South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Steering Committee
AGENDA
Monday, March 9, 2020
12:00 pm – 2:00 pm
Hawthorne Memorial Center – Polaris Room
3901 W El Segundo Blvd
Hawthorne, CA 90250

I. INTRODUCTIONS

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

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS OF ANY CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

V. CONSENT CALENDAR – action items noted, remainder are receive & file – 12:05 pm
   A. Steering Committee – February 10, 2020 meeting minutes attached (Pages 3-8)
      ■ ACTION: Approve
   
   B. Office Move Update
      ■ Memo attached (Pages 9-10)
   
   C. 2019 General Assembly Outstanding Sponsor Payments
      ■ $2500 from Mark Ridley-Thomas – payment being processed

   D. Appointments to Outside Agencies
      ■ Memo attached (Page 11)
   
   E. South Bay Environmental Services Center Activities Report – attached (Pages 13-17)
   
   F. Transportation Monthly Report – attached (Pages 19-24)
   
   G. City Attendance at SBCCOG meetings
      ■ Matrix attached (Page 25)

VI. ACTION ITEMS
   H. South Bay Fiber Network – 12:10 pm
      ■ Fiber applications – Equinix visit – Wally Siembab
      ■ Construction schedule update
      ■ Thank you event in El Segundo – celebration & recognition
      ■ ACTION: Provide direction

   I. Legislative Issues – 12:20 pm
      ■ Legislative Matrix – attached (Page 27-29)
      ■ RHNA methodology discussion
      ■ Sponsor NEV legislation – draft attached (Pages 31-35)
      ■ Status of meeting with developers re: housing legislation
      ■ Trip to Sacramento – 5 electeds signed up for 3/24 and 1 for 3/25 - further update at the meeting
      ■ ACTION: Seek author for NEV legislation for the South Bay
J. Transportation Committee Items – **12:35 pm**
- Metro Budget Request for Measure M and R funds – attached (Pages 37-48)
- **ACTION:** Approve Transportation Committee’s recommendation for Metro Budget Request for Measure R and M funds FY 2020 through Y 2025 to be submitted to Metro
- **ACTION:** Approve any additional items, if any, recommended by Transportation Committee

K. Board Meeting agenda development – **12:45 pm**
- April – SBCCOG Office
- Work Program for 20-21 to be presented
- **ACTION:** Recommend programs of interest for Board presentations

L. Approval of Invoices – available at the meeting – **12:55 pm**
- **ACTION:** Approve invoices for payment

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS
M. General Assembly – **1:00 pm**
- 2020 Sponsors as of 3/2/20 - $84,250 cash & $6,166.60 in-kind for total of $90,426.60!
- Further updates at the meeting

N. Report on Meeting of the Minds Conference – **1:10 pm**

O. Update on Homeless Program and Innovation Project Funding – **1:20 pm**
- Report on 4th Annual Homeless Initiative Conference held March 5
- GIS mapping tools and report on March 4 SBCCOG Homeless Services Task Force meeting

P. Update on Senior Services – **1:30 pm**
- Next meeting is March 31 at new SBCCOG office.
- Inglewood is the latest city to complete their Age-Friendly application. Still working with Hawthorne and El Segundo to complete theirs.

VIII. STRATEGIC POSITIONING ITEMS/ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES
Q. Other updates since agenda distribution – **1:35 pm**

**NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING** – Monday, April 13, 2020 @ 12:00 pm @ SBCCOG Office – 2355 Crenshaw Blvd, Suite 125
South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Steering Committee
FOLLOW-UP AGENDA
Monday, February 10, 2020

Attendees: Christian Horvath (Chair, Redondo Beach); Olivia Valentine (1st Vice Chair, Hawthorne); Britt Huff (Immediate Past Chair); Cedrick Hicks (Carson); Ralph Franklin (Inglewood); Hildy Stern (Manhattan Beach); John Cruikshank (Rancho Palos Verdes); Geoff Rizzo (Torrance); Kim Fuentes, Wally Siembab, Steve Lantz, David Leger, Natalie Champion, Brooke Heri (SBCCOG), Jim Hannon (President of South Bay Bicycle Coalition); Antonio Alvizo (Sharp)

I. INTRODUCTIONS

II. REPORT OF POSTING OF AGENDA
   ■ ACTION: ReceiveD and fileD

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS OF ANY CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

V. CONSENT CALENDAR – action items noted, remainder are receive & file - 12:05 pm
   CRUIKSHANK/HUFF
   A. Steering Committee – January 13, 2020 meeting minutes attached
      ■ ACTION: ApproveD

   B. FY 18-19 Audit
      ■ http://southbaycities.org/about-us/financial-documents
      ■ ACTION: ReceiveD and fileD

   C. Communications staff
      ■ Due to other obligations, the job description and budget for a communications staff person which was due this month will be brought back no later than April

   D. City Attendance at SBCCOG meetings
      ■ Matrix attached

   E. 2019 General Assembly Outstanding Sponsor Payments
      ■ $2500 from Mark Ridley-Thomas – payment being processed

   F. South Bay Environmental Services Center Activities Report – attached

VII. ACTION ITEMS
   G. Metro Service Council and other appointments that are due - 12:10 pm
      ■ Memo attached
      ■ 3 METRO SERVICE COUNCIL SEATS ARE VACANT AND POTENTIAL 4TH WITH EXIT OF DAN MEDINA FROM CITY COUNCIL. MEDINA HOLDS HIS SEAT AS AN ELECTED OFFICIAL. COULD BE ASKED TO STAY ON SERVICE COUNCIL THROUGH HIS TERM, BUT THEN THE SBCCOG WOULD HAVE FEWER ELECTED OFFICIALS ON THE COMMITTEE. ALSO, SCAG RC SEATS AND COMMITTEE SEATS OPEN AFTER MEDINA DEPARTURE AND JUDY MITCHELL NO LONGER WANTING TO SERVE.
      ■ FRANKLIN – MEDINA SEAT SHOULD BE VACATED UPON HIS EXIT FROM CITY COUNCIL. DECLARE THE SEAT VACANT AND FILL 4 SEATS.
      ■ HORVATH – ANY PRESENT MEMBERS INTERESTED? NONE AT THIS TIME.
HORVATH – REGARDING SCAG POSITIONS, MEDINA AND MITCHELL VACANCIES, NEED TO FILL THOSE AS WELL.

STERN – PLEASE SHARE LIST OF OPEN APPOINTMENTS AND SCOPE/RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH APPOINTMENT. LINKS CAN BE SENT DIRECTING ELECTEDS TO THE AGENCIES WEB PAGES.

ACTION: ADVERTISE 4 OPEN METRO SERVICE COUNCIL VACANCIES AND REDISTRIBUTE LIST OF OPEN APPOINTMENTS ALONG WITH THE RESPONSIBILITIES/SCOPE/OTHER RELEVANT INFO.

H. South Bay Fiber Network – 12:20 pm

1. 2nd payment for Work Order #1 attached
2. Work Order #2 – to be sent separately
3. Fiber applications – Equinix visit – Wally Siembab

WALLY – WORK ORDER 1 WAS TO BUILD THE RING NETWORK. WORK IS UNDERWAY AND PERMITS ARE BEING PULLED FOR THIS WORK ORDER. REQUESTING APPROVAL OF 2ND PAYMENT TO ADF FOR WORK ORDER #1. WORK ORDER #2 WILL BEGIN BUILDING LATERAL CONNECTIONS TO CITY SITES. REQUESTING RECOMMENDED BOARD APPROVAL OF WORK ORDER #2. WORK IS PROGRESSING AND SERVICE SHOULD BEGIN BY JUNE 30, 2020. RACE COMMUNICATIONS IS MEETING WITH EACH CITY TO SIGN SERVICE AGREEMENTS.

CRUIKSHANK – IS THE RING BEING BUILT ABOVE OR BELOW GROUND? AND IS CITY STAFF PRESENT TO ENSURE CITY RULES ARE FOLLOWED? WALLY - PERMITS ARE BEING PULLED FROM EACH CITY AS NEEDED SO LOCAL RULES/REQUIREMENTS ARE BEING FOLLOWED.

WALLY – BBK IS SENDING OUT LETTER TO EVERY CITY ENSURING CONCERNS ARE MET AND MSA IS READY TO GO. SMALL REVISIONS WILL GO TO SBCCOG BOARD IN FEBRUARY.

WALLY – EQUINIX VISIT WAS FASCINATING. VISIT WITH ELECTEDS CAN BE FACILITATED. WITH STATE MONEY, APPS WILL BE DEVELOPED. LOOKING TO DO LUNCH AND LEARN SERIES WITH COUNCILMEMBERS AND STAFF. EQUINIX CAN OFFER ADDITIONAL AMENITIES (SUCH AS BACKUP STORAGE FOR COUNCIL MEETING VIDEO ARCHIVES) VIA THE SBFN CONNECTION AND COULD HELP LOWER OTHER COSTS FOR CITIES.

