated May 15 Consistent with LA County</td>
<td>Initially issued March 12, latest issued May 13 Consistent with LA County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditional Reopening of Golf, Lower Risk Retail and Public Spaces</strong></td>
<td>May 8 Lower risk non-essential business can open for curbside pickup; golf courses; trials; car dealerships</td>
<td>May 15 health order aligns with LA County</td>
<td>May 15 health order aligns with LA County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Congregate Living Facilities</strong></td>
<td>April 24 Limit entry and access to facility; Prohibit ill employees from returning to work; no communal dining and activities; separate areas for staff; staff to wear PPE and masks, require residents to wear face coverings; Infection control guidelines; screenings for individuals entering facility; daily temperature checks for staff and residents; testing for all staff and residents</td>
<td>April 12, added testing requirements May 6 Same as LA County</td>
<td>April 15 Same as LA County and Pasadena, no testing requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporary Closures of Beaches and Trails</strong></td>
<td>March 27 All trails, trailheads closed; public beaches, piers, public beach parking lots, beach bike paths and beach access points closed</td>
<td>April 9 Recreation areas and parks closed April 11 to April 13th</td>
<td>March 27 Closure of Beaches, recreational trails, bike and pedestrian paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Isolation Order</strong></td>
<td>Revised May 1 All individuals who have been diagnosed or presumed to have COVID-19 must isolate for at least 72 hours after they have received and at least</td>
<td>Revised May 6 Alignment with LA County Health Officer Order</td>
<td>Revised May 7 Same as LA County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Home Quarantine Orders | Revised May 1
All individuals who have been in close contact with person with or presumed to have COVID-19 are required to quarantine for 14 days from last date they were in contact with the person | Revised May 6
Alignment with LA County Health Officer Order | Revised May 7
Same as LA County |
South Bay Cities Council of Governments

December 14, 2020

TO: SBCCOG Steering Committee

FROM: Steve Lantz, SBCCOG Transportation Director

RE: SBCCOG Transportation Update Covering November 2020

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 Transition: 5 Potential Transportation Policy Changes
The new administration may change federal policy in the following five areas:
1. SAFE Rule Elimination. In August 2018, the National Highway Traffic Safety Agency (NHTSA) and the US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) proposed the Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicle Rule. The Rule creates national fuel efficiency standards for cars and light trucks at 2020 levels and repeals California’s higher fuel efficiency standards, The Biden Administration will likely withdraw the rule.
2. Climate Change and Transportation. Biden will include climate experts across many agencies with a strong focus on transportation. California may be a national model as Phil Washington (LA Metro CEO) and Therese McMillian (MTC CEO) are key members of Biden’s transportation transition team. Agency transition teams are in charge of reviewing current projects and ongoing initiatives, meeting with career federal employees, and preparing the members of the incoming cabinet for their roles and priorities.
3. COVID Relief v. Infrastructure Stimulus v. Reauthorization. There will be only so much room to adopt new spending measures in a divided Congress. With a COVID relief (including transit subsidies) a near certainty, and a surface transportation reauthorization due late in 2021, a "bipartisan" infrastructure bill may be a tough sell.
4. Reauthorization? Biden has proposed a $2 trillion infrastructure plan to promote clean energy and modernize current U.S. systems. But expect more tinkering with the INVEST Act (the transportation reauthorization adopted in June). Earmarks may make a comeback. How to pay for it remains an open question.
5. State Exodus? Federal agencies modeling California policies are likely to hire away expertise from the Golden State. ARB Chair Mary Nichols is a potential selection to head US EPA. How many other state leaders will head to D. C.?

Federal Transportation Funding Bill Advances
The transportation funding bill authored by U.S. Sen. Susan Collins (R-ME) moved out of committee November 10th. Collins, Chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, was one of the authors of the FY 2021 Transportation, Housing and Urban
Development funding bill, which has broad, bipartisan input and support. The bill will now go to Conference Committee before heading to the House and Senate floors for a vote.

The bill provides $74.8 billion in new funding, $561 million more than last year. Included in the bill are $1 billion for BUILD grants, which provide federal assistance for transportation projects across the country; $46.4 billion for Federal-aid highways from the Highway Trust Fund, consistent with the recent extension of the FAST Act; $18 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration with increased funding for aviation safety; and $2 billion for Amtrak.

**State**

**Caltrans To Advance Road Charge Testing**
With support from a federal Surface Transportation Funding Alternative grant, California will undertake a second round of tests to determine how road charge can work with four technologies: usage-based insurance, ridesharing, electric vehicle charging stations/pay-at-the-pump systems, and autonomous vehicles.

Interested in participating? The demonstration will begin in January 2021 and run for six months. To learn more or participate in the next round of demonstration projects, use this link: The first step is to fill out the information requested on the Caltrans California Road Charge website: http://www.caroadcharge.com/engage/contact-us/.