HORVATH – PRESENTATION TO THE BOARD MAY BE INFORMATIVE. THIS OPPORTUNITY CAN BE HUGE FOR SBCCOG CITIES.

ACTION: Approve 2nd payment for work order #1 and recommend Board approval of work order #2 – FRANKLIN/CRUIKSHANK

I. Legislative Issues – 12:35 pm

1. Legislative Matrix – attached
2. DAVID – HANDOUT INCLUDES ONLY MINOR UPDATES FROM MATRIX IN PACKET, LARGELY NEW LOCATIONS OF BILLS. TWO CANNABIS BILLS APPEAR DEAD FOR NOW ALONG WITH SB50.
3. HORVATH – EARLIER THIS MORNING RECEIVED REQUEST FROM LA COUNCILMAN KORETZ TO CONSIDER SUPPORTING CITY OF LA EFFORT TO GET STATE LEGISLATION TO REQUIRE 80% OF RENTAL CARS AT CONRAC AT LAX TO BE EVS BY 2024. THOUGHTS ON Sending SUPPORT LETTER?
4. VALENTINE – SEEMS TO BE A TERRIBLE BURDEN TO PUT ON CAR COMPANIES AND WOULD NOT SUPPORT AT THIS TIME.
5. CRUIKSHANK – AGREE WITH VALENTINE.
6. WALLY – BEFORE ADOPTING MAJOR LEGISLATION LIKE THIS, PERHAPS SBCCOG COULD CONDUCT A PILOT DEMONSTRATION/EXPERIMENT.
7. STERN – SHOULD ALSO ENCOURAGE COMPANIES TO THINK BIG AND TAKE HEROIC STEPS TO BE PART OF SOLUTION.
STEVE – NO WHERE NEAR ENOUGH EV INFRASTRUCTURE TO MAKE THIS A REALITY UNDER CURRENT FUNDING MECHANISMS FOR EV CHARGING STATIONS.

HORVATH – SEND THE LETTER TO WALLY FOR REVIEW/EDITS AND INCLUSION OF RECOMMENDATIONS. NO LETTER TO BE SENT NOW, COULD PROVIDE COMMENTS AND IDEAS TO COUNCILMAN KORETZ INSTEAD.

Meeting with developers re: housing legislation? With LCC, LA? –

Trip to Sacramento – 5 electeds signed up for 3/24 and 2 for 3/25 - further update at the meeting

KIM – SAC VISIT IS BEING PLANNED. CONSULTANT HAS NOT YET RESPONDED TO JACKI ON DETAILS. MARCH 24/25, COME FOR ONE OR BOTH DAYS. CURRENT PLAN IS FOR JACKI TO MEET WITH BOARD MEMBERS AND LEGISLATORS, WALLY TO MEET WITH AGENCY STAFF. LET JACKI KNOW IF YOU WANT TO ATTEND.

HORVATH – JUST AS IMPORTANT FOR BOARD MEMBERS TO MEET WITH AGENCY STAFF SO THEY CAN LEARN FROM EACH OTHER.

FRANKLIN – ANYONE GOING SHOULD ALSO MEET WITH THEIR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORS TO GET UPDATES ON GENERAL PLANS, ETC AND HOW STATE INITIATIVES COULD AFFECT THOSE.

KIM – BEFORE SAC VISIT, JACKI IS PROPOSING A MEETING WITH DEVELOPERS IN ORDER TO GET FEEDBACK ON HOUSING LEGISLATION AND CONCEPTS SBCCOG MIGHT PROPOSE. STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS RESPONDED TO INCLUDE DIFFERENT TYPES OF DEVELOPERS – DAC, HIGH INCOME, ETC. VARIETY OF DEVELOPERS ALONG WITH THOSE WHO MAY DO STRIP MALL COMMERCIAL TO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.

CRUIKSHANK – GREAT IDEA. BIA CAN LIKELY PROVIDE A LIST/VARIETY OF DEVELOPERS FOR THE MEETING.

MAYBE MEET AS A GROUP AFTER MARCH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING TO PLAN/STRATEGIZE.

ACTION: Recommend Board approval of legislation and provide direction on meeting with developers. RIZZO/FRANKLIN

J. Board Meeting agenda development – 12:45 pm

February – Redondo Beach Library – draft agenda attached

Local Travel Network and the Intersection with Housing – Wally Siembab

WALLY – LOOKING AT BEING READY FOR RESIDENT-OWNED LOCAL USE VEHICLES. CITIES WERE TOTALLY UNPREPARED FOR WAVE OF SCOOTERS BY COMPANIES. THIS IS DIFFERENT AS RESIDENTS WILL BE OWNING THESE VEHICLES. LOOKING AT HOW USERS CAN TRAVEL BETWEEN NEIGHBORHOODS BY FINDING SAFE ACCESS POINTS. ALSO TRYING TO WORK ON THE “HOME TO DESTINATION” WHICH COULD SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS IF DONE BY LUV AND NOT A CAR.

HICKS – WHAT ABOUT RIDING ON SIDEWALKS? WALLY – THIS WOULD NOT BE ALLOWED. LOOKING AT EXISTING LOW SPEED AND LOW VOLUME STREETS THAT COULD BE DESIGNATED AS A LOCAL TRAVEL NETWORK ALONG WITH IDENTIFYING CONTROL POINTS FOR SAFELY TRAVELING BETWEEN NEIGHBORHOODS IN LUVS.

STEVE – PER FRANKLIN’S REQUEST, 15 MIN PRESENTATION FROM METRO STAFF ON NEXTGEN BUS STUDY WILL ALSO BE MADE AT THE BOARDS NEXT MEETING.

K. Special Events – 12:50 pm

Celebration and Recognition of SBWIB, R/T, Hahn and Butts re: SBFN – TBD

Tour of Regional Recycled Water Advanced Purification Center in Carson, showcasing its innovative purification process and the importance of purified,
recycled water to Southern California’s future water supply. Tours are approximately 1.5 hours long. Tour: 2/27/2020 - 1:30 P.M.

- KIM – RSVP TO JACKI IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN GOING.
- ACTION: Provide direction

- HORVATH – TOOK A MOMENT TO SHARE PASSING OF BOB BACHARACH. STAFF WILL WORK WITH CHAIR ON IDENTIFYING WAY TO HONOR JACKI’S HUSBAND. PERHAPS DONATION TO CHARITY HE LIKED.

L. Legal Counsel – 12:55 pm
- SBCCOG has had the same legal counsel for over 20 years. Last month’s Steering Committee direction was to create an RFP. Mike Jenkins called and wanted you to know that he is willing to stay pro bono for the basic service and we probably won’t be able to beat that with an RFP.
- Still do RFP?
- KIM – JENKINS OFFERED TO CONTINUE PRO BONO SERVICES FOR BASIC LEGAL COUNSEL (CONTRACTS, ETC). SPECIALIZED SERVICES MAY NEED TO BE PAID FOR DUE TO ACQUISITION BY BBK.
- HORVATH – STILL SHOULD CONSIDER DOING RFP AS FINANCE COMMITTEE PREPARES FOR FUTURE. JENKINS MAY NOT ALWAYS BE AROUND AND THERE SHOULD BE A BUDGET FOR LEGAL COUNSEL IF NEEDED.
- KIM – RFPS ARE VERY TIME CONSUMING FOR THE ISSUER AND APPLICANTS. IF SBCCOG IS NOT SERIOUS ABOUT CONSIDERING NEW LEGAL COUNSEL AND ONLY WANTS TO DETERMINE A BUDGET, SBCCOG STAFF CAN INVESTIGATE COSTS AND FIRMS AND REPORT BACK TO STEERING COMMITTEE.
- CRUIKSHANK – AGREE WITH KIM. WOULD RATHER LOOK INTO OTHER COG BUDGETS BEFORE MOVING FORWARD WITH RFP PROCESS.
- ACTION: RESEARCH OTHER COG BUDGETING FOR LEGAL COUNSEL. BRING INFO BACK TO STEERING COMMITTEE BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH RFP. PROVIDE LINE ITEM IN SBCCOG BUDGET FOR LEGAL COUNSEL.

M. Office Move – 1:00 pm
- Memo attached and possible action re: need for a firewall, discussion and recommendation for Board approval
- KIM – CONSTRUCTION IS EXPECTED TO BE COMPLETED MARCH 11, SO SHOULD BE BACK IN OFFICES BY APRIL MEETINGS. WHILE SBFN CONNECTION IS STILL BEING MADE, TEMPORARY INTERNET CONNECTIONS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED VIA SPECTRUM.
- HORVATH - TONY FROM SHARP IS HERE TO DISCUSS FIREWALL ITEM AND ANSWER QUESTIONS.
- TONY – OPTION 1 IS A GOOD ENTRY LEVEL OPTION BUT DOES NOT HAVE THE CAPACITY AND ADDITIONAL SECURITY THAT OPTION 2 DOES. OPTION 1 WOULD ALSO BOTTLENECK INTERNET SPEEDS DUE TO REVERSION TO COPPER CABLE ONCE IN THE SUITE FROM BROADBAND CONNETTION OUTSIDE.
- FRANKLIN – THERE ARE TWO HOURS OF LABOR. SHOULD THIS NOT JUST BE INCLUDED IN THE OVERALL COST? DAVID - THE LABOR COSTS WOULD BE FOR SHARP STAFF TIME. THE REMAINING COSTS (LICENSE AND HARDWARE) ARE PAID TO THE VENDOR WHO IS NOT SHARP.
- HORVATH – IF OPTION 1 WOULD ESSENTIALLY SELF-THROTTLE DUE TO THAT ISSUE, WE SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERING IT.
- CRUIKSHANK – PREFER IF STAFF WOULD PROVIDE ONE RECOMMENDATION AFTER DUE DILIGENCE AND VETTING. BOARD SHOULD BE CONSIDERING WHAT STAFF HAS IDENTIFIED AS THE ORGANIZATIONAL NEED.
ACTION: Recommend approval of staff recommendation AND SELECTION OF SONICWALL NSA 2650 FIREWALL. CRUIKSHANK/VALENTINE.

N. Mid-Year Budget – 1:05 pm

- BROOKE – NEW CONTRACTS HAVE PUT BUDGET WELL INTO BLACK BY APPROXIMATELY $500K. SOME EXPENSES HAVE GONE UP, SOME DOWN. LIKELY NEED TO BRING ON ADDITIONAL STAFF TO HANDLE NEW PROGRAMS.
- FRANKLIN – DOES SBCCOG ENCUMBER SEVERENCE PAY/PENSIONS/VACATION/ETC. BROOKE – SBCCOG DOES NOT PAY OUT ON SICK TIME. THE RESERVE IS SUPPOSED TO COVER ALL SHUTDOWN COSTS WHICH INCLUDES PAYOUT OF VACATION TIME. VACATION TIME IS PAID OUT BUT HAS A MAXIMUM ACCRUAL AMOUNT BASED ON LENGTH OF TIME WITH ORGANIZATION. BENEFITS AND ANY PENSION CONTRIBUTIONS ARE DONE EACH MONTH AND ARE NOT ONGOING FINANCIAL RISKS TO THE SBCCOG. EMPLOYEES ARE NOT CALPERS OR OTHER RETIREMENT SYSTEMS LIKE IN MOST CITIES.
- ACTION: SHOW VACATION TIME PAYOUT LIABILITY IN THE NEXT BUDGET.

O. Intention to Raise dues – 1:15 pm

- Recommendation from Finance Committee – amount to be determined
- HORVATH – PLEASE MAKE SURE YOUR CITY IS REPRESENTED AT FINANCE COMMITTEE. WORK IS PROGRESSING AND IT IS IMPERATIVE ALL CITIES PARTICIPATE. COMMITTEE IS RECOMMENDING A DUES INCREASE BE CONSIDERED, PERHAPS A ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF THE CURRENT RESERVE BUILDING PLAN.
- FRANKLIN – SO DUES WILL BE RAISED BY $20K TOTAL? HORVATH – THE COMMITTEE HAS NOT RECOMMENDED A SPECIFIC AMOUNT. IF THE CURRENT PLAN WAS EXTENDED ONE YEAR, A TOTAL OF $20K ADDITIONAL WOULD BE COLLECTED, NOT PER CITY. COMMITTEE WILL COME BACK WITH SPECIFICS. SBCCOG BYLAWS REQUIRE MINIMUM OF 60 DAYS NOTICE OF INTENTION TO RAISE DUES. SPECIFIC DUES INCREASE WILL BE PRESENTED AT A FUTURE MEETING.
- WALLY – CONSIDER REQUESTING ON-GOING STATE FUNDING DURING SAC VISIT.
- ACTION: Recommend notice of intention to the Board. FRANKLIN/HICKS

P. Approval of Invoices – available at the meeting – 1:20 pm

- NOTE: Includes Legal review of SBFN Master services agreement of $4,725 –
- ACTION: Approve invoices for payment FRANKLIN/HICKS

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS

Q. Telework Project Update – Wally Siembab - 1:25 pm

- WALLY – REVISING PRIOR AQMD PROPOSAL AFTER MEETING WITH LA COUNTY. PLANNING ON RESUBMITTING AQMD PROPOSAL TO DO A TELEWORK FEASIBILITY STUDY (APPROX $40K).

R. Update on Homeless Program and Innovation Project Funding - 1:35 pm

- KIM – BOARD APPROVED INNOVATION FUNDS PROJECT LIST. LA COUNTY HAS RELEASED A STORYMAP THAT HELPS LOCATE INTERIM AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING IN THE COUNTY. STAFF WILL BE PRESENTING AT THE NEXT HOMELESS SERVICES TASK FORCE MEETING ON MARCH 4TH. THEY WILL ALSO EXHIBIT AT GA. STAFF PARTICIPATED IN CONFERENCE CALL WITH LACHI, LAHSA, HARBOR INTERFAITH, HERMOSA BEACH, MANHATTAN BEACH, AND SAN GABRIEL VALLEY COG ON DEVELOPING TRAINING SERIES FOR CITY STAFF, ELECTED OFFICIALS, BUSINESS OWNERS, AND RESIDENTS. SERVICE PROVIDERS WILL TAKE THE LEAD IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE COURSES. SBCCOG AND PATH STAFF HAVE STARTED TO MEET WITH CITIES TO DETERMINE OUTREACH AND TRAINING NEEDS.
S. Update on Senior Services – 1:40 pm
- KIM – SENIOR SERVICES MEETING HELD IN GARDENA AND HEARD A PRESENTATION ON CANNABIS/HEMP CBD/THC ISSUES INCLUDING VAPING CRISIS. THE GROUP ASKED FOR MORE DETAILED MEDICAL USES AND ISSUES AT THE MAY MEETING. A PRESENTER IS BEING SCHEDULED. EL SEGUNDO IS WORKING ON THEIR AGE-FRIENDLY CITY APPLICATION.

T. General Assembly – 1:45 pm
- Memo attached
- HORVATH – PLEASE INVITE YOUR CONSTITUENTS AND GROUPS TO THE EVENT. JACKI DISTRIBUTED A TEMPLATE FOR YOU TO SEND OUT. THANK YOU FRANKLIN FOR SENDING OUT.
- KIM TO RESEND OUT THE FLYER AND TEMPLATE LETTER.
- KIM – WHAT FOOD MENU PREFERENCE? SBCCOG STAFF MUST MEET WITH CATERER SOON. OVERWHELMING SUPPORT FOR BARBEQUE MENU.

VIII. STRATEGIC POSITIONING ITEMS/ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES
- Other updates since agenda distribution – 1:55 pm
- KIM – APPLIED FOR SCAG SUSTAINABILITY AWARD FOR OUR ADAPTATION PLANNING WORK.

NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING – Monday, March 9, 2020 @ 12:00 pm
- HORVATH – NEXT MEETING AT THE HAWTHORNE MEMORIAL CENTER. THERE WILL ALSO BE AN ACTION ITEM FROM TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE ON METRO BUDGET REQUEST. PLEASE BE PRESENT TO DISCUSS AND VOTE.
TO: SBCCOG Steering Committee
FROM: Jacki Bacharach, SBCCOG Executive Director
SUBJECT: Office Move Update

Adherence to Strategic Plan:

Goal D: Organizational Stability. Be a high performing organization with a clear path to long-term financial health, staffing continuity, and sustained board commitment.