**California Updates Regulations in Anticipation of Robo-Taxis**
Robotaxis do not exist yet. Some experts suspect the driverless services won’t circulate widely for another decade. But in November, the California Public Utilities Commission adopted new rules that updated regulations first established in 2013 for ride-hailing services. The new rules govern how ride-hail services without a driver behind the wheel might work.

There are separate rules for autonomous vehicles with safety drivers and those without. But operators of both types of services will have to hand over lots of information to the government: data on where robo-taxi riders are picked up and dropped off; how many miles the vehicles travel; whether the vehicles are powered by gas or electricity; whether rides are available in underserved communities; and a safety plan, which Californians will be able to comment on.

At the California Public Utilities Commission, ride-hail companies, autonomous vehicle developers, advocacy groups, and local governments have been intensely debating what a driverless taxi service should look like, and what the companies operating on public roads should be required to do. Many commenters suggested the agency take steps it did not take in regulating ride-hail companies a few years ago. The new regulations require more public data from the companies, and are more stringent about accessibility requirements and environmental effects of developing technology.

**Region**

**Redondo Beach Leads Biking and Walking Injuries And Fatalities**
According to the California Transportation Injury Mapping System, the Artesia and Aviation corridors are among the most dangerous the South Bay. Redondo Beach has approximately
three times the number of residents as Hermosa Beach and twice the number of residents of Manhattan Beach. But even on a per capita basis, Redondo is an outlier in its number of cycling and pedestrian collisions and deaths.

Between 2010 and 2019, Redondo Beach had four cycling fatalities and eight pedestrian fatalities. By contrast Hermosa Beach had no cycling or pedestrian fatalities. Manhattan had one cycling death and one pedestrian death.

Metro Approves NextGen Bus Plan; Implementation to Begin In December
The L. A. Metro Board of Directors approved a three-tiered NextGen bus plan at its October 23rd meeting after three years of planning. The initial changes in routes and schedules for the nation's second busiest bus system will begin in December 2020, with a second and third round of changes coming in June 2021 and December 2021.

Under the new service plan, buses will arrive every five to 10 minutes for 83 percent of current riders compared to around 48 percent today. One of the key changes will be to combine most rapid and local bus lines that currently operate on duplicative routes. These new combined services will stop fewer times than a prior local bus but a few more than a prior rapid line. In combination with transit signal priority that has been a key part of rapid service, all riders on the former rapid routes will have faster door-to-door trips.

Port of L. A. Issues RFI For Zero-Emission Trucks at The Port Of Los Angeles
Los Angeles issued a Request for Information (RFI) on November 3rd to solicit proposals on expanding the use of zero-emission technology at the Port of Los Angeles (POLA) with a goal of achieving all zero-emissions drayage trucks serving the San Pedro Bay port complex by 2035.

As part of the RFI, the private sector is asked to provide input to POLA as it looks at strategies to develop and adopt zero-emission trucks at the site. The Port is currently engaged in 16 different zero-emission demonstration projects designed to bring feasible technology to the marketplace. The RFI is designed to recruit the best ideas available to help POLA serve as a catalyst and make a meaningful impact on climate change.

Proposers were asked to make the best use of public and private funding sources; new asset management solutions that can accommodate San Pedro Bay Ports’ scale; proposal for charging and fueling infrastructure; maintenance and procurement methods and models for public-private partnerships.

Urban Planners Are Coming for Your City’s Curb Space
A panel of transportation and logistics experts at the Vision Zero Cities Conference in mid-October predicted continued and long-lasting changes in the way curbs, sidewalks, and curbside parking spaces are organized, managed, and prioritized, in part due to the intermittent closure of retail and restaurants during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Road pricing has become a common policy tool and urban planners are beginning to focus on its cousin, the curb, by asking about valuing the various uses of curbs that are provided free to parked automobiles. In their view, curb space should be charged for, using technology that can calculate a curb's current occupancy rate, its latent demand and what its market price should be used for to prevent overcrowding and suboptimal curb use. Some interesting uses:
**Toll lanes:** If those lanes were subject to tolls, they could function as an express toll lane with a policy that allows buses to use the lanes for free.

**Bus shelters:** The bus riding experience could be improved by using curb space at intersections for bulb outs with permanent bus shelters. Large well-lit structures with maps, seating and advertising are too big for most sidewalks, but become feasible when curb space is available.

**Micro-mobility lanes:** Provide a protected right of way for bikes, scooters and mopeds. Using curb space to install protected micro-mobility lanes would make streets and sidewalks safer for all users.