UPDATE

Preparations for the move to Park Del Amo at 2355 Crenshaw Boulevard in Torrance (corner of Crenshaw and Sepulveda Boulevards) continue. The following are updates:

- **Lease Agreement for Additional Space** – Staff is continuing to follow up on the status of the additional space.
- **Construction at Park Del Amo** – Construction is beginning to wrap up on the office space. Estimated construction completion is scheduled for March 11th. Staff has visited the site and started planning move in schedule.
- **Temporary Office Space** – Staff will continue to work at the San Pedro office building of L.A. Councilmember Buscaino – 638 Beacon Street - through move in at the new space which will most likely finish the end of March.
- **Office Furniture** – Office furniture from the Maritz site is in storage. Staff is working with Office Depot to identify appropriately sized furniture for the new offices. An order will be made in early March. Delivery and assembly will be coordinated through Office Depot depending on actual construction completion dates. A subsequent furniture purchase (still within the overall move budget) may be needed after move-in to the new office and as needs are identified.
- **Movers** – Mover Services Inc. is storing SBCCOG items through March to accommodate any potential delays in move-in to the Park Del Amo office. Tentatively, Mover Services is set to deliver items from storage to the new office during the last week of March.
- **Relocation of I.T. Network and Connected Devices** – Xerox relocation for the Park Del Amo office will be completed in the last week of March. IT Network cabling has been finished at the Park Del Amo office.
- **South Bay Fiber Network (SBFN)** – SBCCOG staff has postponed the SBFN connection due to budget. Temporary internet service from Spectrum will be transferred from the San Pedro to the new Torrance office.
ESTIMATED CALENDAR – projected key dates

- Mar. 2-6: Office furniture purchased
- Mar. 11-13: Office construction completed
- Mar. late: Move in office furniture/equipment
- Apr. 1: First workday in new office

BUDGET

Below is the estimated budget and balance based on information currently available. The chart will be updated as actual costs are incurred and any additional items are identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security Deposit – Park Del Amo</td>
<td>$13,362.39</td>
<td>$13,362.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.T.</td>
<td>$24,754.00 (includes additional Xerox costs)</td>
<td>$4,856.60 (De-cabling &amp; half of new cabling)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Costs</td>
<td>$11,000.00 (not to exceed)</td>
<td>$2,116.87 (Deposit on total move)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage Removal at Maritz Building</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Alternates (sound insulation for specified walls)</td>
<td>$9,719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New office furniture (estimate)</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$74,245.39</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,745.86</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BUDGET</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,000.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUDGET REMAINING</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,754.61</strong></td>
<td><strong>$79,254.14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION

Receive and file this update and provide direction to staff, if any.

Prepared by:
Kim Fuentes, Deputy Executive Director
David Leger, SBCCOG staff
Chandler Sheilds, SBCCOG staff
South Bay Cities Council of Governments

March 9, 2020

TO: SBCCOG Steering Committee

FROM: Jacki Bacharach, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Status of Appointments to Outside Agencies

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

BACKGROUND
The SBCCOG makes appointments to represent the organization on several other agency Boards and Committees. Some of the appointments have their own terms but if they don’t, consistent with Board policy, these appointments expire every two years in order to make sure that those that are interested in serving have a chance to do so.

The appointments listed below are due to expire. These appointment opportunities are open for any Mayor or Councilmember in the South Bay but the SBCCOG does request that any appointee be prepared to provide regular reports to the SBCCOG Board of Directors.

The current opportunities along with the status of the nominations which are due by March 20 is as follows:

- SCAG Regional Council District #40 – Drew Boyles declared elected after no one else filed - COMPLETED
- SCAG Community Economic Development & Housing Committee - Mark Waronek has re-applied
- South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce - Olivia Valentine has re-applied
- I-710 Project Advisory Committee – non-voting (incumbent is Judy Mitchell) – NO NOMINATIONS
- SCAG Regional Council District #28 (incumbent not eligible, leaving public office) – NO NOMINATIONS AND DEADLINE WAS MARCH 2 FOR THIS POSITION. NEED TO RE-ADVERTISE.
- Metro Service Council – 4 seats (incumbents are Ralph Franklin, Luis Duran, Meghan Langlois for a 3 year term and a vacant seat for a 1 year term)
  - Eric Craig – 25 year old rider in Watts area – passionate about public transit
  - Johnny Baeza – resident of Carson, student at CSULB, works with youth
  - Sean Mottles – resident of Redondo Beach & engineer who works at an aerospace company in Hawthorne. Doesn’t drive – rides transit and bikes
  - Expression of interest from LAWA

NEXT STEPS
The deadline is March 20 @ 5 pm but staff will take the following actions:
- Send out additional reminders specifically for I-710 Project Advisory Committee
- Solicit elected officials for Metro Service Council
- Re-advertise SCAG Regional Council District #28 position.
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South Bay Cities Council of Governments

March 9, 2020

TO: SBCCOG Steering Committee

FROM: Jacki Bacharach, SBCCOG Executive Director
       Kim Fuentes, Deputy Executive Director

SUBJECT: Environmental Activities Report – February 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

Climate Adaptation
In January and February, SBCCOG staff met with staff from 11 member cities to discuss climate adaptation strategies. In the coming months, the SBCCOG will be supporting member cities as they select locally relevant strategies to address their climate risks. Representatives from the SBCCOG will also be presenting City Vulnerability Assessments and selected strategies to city staff and councils as requested by cities.

Energy
Energy Efficiency Partnership Program – Southern California Gas Company (SCG)
2019 Goal: 10,000 therms 2019 Status: estimated 10,000 therms installed GOAL: 100% GOAL MET

Energy Efficiency Partnership Program – Regional Energy Network (REN)
Contracts are under final review by LA County. Notice to proceed is anticipated mid-March – first of April. The first steps will be training for the SBCCOG by the REN staff. A city staff kickoff meeting will be scheduled first of April.

SBCCOG continues to promote PACE financing for homeowners.
YGRENE – PACE: Proceeds from Ygrene for 2019 Q4 = $113.35. Total since the program start in 2015 = $8,919.85. Payment for 2020 Q1 is expected in May 2020 and will be reported out in June 2020.

HERO – PACE: Beginning this quarter, Western Riverside COG will issue quarterly reports with the next one in March 2020. Proceeds from HERO for 2019 Q4 = $180.38. Total since program start in 2014 = $31,126.05. Proceeds for 2020 Q1 will be reported out in May 2020.

CA Green Business Network (CAGBN) & South Bay Green Business Assist Program (GBAP):
(Contract period August 1, 2019 – March 2020)
CAGBN – SBCCOG staff continues to assist CAGBN cities of Hawthorne and Torrance with certifying businesses and continues to conduct outreach. During the month of February, SBCCOG
staff conducted 3 assessments for businesses in Hawthorne and one in Torrance. Appointments have been confirmed for 7 additional business assessments next month.

*Contract goals - City of Hawthorne:* 20 certified green businesses; *Status of goals:* 18 certified businesses  
*Contract goals - City of Torrance:* 15 certified green businesses; *Status of goals:* 14 certified businesses

As businesses are certified through CAGBN, they also become GBAP participants. GBAP by city: Torrance (59), Lawndale (27), Hawthorne (41), 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 231 businesses in the program as of the end of February 2020.

**Water Conservation**

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

*Contract year is July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020*

**Task 1. Educational Outreach Support**

*Exhibit Events*

*Contract goal:* 100 exhibit events, presentations, workshops, networking opportunities, etc.  
*Status of goal:* 80 exhibit events, presentations, workshops, networking opportunities, etc. as of the month of February

*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.

SBCCOG continue to reach out to potential sites. In addition, SBCCOG is promoting this program through social media.

**Task 2. Support for Workshops & Events**

*Educational Classes*

*Contract goal:* minimum of 5 and a maximum of 10  
*Status of goal:* 4 completed; 3 additional classes scheduled – March 5 in Carson; May 21 in Culver City; tentative dates: May 13 in Harbor City and June 4 in Lawndale

*Rain Barrel Giveaway*

*Contract goal:* 5 events  
*Status of goal:* 3 completed; 2 scheduled: March 7 (Gardena) and April 25 (Inglewood)

**Task 3. Cash for Kitchens**

The revised goal is to follow up with 86 prior survey sites to distribute small devices.

SBCCOG staff and West Basin staff participated in a training with West Basin’s consultant, Green Media Creations in January and SBCCOG staff began reaching out to prior sites in February.

**Task 4. IRWMP & Measure W Assistance**

*Contract goal:* Assist West Basin as needed, including attendance at meetings, taking notes, assisting with reports, etc.
Status of goal: Staff has been attending meetings.

Task 6. Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) Water-Energy Savings Program

Status: The program was launched on February 10th. West Basin consultant, Allegra, is conducting door-to-door canvassing in Inglewood, Lennox, Gardena, Hawthorne, Del Aire, and Carson. Fourteen home surveys have been completed. Weekly check-in phone call meetings have been scheduled with the consultant, WBMWD, and the SBCCOG.

Torrance Water Contract year is July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2020

Task 1: Support for educational classes - California Friendly Landscape Training (CFLT) or Turf Removal (TR) Class and community events (This goal is dependent upon Torrance establishing classes).

Contract goal: as requested
Status of goal: 7 completed; 1 scheduled – April 18. The Torrance City Yard Open House has been rescheduled from June 6 to June 13, 2020.

Task 2: Cash for Kitchens

Contract goal: 10 new commercial kitchens; 10 follow-up site visits
Status of goal: 3 water survey completed; 9 follow-up site visits completed

Water Replenishment District of Southern California (WRD)

Contract year is July 1, 2019-September 30, 2020.
Ongoing promotion of WRD programs continues through the SBCCOG’s e-newsletters, other social media channels, and events during the month of February.