**Micro-mobility parking:** Convert one parking space per block to safely store shared-bikes and scooters.

**Paid just-in-time drop-off zones:** Avoid double parking by Uber or FedEx by designating some curb space as paid drop-off space, charging per minute. Mobile apps will soon be able to direct deliverers — not just those in trucks, but also those in smaller vehicles — to available spaces in the last mile before a stop.

**Leased carshare parking:** A curb pricing program could allow carshare companies to lease a certain amount of curb space for their operations.

**Outdoor dining:** Make this al fresco use permanent post-pandemic by renting the space to adjacent restaurants.

**Paid parking:** Of course, there's nothing wrong with using curb space for old-fashioned traditional paid parking, by the hour or even the day. Pricing the curb would entail a balancing act for different users. Persons with disabilities, for example, should have complimentary access.

**General street beautification:** Above all, better curb management means nicer streets. Space that isn't used for free parking can go for everything from wider sidewalks to more seating, parklets, trees and flower beds. Cities could even use the added space to build elaborate road medians, pushing traffic flow away from sidewalks and pedestrians.

The biggest challenge to this (and the reason market-based curb management isn't common) is the difficulty of determining the real value of a specific stretch of curb space. Beyond parking meters and residential permit parking, public agencies have yet to put a price on that free public sidewalk and curb lane. By including a pricing structure in each innovative use of the curb, local jurisdictions can take a step toward using the space to better address cities' needs.

**‘Live and Work From Anywhere’ Is Here To Stay**

Working from home was intended to be a temporary measure for millions of workers in the early days of COVID-19. With no clear end in sight eight months later, employers are offering a perk that would have been unthinkable at the start of the year: Live and work from wherever you want — permanently.
It is a monumental shift for corporate America, one that’s forcing companies to rethink the ways they conduct business, manage employees and shape their corporate cultures. But there is often a catch.

Tech companies are leading the way. Facebook, Twitter, VMware, Stripe and ChowNow are among those that have rolled out permanent work-from-anywhere policies and salary adjustments, and are preparing for a wave of employees to distance themselves from headquarters and other main offices. In May, Mark Zuckerberg predicted that up to half of Facebook’s employees would work from home within five to 10 years.

The benefits for workers are clear: less time stuck in traffic, more time at home, greater freedom to set and manage one’s own schedule, and the possibility of relocating to a more affordable city or to be closer to extended family.

For employers, the greatest upside is the ability to attract new employees who live in places they would not have hired from in the past, giving them a competitive edge over rivals who insist on in-office workers.

Since surveys have shown only 10% of employees said they want to be in the office post-COVID the majority of the time, and to make things fair post-COVID under the new policies, existing knowledge employees that don’t need to work in an office are also being allowed to move wherever they want to live. It is not clear how companies will handle employees that need to work at the office on a regular schedule or how much compensation will be discounted for employees that only work from home part time. Twitter is adjusting pay on a case-by-case basis.

There is also no consistent HR policy on how working from home will change corporate communications protocols, virtual meeting policies, and opportunities for advancement. Twitter has also adapted its coveted high-tech campus perks: With employees spread in far-flung locations across numerous time zones, Twitter has sought to maintain a sense of togetherness this year by hosting virtual tea times, cooking demonstrations and magic shows, as well as a Virtual Hack Week.

Other employers have provided access to remote yoga and meditation classes; provide reimbursements or financial allowances for day care, at-home fitness equipment and Wi-Fi; and are given $1,000 to help set up home office spaces. Some employers are offering one-time bonuses up to $20,000 to permanently work from home anywhere in the U. S.

For those who move to less-expensive cities, some companies that allow working from anywhere are adjusting pay based on factors including the cost of labor and income tax rates in an employee’s new location. In some cases, employees have seen their salaries cut by more than 10% based on the cost of living differential between their former workspace and their new home office. Other companies are eliminating geographic compensation zones in the U.S. by putting all employees on the same highest compensation regardless of where they live and work.

Private Sector Is Developing Flying Taxis in Time For The 2028 Los Angeles Olympics
A race is on to develop a commercial flying taxi service in time for the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles. The helicopter-like service is tentatively called Uber Air and the company plans to eventually oversee production of 10,000 electric aircraft annually. The first air shuttles could be in service as early as 2023.

Hyundai is the latest company to join Uber to refine the technology so it would be available by 2028. Uber and Hyundai are also working in partnership with two aircraft companies, Embraer and Pipistrel Aircraft. The company expects the cost of operating a helicopter will be close to $700 per flight hour. The electrically-powered personal air vehicle (PAV) will have the capability to carry up to four passengers on trips of up to 60 miles at speeds reaching 180 mph.