Sanitation Districts of LA County (LACSD) Contract year is July 1, 2019-June 30, 2020

Contract goal: 100 exhibit events, workshops, networking opportunities, etc.
Status of goal: 80 exhibit events, presentations, workshops, networking opportunities, etc. as of February
Contract goal: 1 training for SBCCOG Volunteers on LACSD programs - Status of goal: GOAL MET
Contract goal: Schedule up to 3 Sanitation Districts-related presentations
Status of goal: 1 has been completed

SBCCOG staff continues to reach out to community organizations to schedule presentations. In addition, SBCCOG staff coordinates with LACSD regularly to promote their programs.

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: 1 completed
• 1 training for SBCCOG Volunteers on LADWP programs - Status of goal: To be scheduled after March 2020.
• 6-8 commercial kitchens to be identified for water assessments and conservation training Status of goal: Staff continues to identify locations.
Transportation

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

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

Status of goals: 52 outreach events; 3 vanpool or rideshare meetings; 1 Survey Engagement

New Metro Shared Mobility materials were sent to the SBCCOG office and will be distributed at upcoming outreach events.

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

Preparation began to provide Metro’s MEL Outreach Team with a South Bay event calendar that will be used to schedule the MEL outreach van at community events.

II. MARKETING, OUTREACH, & IMPLEMENTATION

Workshops, Trainings, & Exchanges

The following chart provides an overview of all registration events held in February 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Date</th>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>No. Attended/No. of RSVPs</th>
<th>Marketing Info. (how did they hear about the Workshop)</th>
<th>Staff Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2020</td>
<td>Rain Barrel Distribution – Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>169/287</td>
<td>Comm. Org./Event: 15, Door Hanger: 74, Flyer: 36, Newspaper: 9, Online Calendar: 5, Other Social Media: 12, Postcard: 7, SBESC Email: 89, West Basin Social Media: 14, West Basin Website: 8, Word of Mouth: 18, Walk-In: 36</td>
<td>GF, DL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2020</td>
<td>California Friendly Landscape Class - Torrance</td>
<td>31/47</td>
<td>Email: 17, Flyer: 1, Friend or Family: 5, Local Publication: 5, Website: 14, Other: 5, Walk-In: 4</td>
<td>CS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outreach Events

In February

- 1 Community Events
- 1 residential workshop

For the period July 1, 30 2019 through February 29, 2020

- 26 community events
- 9 business events
- 0 presentation
- 14 residential workshops
- 26 networking opportunities

Media

Social Media (during the month of February)

- SBCCOG -- Totals for Social Media (SBCCOG) (top tweet – right)
  - Twitter: 241 followers total, 3,000 impressions*
  - Facebook: 120 likes total, 161 impressions

- SBESC -- Totals for Social Media (top tweet – right)
  - Twitter: 557 followers total, 2,700 impressions*
  - Facebook: 753 likes total, 124 impressions
  - LinkedIn: 133 followers total, 49 impressions

@WestBasin is committed to being an innovative leader in the water industry by exploring new methods & technologies that enhance #reliability in the region’s #water water supply. To join them as a sponsor for our upcoming #sbc cogGA2020, follow this link: bit.ly/2RxWj0P
*Impressions: the number of times a post has been viewed during the specified month

**Earned Media/Articles/Network TV**


**Volunteer Program**

*Status of Program:* 75.00 hours for February 2020

Grand total as of 2/28/2020 - 20,226.67 (starting April 2008)
South Bay Cities Council of Governments

March 9, 2020

TO:   SBCCOG Transportation Committee
      SBCCOG Steering Committee

FROM:  Steve Lantz, SBCCOG Transportation Director

RE:   SBCCOG Transportation Update Covering February 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

President’s FY 2021 Budget Proposes $1Trillion Infrastructure Investment
The fiscal year 2021 budget issued by President Trump’s administration on February 10th proposes to reauthorize surface transportation funding to the tune of $810 billion over the next decade, along with an additional one-time payment of $190 billion to support a broad mixture of “infrastructure investments” across a range of industrial sectors.

The annual White House proposal represents the traditional first step in budget negotiations with Congress towards adoption of the final FY 2021 appropriations measures. Hence, the proposal does not address the near-term shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund nor other potential sources of funding to provide the revenues. However, adding $1 trillion in direct federal transportation and infrastructure funding between 2021 and 2030 represents a “distinct departure” from the administration’s 2018 outline, which sought to leverage $200 billion of direct federal funding into $1 trillion in overall investment with state/local and private contributions. The proposed $810 billion, 10-year surface transportation package also represents a 12 percent increase over the Congressional Budget Office baseline of current surface transportation funding.

Building on the foundation provided in the FAST Act, the administration’s funding proposal would largely grow by almost 4 percent annually through FY 2030. The proposal would provide an average annual investment of $60.2 billion for highways over that decade-long timeframe, with $15.5 billion yearly for transit, $2 billion for National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and Federal Motor Carriers Safety Administration, $1.7 billion for rail, and $100 million for pipeline and hazmat safety, $1 billion for the Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) program, $1 billion in discretionary resources to the Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) program, and $1.9 billion for the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) program for transit-related projects.

Builders and Truckers At Odds Over Options To Fund Highways, Roads, Bridges
The American Trucking Association and the American Road & Transportation Builders Association initiated competing campaigns on February 24th to influence U. S. Senate deliberations on how to pay for a five-year, $287 billion highway bill (S. 2302). Senate
committees are considering a new commercial vehicle-mileage tax as one of three pillars—along with indexing the motor fuels tax and taxing electric vehicles—to pay for highways, roads, and bridges.

Trucking groups and the agricultural industry support an increase in the federal motor fuels taxes on all drivers. The Owner–Operator Independent Drivers Association members have already taken issue with the newly mandated electronic logging devices, used to monitor compliance with hours of service requirements. They fear adding mileage tracking onto the already unpopular technology would create a “discriminatory tracking tax on America’s truckers” that would monitor a driver’s every move and share the information with the Internal Revenue Service.

The trucking industry notes that the 24.4 cents-per-gallon federal diesel tax they pay already exceeds the 18.4-cents-per-gallon federal gasoline tax that other motorists pay. Truckers also pay additional fees, including an excise tax on tires. Road builder groups support a user fee-based solution of either a gas tax or mileage tax on trucking. Supporters say the tax on commercial trucking is fair because the heavy vehicles take a greater toll on roads.

The current surface transportation authorization (Public Law 114–94) expires at the end of fiscal 2020 and its funding stream faces a shortfall in fiscal 2021.

U. S. Pedestrian Fatalities In 2019 Highest Since 1988
A February 24th report from the Governors Highway Safety Association (GHSA) estimates that 6,590 pedestrian fatalities occurred in 2019, the highest number in more than 30 years and a 5% increase over 2018 pedestrian deaths. Pedestrians are projected to account for 17% of all traffic deaths in 2019, compared to 12% in 2009. While pedestrian deaths have been increasing significantly over the past decade, the number of all other traffic deaths has increased by only 2%.

A number of trends offer insight into the many causes behind the rise in pedestrian fatalities:

- Most pedestrian fatalities take place on local roads, at night and away from intersections, suggesting the need for safer road crossings and increased efforts to make pedestrians and vehicles more visible. During the past 10 years, the number of nighttime pedestrian fatalities increased by 67%, compared to a 16% increase in daytime pedestrian fatalities.
- Many unsafe driving behaviors – such as speeding, distracted and drowsy driving – pose risks to pedestrians, and alcohol impairment by the driver and/or pedestrian was reported in nearly half of traffic crashes that resulted in pedestrian fatalities in 2018.
- Pedestrians struck by a large SUV are twice as likely to die as those struck by a car. Although passenger cars are the largest category of vehicles in fatal pedestrian crashes, the number of pedestrian fatalities over the past decade involving SUVs increased at a faster rate – 81% – than passenger cars, which increased by 53%.

In addition to examining pedestrian fatality crash characteristics, the report discusses comprehensive strategies to reduce pedestrian and motor vehicle crashes, addressing promising infrastructural, educational and enforcement approaches. It also outlines specific examples from states, such as targeted law enforcement efforts, outreach in high-risk areas, pedestrian safety assessments and road safety audits, and support for engineering efforts. The full report, including infographics and state-by-state data, is available at: ghsa.org/resources/Pedestrians20.
Cargo Fee Legislation Re-Introduced To Support Federal Freight Mobility Network

The Freight Infrastructure Reinvestment Act (FIRA) of 2020 (H.R.5908), introduced on February 14th, would create the National Freight Mobility Infrastructure Fund to support a new national freight discretionary grant program.

The fee would support construction projects that make roads and bridges safer, improve marine terminal facilities, and expand rail and highway tunnels to accommodate increased cargo. The program would be funded with a new 1% fee on the shipment of freight cargo that is transported by freight rail or a commercial motor vehicle that travels more than 50 miles. The bill was originally introduced in 2017.

STATE

CA Zero Fatalities Task Force, AB 2121 Would Change The Way Speed Limits Are Set

A. B. 2363, enacted in September 2018, created a Zero Fatalities Task Force to prepare a report that was released in February. Its conclusion: California needs to change the way it sets and regulates speed limits on its streets.

Speed limits are currently changed after surveying how fast people drive on a given segment of road and then adjusting the posted speed limit to within 5 mph of the speed driven by 85 percent of those drivers without being able to consider road conditions or design or the safety of other users. Over multiple surveys, this leads to speed creep. And with the higher speeds come increased traffic fatalities of non-motorized users that share the road, particularly with SUVs.

The Zero Fatalities Task Force report recommended that FHWA replace the 85th percentile method in its guidance with context-sensitive methods that prioritize the safety of all road users by developing traffic speed surveys that take into account pedestrian and bike safety.

The report recommends that the state create guidance to give city planners a better idea of the options they have to increase safety. This includes inserting information about engineering and design interventions into the California Highway Design Manual, such as the notion of “target speed” (designing a street in a way that encourages driving at a particular safe speed to reduce the potential for non-motorized-road-user fatalities).

The report also makes several recommendations focused on improving enforcement of speeding laws, including automated speed enforcement (ASE), as in cameras that are triggered when a vehicle is measured going a set speed over the legal limit. The report cites studies that found speed cameras to be an effective tactic to reduce speeding and increase safety. In New York City, which added speed cameras to about 140 school zones in recent years, speeding dropped 60% in those zones, according to city data. But California is not currently authorized to use them due to privacy and constitutional grounds.

AB 2121, introduced on February 6th, would require Caltrans to convene a committee of external street design experts to work on revisions to the state's Highway Design Manual, which mandates the 85th percentile method. The bill would essentially pause the 85th percentile rule and allow local governments to retain current speed limits for specific zones, like school zones, business districts and residential areas — if road surveys show more traffic crashes are happening on those roads.
The bill also would require the California Traffic Safety Program to include a traffic safety monitoring program that identifies and addresses locations with pedestrian- and bicyclist-related crashes but does not include any change to speed enforcement cameras.

A growing number of U.S. cities with Vision Zero programs — an international initiative to eliminate all traffic deaths and serious injuries — have made reducing speed limits an integral part of their work to reduce traffic deaths. Seattle is lowering speeds on the vast majority of its streets to 25 mph. In 2017, Portland reduced the speed limit of its residential streets to 20 mph and lowered the limits on dozens of other roadways in the past few years. New York City officials received authorization from the state in 2014 to lower the speed limit from 30 mph to 25 mph on the majority of its streets.

Results of recent speed reduction initiatives are mixed. From 2014 through 2018, overall traffic deaths declined about 22% in NYC, and pedestrian deaths dropped nearly 18%. But traffic deaths were up in NYC last year, due in large part to a dramatic increase in cyclist deaths (from 10 in 2018 to 28 in 2019). In L.A. from 2015 (the year Mayor Garcetti launched Vision Zero) through 2019, overall traffic deaths jumped more than 30% while pedestrian deaths have soared 52%. An estimated 134 people walking L.A.’s streets were killed by drivers last year.

**REGION**

**Crime Down On Metro Buses and Trains**
The February Metro Board Report on security and safety shows crime is down on Metro’s buses and trains. Crime overall has decreased 17 percent over five years on Metro’s buses and light rail trains, with serious crimes down nearly 23 percent, between 2015 and 2019.

Metro says overall there are approximately 3.9 crimes per 1 million transit riders, a rate consistent with other major transit agencies across the United States.

**L. A. City Transportation Committee Approves Bus, Walk, Bike Network Improvements**
The Los Angeles City Council Transportation Committee on February 26th approved a motion that lays the groundwork for Mayor Garcetti’s February 10th Executive Directive to improve L.A. City’s networks for getting around by bus, bicycle, and on foot. The proposed action plan is intended to steer Los Angeles toward carbon neutrality, and makes policy proposals regarding the city's use of electricity and water, as well as its approach to waste management.

If approved by the full City Council, the city will generate an implementation plan report in July, 2020. The motion directs departments to report back by July 1, 2020 with a proposed network of bus priority infrastructure (e.g.: bus-only lanes, queue jumpers, and transit signal priority) that could be implemented by October 1st to improve travel speeds on transit corridors by 30 percent.

The implementation plan also calls for a comprehensive Citywide network of active transportation corridors for walking, bicycling, and micro-mobility. The motion requires the implementation plan to complete at least one major regional project and one neighborhood-oriented network per year. The projects will be prioritized based on the Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles’ Community Equity and Health Index. The implementation plan must also include projected mobility benefits and emission reductions.
The L. A. City Department of Transportation is also directed by the City Council action to develop a congestion pricing pilot program with the goal of unveiling a joint proposal with Metro by January 2021.


L.A. Metro To Launch Three-Year MicroTransit Pilot Program For Short Trips
The L. A. Metro Board at its February 27th meeting approved a three-year ride-hailing MicroTransit pilot project for short trips within six designated service zones.

Eight new part-time Metro employees will operate ten-passenger vehicles that will be provided and maintained by RideCo Inc. under a $29-million Metro contract, The Board also approved nearly $8 million in funding for operational expenses.

The pilot project is designed to provide a mobility option for the more than 50% of all trips in Los Angeles that are short, solo trips. In addition to the added service, the pilot project will allow riders to book the entire transit trip (including the segments taken in the van, bus and train) using real-time booking through a single mobile app, internet browser, or Metro’s call center. Riders will be able to pay for the service by using their TAP card and TAP account, or with a debit, credit or prepaid credit card.

The pilot project will also expand the ride-hailing technology to all public transit customers, including historically underserved communities and populations, along with areas of Los Angeles County where fixed-route bus or rail service is less frequent or unavailable. Prices for the MicroTransit trips have not yet been determined.

Initial MicroTransit Pilot service will be operated seven days a week, 12 hours a day. Metro staff will be continually adjusting the service during the pilot project based on demand and real-time results from data collected during its operation within each of the six pilot project zones. Service will be initiated in the following sequence:

- Summer 2020: Watts/Willowbrook
- Fall 2020: Northwest San Fernando Valley
- Winter 2020: LAX/Inglewood
- Spring 2021: Highland Park/Eagle Rock/Glendale
- Summer 2021: Altadena/Pasadena/Sierra Madre
- Fall 2021: UCLA/VA Medical Center/Century City

For more information, visit www.metro.net/projects/microtransit/.

TRENDS

Mobility Trends To Look Out For In 2020
Here are some of the trends that transportation experts are predicting will change mobility in the next year:

- Increased focus on urban travel time goals as technology-enabled mobility services emerge.
- Auto ownership will continue to decline as Mobility As A Service (MAAS) surges.
MAAS begins with a trip planner that is linked to one-stop payment for a range of mobility services – ride-hailing, e-scooters, e-bikes, taxis, public transport, and tolls. MAAS will continue to become integrated multi-modally with anonymized open-data trip planning and secure payment systems that include all mobility choices and payments. MAAS has attracted $6.8 billion to date, but is expected to grow to over US$100 billion by 2030.

- Autonomous transport will become a reality on city streets.
- Artificial intelligence will guide development of customer experience improvements, operational optimization through predictive demand analysis, autonomous dispatching, traffic monitoring, preventive maintenance, and AI powered video analytics for improved security and safety.
- Perfecting the complete trip will include increased focus on creating more choices and better access for older adults, people with disabilities and underserved communities.
- Curb-side management programs will grow including curb digitization, reservation pilots, and regulations for curb utilization at specific times on specific days for all users.
- Vehicle-Miles-Travelled from TNCs and E-Commerce will rise; even if prices rise as high as 50%, people / freight trips will continue to grow by more than 25%.
- Significant changes will occur in first/last mile deliveries: bicycle deliveries, delivery company consolidation, neighborhood package drop off and pick up centers, autonomous home delivery, drones.
- The transition to electric vehicles will accelerate creating increased demand for EV charging capabilities and challenging parking standards, parking minimums, ADA space configuration, and conversion of curb-side parking meters to charging spaces.
- Resistance will continue to safe active transportation integration into streets through multi-modal street design.

TRB Publishes Report On Technology’s Impact On Transportation And Land Use

The National Cooperative Highway Research Program has released a report titled "Foreseeing the Impact of Transformational Technologies on Land Use and Transportation" that examines transformational technologies, including wireless telecommunications, shared vehicles, connected vehicles, fully autonomous vehicles, alternative-fuel vehicles, smart cities and communities, big data analytics, internet-of-things, unmanned aerial vehicle (UAVs, or drones), 3-D printing, and more.