With so many vehicles projected to be zipping around the city’s skies, Uber is planning to construct "skyports" where passengers can board aircraft en-route to another hub. Architecture firm Gensler is designing the flying taxi stations that will be distributed throughout Los Angeles at strategic points where passengers can easily access public transportation or shared devices like bikes and scooters.
December 14, 2020

To: SBCCOG Steering Committee

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

Subject: Modernizing the Metro Highway Program

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
Metro staff and the Metro Board staff are circulating draft recommendations to modernize the Metro Highway program. In essence, the recommended new eligibility guidelines described in Exhibit 1 broaden eligible uses of sub-regional highway funds to serve all users of the public infrastructure including pedestrians, cyclists, transit, the disabled, cars and trucks. Newly eligible are projects such as bike lanes and pedestrian improvements, transit shelters, and bus-only lanes.

The recommendations would also re-commit Metro to its previously-adopted Complete Streets Policy and would update performance metrics based on reducing vehicle miles travelled rather than improving highway level of service.

The recommendations were developed in Spring 2020 by a Metro Board Staff Highway Subcommittee appointed by then Metro Chair James Butts. The subcommittee charter was to broaden project eligibility under Metro’s Measure R Highway Operational Improvements and Ramp/Interchange Improvements and under Metro’s Measure M Multi-Year Sub-Regional Programs to include active transportation projects as stand-alone projects rather than as minor elements of highway projects.

The Subcommittee recommendations listed in Exhibit 1 would replace existing Metro sub-regional project eligibility guidelines for both the Measure R (See Exhibit 1, Appendix A) and Measure M (See Exhibit 1, Appendix B). The report also includes a list of relevant studies and reports that the Sub-Committee reviewed in developing its recommendations (See Exhibit 1, Appendix C).

The newly broadened list of eligible projects does not eliminate previously eligible highway projects that do not include active transportation elements. However, the recommended guidelines would require project applicants to submit a letter with their application describing the reasons that Complete Streets elements were considered but not included in the requested project. Because existing types of projects would continue to be eligible and the policy continues to allow project applicants to recommend traditional or new projects, SBCCOG staff
recommends that the SBCCOG support the Metro Board Sub-committee recommendations in Exhibit 1.

Metro staff has requested Councils of Governments to review the Board Sub-Committee Recommendations. Although comments have been requested by December 7, the first opportunity for SBCCOG to consider the recommendations are these meetings, the Transportation Committee and the Steering Committee acting as the Board in December.

Staff has drafted a letter to Metro reflecting SBCCOG’s proposed position on the recommended changes in sub-regional program policies (See Exhibit 2).

RECOMMENDATION
The SBCCOG Transportation Committee recommends that the Steering Committee approve the SBCCOG’s comments as reflected in the draft letter in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 1 – Metro Board Sub-Committee Recommended Improvements to Metro Highway Program

Exhibit 2 – SBCCOG Draft Letter re. Metro Board Sub-Committee Recommendations
May 11, 2020

TO: James T. Butts, Metro Board Chair
FROM: Metro Board Staff Highway Subcommittee
SUBJECT: Recommended Improvements to Metro Highway Program
ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION

That the Metro Board:

1) ENDORSE the recommendations of the Metro Board Staff Highway Subcommittee; and

2) DIRECT the Chief Executive Officer to:
   A) Amend the Measure R Highway Program Eligibility Criteria and initiate an amendment to the Measure M Guidelines to clarify eligibility for transit, active transportation, and complete streets improvements, as described in Attachments A and B; and
   B) Report back in 90 days with responses to recommendations.

ISSUE

In February 2020, Metro Board Chair James Butts created a subcommittee to address various concerns related to the Metro Highway Program raised by board members, cities, councils of governments, and other stakeholders. The subcommittee reviewed relevant plans and policy documents, consulted with Metro staff, and developed recommendations regarding funding guidelines, project eligibility, complete streets, stakeholder involvement, future planning needs, and technical assistance for local jurisdictions. These recommendations are provided herein for the Board’s consideration.

BACKGROUND

In 2008 and 2016, Los Angeles County voters supported multimodal funding measures to improve mobility and ease congestion by providing new transportation options. Both measures included major transit and highway capital projects, as well as funding programs for subregional projects. During the implementation of Measure M subregional programs, several cities and subregional councils of governments have raised the need for consistent policies relating to funding multimodal projects within the highway program.
Metro Board Chair James Butts appointed a subcommittee of board staff in February 2020 to provide recommendations for updating the Metro Highway Program. The Chairman’s charter was to:

“Chart a roadmap toward a more future-oriented highway program that reflects the Board’s strategic priorities of efficiency (defined multimodally), safety, equity and sustainability.”

The subcommittee met twice to discuss issues with current Highway Program policies and procedures. A third meeting was canceled in response to COVID-19. Additionally, subcommittee members reviewed dozens of relevant documents, as described in Attachment C.

DISCUSSION

Metro is the primary agency responsible for the planning, funding, constructing, operating, and maintaining Los Angeles County’s transportation system. In partnership with Caltrans, the Metro Highway Program works to plan, fund, and provide technical/professional services and construction management/support for major highway capital projects. Since the passage of Measures R and M, the Highway Program has also had responsibility for administering subregional highway programs, in partnership with councils of governments.

In October 2014, the Metro Board adopted the Complete Streets Policy, marking a shift in philosophy from traditional highway capacity projects toward comprehensive, multimodal planning and implementation. In 2016, Measure M continued this trajectory by diversifying the types of projects and programs included in the expenditure plan, incorporating stakeholder input via a “bottom up” planning process, and giving subregions a more direct role in setting funding priorities on an ongoing basis. This decentralization of highway planning and the increasing prevalence of projects on city streets makes it timely to assess the structure, policies, and procedures of the Metro Highway Program to identify opportunities for increased alignment with current board policies, funding priorities, and street design best practices.

The subcommittee focused its recommendations on how the Metro Highway Program can better fulfill Metro’s role as a planner and funder, as well as a leader. These functions are traditionally associated with planning, rather than construction. The subcommittee expressed confidence in the Highway Program’s capabilities for engineering and project delivery of freeway projects.

The subcommittee’s recommendations are as follows:

Metro as Planner

Historically, streets have been designed and operated to emphasize movement of motorized vehicles rather than people. The emergence of active transportation and smaller,
neighborhood-scale vehicles has broadened the planning objectives for highway and street improvements in response to 21st Century mobility and sustainability objectives. As the primary transportation planning agency in Los Angeles County, Metro’s role is to envision how streets and freeways should function as multimodal public facilities in the coming decades to meet the region’s mobility needs and support a safe, sustainable, and equitable transportation future, and then work with stakeholders and implementing public and private-sector partners to translate that vision into projects. The Complete Streets Policy recognizes these many uses of the public right-of-way and establishes procedures to ensure their adequate consideration in project development, subject to applicable exceptions. Metro should ensure the agency’s multimodal vision for balancing the modal uses of public rights-of-way is integrated into each and every plan, policy, and/or project, regardless of which functional unit is leading the work.

Metro should:

1. Incorporate staff with multimodal planning expertise in all project development teams to identify opportunities and challenges early and evaluate potential solutions before options are precluded by budget and right-of-way constraints.

2. Ensure that all Metro-led highway planning processes include a multimodal stakeholder participation process that includes review of staff drafts prior to consideration by the Metro Board using existing Metro and/or COG stakeholder advisory committees or a new study-specific committee, as warranted.

3. Include analysis of greenhouse gas emissions resulting from Metro-funded highway projects in forthcoming Metro sustainability and climate action plans, including Moving Beyond Sustainability/Sustainability Plan 2020.

4. Incorporate multimodal recommendations in Metro’s upcoming Joint Systemwide Strategic Highway Plan, the Goods Movement Strategic Plan, and any other relevant ongoing strategic planning activities.

5. Include technology, policy, and land use strategies to promote sustainable distribution and neighborhood delivery in the Goods Movement Strategic Plan and/or the I-710 Clean Truck Element.

6. Coordinate implementation of the Countywide Strategic Truck Network and Active Transportation Strategic Plan to ensure a balanced highway/arterial/street network that safely serves pedestrians, bicycles, slow-speed vehicles, buses, rail alignments, automobiles, and goods movement vehicles.

7. Incorporate Transportation Demand Management (TDM) tools and projects as components of Metro’s mobility and sustainability strategies, with particular emphasis on those that reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Metro as Funder

Metro administers over two-thirds of transportation funding in Los Angeles County, both as the direct recipient of four half-cent sales taxes and the programming agent for multiple state and
federal funding sources. Metro should ensure that funding decisions and guidelines are aligned with its multimodal vision.

Metro should:

1. Expand funding eligibility for transit and active transportation projects by clarifying that all multimodal project elements within a street right-of-way are eligible for highway funding programs in all applicable guidelines, including Measure R Highway Program Criteria and Measure M Guidelines. (See Attachments A and B.)
2. Clarify funding eligibility for projects and technologies that support the implementation of TDM strategies in applicable programs.
3. Ensure that project and program objectives and performance criteria are defined multimodally and equitably (e.g. using person throughput instead of vehicle throughput; safety of vulnerable road users; reduction of VMT).
4. Replace the use of Level of Service (LOS) with VMT reduction as a criterion in all funding decisions. Coordinate with Caltrans to ensure that Metro’s application of VMT performance criteria is consistent with Caltrans.
5. Ensure that all discretionary funding programs, including Multiyear Subregional Programs, conform to Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, which requires all funding recipients to have locally adopted complete streets policies. Provide additional technical assistance to local jurisdictions to support compliance, if needed.
6. Require the use of a complete streets checklist for all Metro-funded projects, consistent with Metro’s Complete Streets Policy.
7. Establish aggregate countywide VMT reduction objectives consistent with statewide regional greenhouse gas emissions targets and ensure funding decisions support the attainment of countywide targets.