The report premise: "Public agencies face significant challenges continuing to perform their governmental functions in the face of the private sector’s prodigious output of these new technologies. Agencies need to rethink how they develop their policies and plans—and they need to obtain new expertise."

The report is available at: http://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/179645.aspx
### Cities that attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Meetings</th>
<th>Caron</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</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Managers Meeting</td>
<td>L. Butler</td>
<td>S. de la Cruz</td>
<td>S. Jackson</td>
<td>S. Garrett</td>
<td>F. Fulton</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>Economic Development Directors' Roundtable Group</td>
<td>J. Martin</td>
<td>E. Moreno</td>
<td>B. Shrewsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. Lai</td>
<td>F. San (Port of LA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>W. Mendosa</td>
<td>M. Gibson</td>
<td>L. Rodriguez</td>
<td>L. Atwell</td>
<td>S. Katoules</td>
<td>E. Zandvliet</td>
<td>N. Razepour</td>
<td>T. Semaan</td>
<td>A. Winpa</td>
<td>D. Wahba</td>
<td>W. Johnson</td>
<td>P. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Committee</td>
<td>D. Pyet</td>
<td>L. Trifletti</td>
<td>J. Rooney</td>
<td>D. Amaya</td>
<td>G. Oforoegbu</td>
<td>J. Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## South Bay Cities Council of Governments

March 9, 2020

TO:         SBCCOG Steering Committee
FROM:      Jacki Bacharach, SBCCOG Executive Director
RE:    Bills to Monitor and for Action – **Status as of March 4, 2020**

**NOTE:** Legislation in **BOLD** is new to the matrix

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

### ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1672</strong> (Bloom)</td>
<td>Solid waste: nonwoven disposable products. Would require, commencing January 1, 2021, except as provided, certain nonwoven disposal products to be labeled clearly and conspicuously to communicate that they should not be flushed, as specified. Would prohibit a covered entity, as defined, from making a representation about the flushable attributes, benefits, performance, or efficacy of those nonwoven disposal products, as provided.</td>
<td>SUPPORT (2/27/20)</td>
<td>1/30/20</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee for assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 1363</strong> (Allen)</td>
<td>Regional transportation plans: sustainable communities strategies: greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled reduction targets. Would require the State Air Resources Board to provide, no later than December 31, 2022, each affected region with greenhouse gas emission reduction targets for the automobile and light truck sector for 2045 and 2050, and with vehicle miles traveled reduction targets for 2035, 2045, and 2050, and to release, no later than September 30, 2022, a draft of those targets, as specified.</td>
<td>MONITOR</td>
<td>2/24/2020</td>
<td>From printer. May be acted upon on or after March 25. Read first time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FINANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 795</strong> (Beall)</td>
<td>Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Program. Would establish in state government the Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Program, which</td>
<td>SUPPORT (2/27/20)</td>
<td>1/15/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would be administered by the Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Committee. Would authorize a city, county, city and county, joint powers agency, enhanced infrastructure financing district, affordable housing authority, community revitalization and investment authority, transit village development district, or a combination of those entities, to apply to the Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Committee to participate in the program and would authorize the committee to approve or deny plans for projects meeting specific criteria. Would also authorize certain local agencies to establish an affordable housing and community development investment agency and authorize an agency to apply for funding under the program and issue bonds, as provided, to carry out a project under the program.

| TRANSPORTATION | AB 326 (Muratsuchi) | Vehicles: motorized carrying devices. Would define a motorized carrying device and authorize the use of a motorized carrying device, in accordance with specified rules, on sidewalks and crosswalks. | MONITOR | LCC: monitor | 1/30/20 Senate Rules Committee for assignment |
|                | AB 2121 (Friedman) | Traffic Safety: Would require, beginning June 1, 2022, and every 6 months thereafter, Caltrans to convene a committee of external design experts to advise on revisions to the Highway Design Manual. (possible leg. for changing speed limit calculations) | MONITOR | LCC: monitor | 2/20/20 Assembly Transportation Committee |

| FEDERAL | HR 530 (Eshoo) | Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Empowering Local Communities Act of 2019. Overturns the FCC's September order preempting local authority over small cell wireless infrastructure on January 14, the day the order took effect. Would not preclude future FCC or congressional preemption of cities on wireless infrastructure, but it would halt the FCC's harmful preemption order, which ignored the input of hundreds of local governments. The bill also complements ongoing efforts to overturn the FCC order in federal courts, and the investigation by congressional leaders into alleged attempts by the FCC to thwart that litigation. | SUPPORT & REQUEST CO-SPONSORS (2/11/19) | Endorsed by NLC, NATOA, NAC | 1/25/19 House Energy & Commerce Committee - Subcommittee on Communications & Technology |
HR 1507  
(Blumenauer)  
The Bicycle Commuter Act of 2019.  Official summary in progress.  Would allow cyclists to deduct more than $50 per month and write off bike-share memberships.

2020 Legislative Session Calendar
Feb. 21 Last day for bills to be introduced
Apr. 2  Spring Recess begins upon adjournment
Apr. 13 Legislature reconvenes from Spring Recess
Apr. 24 Last day for policy committees to hear and report to fiscal committees fiscal bills introduced in their house
May 1 Last day for policy committees to meet and report to the floor nonfiscal bills introduced in their house
May 8 Last day for policy committees to meet prior to June 1
May 15 Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in their house. Last day for fiscal committees to meet prior to June 1
May 26-May 29 Floor session only. No committee may meet for any purpose except for Rules Committee, bills referred pursuant to Assembly Rule 77.2, and Conference Committees
May 29 Last day for each house to pass bills introduced in that house
June 1 Committee meetings may resume
June 15 Budget Bill must be passed by midnight
June 25 Last day for a legislative measure to qualify for the Nov. 3 General Election ballot
June 26 Last day for policy committees to hear and report fiscal bills to fiscal committee
July 2 Last day for policy committees to meet and report bills (J.R. 61(b)(14)). Summer Recess begins upon adjournment, provided Budget Bill has been passed
Aug. 3 Legislature reconvenes from Summer Recess
Aug. 14 Last day for fiscal committees to meet and report bills
Aug. 17-31 Floor session only. No committee may meet for any purpose except Rules Committee, bills referred pursuant to Assembly Rule 77.2, and Conference Committees
Aug. 21 Last day to amend bills on the floor
Aug. 31 Last day for each house to pass bills
Sept. 30 Last day for Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature before Sept. 1 and in the Governor's possession on or after Sept. 1
Oct. 1 Bills enacted on or before this date take effect January 1, 2021.
AB/SB XXX, _____. Neighborhood electric vehicles.

Existing law defines “low-speed vehicle” for purposes of the Vehicle Code as a motor vehicle, other than a motor truck, with 4 wheels that is capable of a minimum speed of 20 miles per hour and a maximum speed of 25 miles per hour on a paved level surface and that has a gross vehicle weight rating of less than 3,000 pounds. Existing law imposes certain restrictions on the use of low-speed vehicles on public streets and highways, and generally requires an operator of a low-speed vehicle to have a driver’s license. A low-speed vehicle is also known as a neighborhood electric vehicle (NEV). A violation of the Vehicle Code is an infraction, unless otherwise specified.

Existing law authorizes certain local agencies to establish a NEV transportation plan subject to certain requirements. A person operating a NEV in a plan area in violation of certain provisions is guilty of an infraction punishable by a fine not exceeding $100.

This bill would authorize the South Bay Cities Council of Governments to establish a similar NEV transportation plan for the South Bay Cities Plan area, encompassing the Cities of Carson, El Segundo, Gardena, Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Inglewood, Lawndale, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, Redondo Beach, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, Torrance, as well as the Harbor City/San Pedro/Wilmington, communities of the City of Los Angeles, and the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles District 2 and District 4, subject to the same penalties. The bill would require the plan to be submitted to the department for review and approval. The bill would require a report to the Legislature by ____date____, if the South Bay Cities Council of Governments adopts a plan. The bill would repeal these provisions on ____date____. Because the bill would create a new crime, it would impose a state-mandated local program.

The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies and school districts for certain costs mandated by the state. Statutory provisions establish procedures for making that reimbursement.

This bill would provide that no reimbursement is required by this act for a specified reason.