Metro as Leader

In addition to its statutory authority, Metro is a leader in the transportation sector that other agencies across the nation look to for guidance and best practices. Metro also partners with other agencies at all levels of government and holds considerable influence in these relationships. Metro should promote best practices in highway planning to achieve its vision, and seek to shape guidance from state and federal partners to promote multimodal planning.

Metro should:

1. Develop comprehensive performance evaluation methods for arterial streets, including mobility, safety, health/sustainability, and equity, and assist local governments with data collection.
2. Engage with Caltrans in the development of SB743 guidelines to responsibly transition highway planning from LOS to VMT to advance the goals outlined in this memo.
3. Research and promote best practices for emerging/increasing uses of arterial streets, including first/last mile delivery, curb management, bus transit priority, micromobility, and active transportation, including TDM best practices to support emerging modes and/or trip reduction.

4. Offer technical assistance to local jurisdictions on incorporating emerging highway/arterial and TDM best practices into their General Plan Circulation Element.

5. Maintain the confidence of Los Angeles County voters by continuing to advance projects and programs included in the Measure R and Measure M expenditure plans.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT**

This action has no immediate financial impact. Any future changes to project scopes or budgets will be subject to Metro’s cost containment policies.

**IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**

The recommended changes to the Metro Highway Program support the following Strategic Plan goals:

**Goal 1:** *Providing high quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling*

The Highway Program will support all modes that travel on the State conventional highways and major and minor arterials, provide safer and more convenient travel options, and reduce demand for vehicular travel on congested streets and highways.

**Goal 2:** *Deliver outstanding trip experience for all users of the transportation system*

The Highway Program will plan for the safety, comfort, and conveniences of all road users.

**Goal 3:** *Enhance communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity*

The Highway Program will invest in projects that support the mobility needs of diverse communities, including those who experience barriers to accessing private vehicles.

**Goal 4:** *Transform LA County through regional collaboration and national leadership*

The Highway Program will promote best practices in multimodal planning, stakeholder engagement, and street design amongst local, state, and federal partner agencies.
Goal 5: Provide responsive, accountable, and trustworthy governance within the Metro organization

The Highway Program will make decisions transparently and in consultation with diverse stakeholders, including local agencies and community members.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board could choose not to endorse these recommendations and not to make revisions to Measure R and Measure M guidelines. This is not recommended because it would leave current conflicts over highway project eligibility and policy direction unresolved.

NEXT STEPS

These recommendations touch a wide range of staff work. In the coming weeks and months, Metro staff will need to review their roles, responsibilities, existing work plans, and scopes for plans that are underway to ensure that these recommendations are incorporated. Additionally, staff will need to revisit prior commitments, such as the Complete Streets Policy’s implementation section, to set new timelines for deliverables that have not been completed on schedule. Metro staff should report back to the Board via board box in 90 days.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Recommended Revisions to Measure R Highway Program Criteria
Attachment B – Recommended Revisions to Measure M Guidelines
Attachment C – Literature Review
RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO MEASURE R HIGHWAY PROGRAM CRITERIA

The following shall replace Measure R Highway Program eligibility criteria in their entirety:

Project Eligibility for Highway Operational Improvements and Ramp/Interchange Improvements

The intent of a Measure R Highway Operational Improvement is to improve multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability along an existing State Highway corridor by reducing congestion and operational deficiencies that do not significantly expand the motor vehicle capacity of the system, or by incorporating complete streets infrastructure into the corridor, in accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan. In addition to those eligible projects on the State Highway System, for Measure R, projects located on primary roadways, including principal arterials, minor arterials, and key collector roadways, will be considered eligible for Operational Improvements and for ramp and interchange improvements.

Examples of eligible improvement projects include:
- interchange modifications;
- ramp modifications;
- auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges;
- curve corrections/improve alignment;
- signals and/or intersection improvements;
- two-way left-turn lanes;
- intersection and street widening
- traffic signal upgrade/timing/synchronization, including all supporting infrastructure;
- traffic surveillance;
- channelization;
- Park and Ride facilities;
- turnouts;
- shoulder widening/improvement;
- safety improvements;
- on-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements;
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways;
- sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps;
- pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks;
• transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies.

Up to 20% of a subregion’s Operational Improvement dollars may be used for soundwalls. Landscaping installed as a component of an operational improvement must be limited to no more than 20% of a project’s budget. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible. Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to State Highway Operational Improvements can be shown, such as a measurable reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled.
ATTACHMENT B

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO MEASURE M GUIDELINES, SECTION X
MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMS (HIGHWAY SUBFUNDS)

The following shall replace subsection ‘A. “Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements” definition:’ in its entirety.

Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements includes those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, travel times; and reduce recurring congestion, high-frequency traffic incident locations, and operational deficiencies on State Highways. Similarly, improvements which achieve these same objectives are eligible on major/minor arterials or key collector roadways. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related project phases as referenced in Sections IX and X and are subject to eligibility criteria and phasing thresholds that will be developed within 6 months as part of the applicable administrative procedures. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds. Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements can be shown, such as a measurable reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- System and local interchange modifications
- Ramp modifications/improvements
- Auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges
- Alignment/geometric design improvements
- Left-turn or right-turn lanes on state highways or arterials
- Intersection and street widening/improvements
- New traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, including left turn phasing, signal synchronization, and all supporting infrastructure
- Turnouts for safety purposes
- Shoulder widening/improvements for enhanced operation of the roadway
- Safety improvements
- Freeway bypass/freeway to freeway connections providing traffic detours in case of incidents, shutdowns or emergency evacuations
- ExpressLanes
- On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways
- Sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps
• Pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks
• Transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies

The following shall replace subsection ‘C. “Multi-Modal Connectivity” definition:’ in its entirety.

“Multi-Modal Connectivity” definition:
Multi-modal connectivity projects include those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and network performance; provide network connections; reduce congestion, queuing or user conflicts; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; encourage ridesharing; and reduce vehicle miles traveled. Project should encourage and provide multi-modal access based on existing demand and/or planned need and observed safety incidents or conflicts. Subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

Examples of Eligible Projects:
• Transportation Center expansions
• Park and Ride expansions
• Multi-modal access improvements
• New mode and access accommodations
• First/last mile infrastructure

The following shall replace subsection ‘D. “Freeway Interchange Improvement” definition:’ in its entirety.

“Freeway Interchange Improvements” definition:
Freeway Interchange Improvements includes those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance safety by reducing conflicts; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, and travel times; and reduce recurring congestion and operational deficiencies on State Highways. Similarly, improvements on major/minor arterials or key collector roadways which achieve these same objectives are also eligible under this category. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete
streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. State of good repair, maintenance improvements and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

The following shall replace subsection ‘E. “Arterial Street Improvements” definition:’ in its entirety.

“Arterial Street Improvements” definition:

Arterial Street improvements include those projects, which upon implementation would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, and travel times; and reduce recurring congestion and operational deficiencies. Projects must have a nexus to a principal arterial, minor arterial or key collector roadway. The context and function of the roadway should be considered (i.e., serves major activity center(s), accommodates trips entering/exiting the jurisdiction or subregion, serves intra-area travel) and adopted in the City’s general plan. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. State of good repair, maintenance improvements and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- Intersection or street widening
- Two-way left-turn or right turn lanes
- New traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, including left turn phasing
- Sight distance corrections/improve alignment
- Turnouts
- Safety improvements
- On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways
- Sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps
- Pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks
- Transportation infrastructure in a street right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies
ATTACHMENT C

LITERATURE REVIEW

The subcommittee members reviewed precedential documents to establish a baseline understanding of current highway-related policies and practices. Reviewed documents include the following board-approved policies, program guidelines, board actions, administrative procedures, and relevant highway studies (in chronological order):

- Board motion on Status Report on Financial Forecast to Deliver Twenty-Eight by ’28 (February 2019)
- Metro’s “Vision 2028 Plan” (June 2018)
- City College of New York’s Complete Streets Considerations for Freight and Emergency Vehicle Operations (May 2018)
- Board-adopted Measure M Master Guidelines including Substitute Motion (June 2017)
- Measure M Ordinance (June 2016)
- Los Angeles County Strategic Goods Movement Arterial Plan (CSTAN) (May 2015)
- Subregional Mobility Matrices (April 2015)
- Board-adopted Complete Streets Policy (October 2014)
- Recommendations from the Reconvened Measure R Highway Advisory Committee (2014)
- Board-approval of the updated project list of the Measure R Highway Subregional Programs in six subregions (November 2013)
- Clarification Board Item on Project Eligibility for Measure R Highway Operational Improvements and Ramp Interchange Improvements (June 2012)
- Board-adopted 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan for Los Angeles County including Attachment D-1, Clarification on Project Eligibility for Highway Operational Improvement and Ramp/Interchange Improvements, of the Measure R Highway Program Funding Strategy (October 2009)
- Measure R Ordinance (2008)
- Proposition C Ordinance (1990)
- Proposition A Ordinance (1980)
Draft SBCCOG Letter

Phillip Washington
Chief Executive Officer
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: SBCCOG Comments on Metro Board Highway Sub-Committee Recommendations To Modernize the Metro Highway Program

Dear Mr. Washington:

Metro staff has requested that the Councils of Governments comment on the recommendations proposed by the Metro Board Sub-Committee report on Highway Program Modernization. The SBCCOG commends the sub-committee for its recommendations and supports the Metro Board’s adoption of the report as written.

We believe the recommendations will benefit South Bay project sponsors by expanding eligibility of Measure M and Measure R Subregional funds to include projects that improve the public rights-of-way for all users, rather than just for cars and trucks. We believe there will be strong interest in developing and delivering Complete Streets transit and active transportation projects using these funds.

We also fully support the use of performance metrics in the project selection process that allow projects to be selected based on reducing Vehicle Miles Travelled rather than the traditional Highway Level of Service. However, since there are instances in which a bike lane or bus lane is incompatible, such as on heavy truck routes, it is most important that project sponsors be allowed to use metrics and eligibility criteria appropriate to the project needs and project benefits. Therefore, we would strongly support the modernized guidelines continuing to allow highway projects to be funded that reduce delay on our congested streets or that reduce vehicle miles travelled.

We believe that the guidelines, as written, provide for the flexibility but caution that Metro staff not feel constrained by the new VMT-only performance criteria and so will not allow a highway project that improves LOS without improving VMT even though it is important to the community. If a project does not include Complete Street elements, we can support the new requirement for a project sponsor to submit a letter explaining why Complete Streets elements are not incorporated. However, we cannot support a policy that would prevent a highway project that does not include Complete Streets elements from being eligible for Measure R or M Sub-Regional funding. We strongly believe that would be inconsistent with the intent of Measure R and Measure M Ordinances which allow wide discretion in the sub-regional programs. The guidelines should be permissive, not restrictive.
Thank you for considering our comments. We look forward to continuing to participate in the process to develop more modern and expansive Measure R and M guidelines for the Sub-Regional programs.

Sincerely,

Olivia Valentine, Chair
South Bay Cities Council of Governments

c.c.: SBCCOG Board of Directors
      Metro Board of Directors
The Director of Regional Development is responsible for conducting the agency’s housing and development program as follows:

Always in consultation with the city Community Development Directors:

- Assist the COG and member jurisdictions in developing a coherent housing policy to ensure that state policy goals to accelerate housing production are met, while also meeting the local needs of communities in the SBCCOG region;

- Track state housing policy and legislation, recommend advocacy positions to be taken by the SBCCOG Board and support or participate in legislative advocacy on behalf of the SBCCOG as directed;

- Track and participate in the development of regional plans, particularly the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) periodically developed by SCAG; track and participate in related regional committee meetings (Technical Working Group, Regional Council, Policy Committees, etc.); and keep COG members informed of their implications;

- Track and participate in SCAG’s RHNA process, including RHNA Subcommittee meetings for the distribution methodology, and keep COG members informed of the process and its implications;

- Oversee the implementation of the SCAG REAP programs that the SBCCOG has submitted on behalf of SBCCOG cities;

- Work with other COG and city program staff, including transportation planning, economic development, and homelessness to ensure that policy, planning, and project development efforts are coordinated;

- Develop a comprehensive understanding of what cities are doing throughout the state on complying with requirements, i.e. best practices, re: ADU’s, public participation, etc.;

- Track member jurisdictions’ compliance with state housing law and assure they receive technical assistance as needed;

- Be a resource to cities on request – conducting research, assisting with RFP’s

- Further develop the agency’s climate planning initiatives by ensuring member jurisdictions continue to use the Climate Action Planning Framework; update the CAP Framework and develop additional tools as needed;

- Recommend and develop additional innovative planning programs as needed, and monitor and share funding opportunities to help the South Bay Cities prosper economically, environmentally, and socially.
Proposed City Assessments for Climate Action Plan Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Assessments</th>
<th>Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES COUNTY</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES CITY</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TORRANCE</td>
<td>137,946</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGLEWOOD</td>
<td>112,580</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARSON</td>
<td>89,730</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWTHORNE</td>
<td>84,112</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDONDO BEACH</td>
<td>63,261</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARDENA</td>
<td>57,746</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANCHO PALOS VERDES</td>
<td>41,145</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANHATTAN BEACH</td>
<td>33,852</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWNDALE</td>
<td>31,711</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOMITA</td>
<td>20,046</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERMOSA BEACH</td>
<td>18,566</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL SEGUNDO</td>
<td>16,033</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALOS VERDES ESTATES</td>
<td>13,340</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLLING HILLS ESTATES</td>
<td>7,676</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLLING HILLS</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $83,500
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