DIGEST KEY
Vote: majority  Appropriation: no  Fiscal Committee: yes  Local Program: yes
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1.
Chapter 6.2 (commencing with Section 1962) is added to Division 2.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

CHAPTER 6.2. Neighborhood Electric Vehicle Transportation Plan for the South Bay Cities Council of Governments Area, encompassing the Cities of Carson, El Segundo, Gardena, Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Inglewood, Lawndale, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, Redondo Beach, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, Torrance, as well as the Harbor City/San Pedro/Wilmington, communities of the City of Los Angeles, and the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles District 2 and District 4

It is the intent of the Legislature, in enacting this chapter, to authorize the South Bay Cities Council of Governments, a joint powers authority for the Cities of Carson, El Segundo, Gardena, Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Inglewood, Lawndale, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, Redondo Beach, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, Torrance, as well as the Harbor City/San Pedro/Wilmington, communities of the City of Los Angeles, and the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles District 2 and District 4 to establish a neighborhood electric vehicle (NEV) transportation plan. The purpose of this NEV transportation plan is to further the vision of creating a sustainable development that reduces gasoline demand and vehicle emissions by offering a cleaner, more economical means of local transportation within the plan area. It is the further intent of the Legislature that this NEV transportation plan be designed and developed to best serve the functional travel needs of the plan area, to have the physical safety of the NEV driver’s person and property as a major planning component, and to have the capacity to accommodate NEV drivers of every legal age and range of skills.

1962.1.
The following definitions apply to this chapter:

(a) “Plan area” means any portion of the South Bay Cities area, encompassing the Cities of Carson, El Segundo, Gardena, Hawthorne, Hermosa Beach, Inglewood, Lawndale, Lomita, Manhattan Beach, Palos Verdes, Palos Verdes Estates, Redondo Beach, Rolling Hills, Rolling Hills Estates, Torrance, as well as the Harbor City/San Pedro/Wilmington, communities of the City of Los Angeles, and the unincorporated areas of the County of Los Angeles District 2 and District 4 that together make up the South Bay Cities Council of Governments area, and any streets and roads in the Plan area, to the extent the South Bay Cities Council of Governments has adopted a NEV transportation plan pursuant to Section 1962.2, including the privately owned land of any owner that consents to its inclusion in the plan.
(b) “Neighborhood electric vehicle” or “NEV” means a low-speed vehicle as defined by Section 385.5 of the Vehicle Code.

(c) “NEV lanes” means all publicly or privately owned facilities that provide for NEV travel, including roadways designated by signs or permanent markings that are shared with pedestrians, bicyclists, and other motorists in the plan area.

1962.2.
(a) The South Bay Cities Council of Governments or any city therein may, by ordinance or resolution, adopt a NEV transportation plan for the plan area within its jurisdiction. Two or more jurisdictions may jointly adopt a NEV transportation plan for all or a portion of the territory under their respective jurisdictions.

(b) The transportation plan shall have received a prior review and the comments of Los Angeles County and any agency having traffic law enforcement responsibilities in an entity included in the plan area.

(c) The transportation plan may include the use of a state highway, or any crossing of the highway, subject to the approval of the Department of Transportation.

1962.3.
The transportation plan shall include, but need not be limited to, all of the following elements:

(a) Route selection, which includes a finding that the route will accommodate NEVs without an adverse impact upon traffic safety and will consider, among other things, the travel needs of commuters and other users.

(b) Transportation interfacing, which shall include, but not be limited to, coordination with other modes of transportation so that a NEV driver may employ multiple modes of transportation in reaching a destination in the plan area.

(c) Provision for NEV-related facilities, including, but not limited to, special access points, special NEV turnouts, and NEV crossings.

(d) Provisions for parking facilities at destination locations, including, but not limited to, community commercial centers, golf courses, public areas, and parks.

(e) Provisions for special paving, road markings, signage, and striping for NEV travel lanes, road crossings, parking, and circulation, as appropriate.

(f) Provisions for NEV electrical charging stations.

(g) NEV lanes for the purposes of the transportation plan shall be classified as follows:

(1) Class I NEV routes provide for a completely separate right-of-way for the use of NEVs.

(2) Class II NEV routes provide for a separate striped lane adjacent to roadways with speed limits of 55 miles per hour or less.

(3) Class III NEV routes provide for shared use by NEVs with conventional vehicle traffic on streets with speed limits of 35 miles per hour or less.
If the South Bay Cities Council of Governments or any city therein adopts a NEV transportation plan for the plan area pursuant to Section 1962.2, it shall do all of the following:

(a) Establish minimum general design criteria for the development, planning, and construction of separated NEV lanes, including, but not limited to, the design speed of the facility, the space requirements of the NEV, and roadway design criteria, if the plan envisions separated NEV lanes.

(b) In cooperation with the Department of Transportation, establish uniform specifications and symbols for signs, markers, and traffic control devices to control NEV traffic; to warn of dangerous conditions, obstacles, or hazards; to designate the right-of-way as between NEVs, other vehicles, and bicycles, as may be applicable; to state the nature and destination of the NEV lane; and to warn pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists of the presence of NEV traffic.

(c) Submit the transportation plan to the director of the Department of Transportation for approval following a review and recommendation by the California Traffic Control Devices Committee.

If the South Bay Cities Council of Governments or any city therein adopts a NEV transportation plan for the plan area pursuant to this chapter, it shall also adopt all of the following as part of the plan:

(a) NEVs eligible to use NEV lanes shall meet the safety requirements for low-speed vehicles as set forth in Section 571.500 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) Minimum safety criteria for NEV operators, including, but not limited to, requirements relating to NEV maintenance and NEV safety. Operators shall be required to possess a valid California driver’s license and to comply with the financial responsibility requirements established pursuant to Chapter 1 (commencing with Section 16000) of Division 7 of the Vehicle Code.

(c) (1) Restrictions limiting the operation of NEVs to NEV routes identified in the transportation plan, and allowing only those NEVs that meet the safety equipment requirements specified in the plan to be operated on those routes.

(2) Any person operating a NEV in the plan area in violation of this subdivision is guilty of an infraction punishable by a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars ($100).

If the South Bay Cities Council of Governments or any city therein adopts a NEV transportation plan for the plan area pursuant to this chapter, the South Bay Cities Council of Governments shall submit a report to the Legislature on or before date, in consultation with the Department of Transportation, the Department of the California Highway Patrol, and any applicable local law enforcement agency.

(b) The report shall include all of the following:

(1) A description of the NEV transportation plan and its elements that have been authorized up to that time.

(2) An evaluation of the effectiveness of the NEV transportation plan, including its impact on traffic flows and safety.
(3) A recommendation as to whether this chapter should be terminated, continued in effect, or expanded statewide.

1962.8.
This chapter shall remain in effect only until ___date___, and as of that date is repealed, unless a later enacted statute, that is enacted before ___date___, deletes or extends that date.

SEC. 2.
Section 21251 of the Vehicle Code is amended to read:

21251.
Except as provided in Chapter 6.2 (commencing with Section 1962), Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 1963), Chapter 7.1 (commencing with Section 1964), Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 1965), and Chapter 8.1 (commencing with Section 1966) of Division 2.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, and Sections 4023, 21115, and 21115.1, a low-speed vehicle is subject to all the provisions applicable to a motor vehicle, and the driver of a low-speed vehicle is subject to all the provisions applicable to the driver of a motor vehicle or other vehicle, when applicable, by this code or another code, with the exception of those provisions that, by their very nature, can have no application.

SEC. 3.
Section 21260 of the Vehicle Code is amended to read:

21260.
(a) Except as provided in paragraph (1) of subdivision (b), or in an area where a neighborhood electric vehicle transportation plan has been adopted pursuant to Chapter 6.2 (commencing with Section 1962), Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 1963), Chapter 7.1 (commencing with Section 1964), Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 1965), or Chapter 8.1 (commencing with Section 1966) of Division 2.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, the operator of a low-speed vehicle shall not operate the vehicle on any roadway with a speed limit in excess of 35 miles per hour.

(b) (1) The operator of a low-speed vehicle may cross a roadway with a speed limit in excess of 35 miles per hour if the crossing begins and ends on a roadway with a speed limit of 35 miles per hour or less and occurs at an intersection of approximately 90 degrees.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the operator of a low-speed vehicle shall not traverse an uncontrolled intersection with any state highway unless that intersection has been approved and authorized by the agency having primary traffic enforcement responsibilities for that crossing by a low-speed vehicle.

SEC. 4.
No reimbursement is required by this act pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution because the only costs that may be incurred by a local agency or school district will be incurred because this act creates a new crime or infraction, eliminates a crime or infraction, or changes the penalty for a crime or infraction, within the meaning of Section 17556 of the Government Code, or changes the definition of a crime within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.
March 9, 2020

To: SBCCOG Transportation Committee  
   SBCCOG Steering Committee

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

Re: FY 21-25 Measure M Metro Budget Request Recommended Projects and Funding Commitments

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**

Measure M includes four South Bay sub-regional programs funded within the Highway Sub-fund: the Highway Operational Improvements Program (HOIP), two Transportation System Mobility Improvement Programs (TSMIP I and TSMIP II), and the Sub-Regional Equity Program (SREP). The ordinance restricts use of funding available within each category to the annual amounts programmed in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.

The SBCCOG has previously requested that the entire $130 million in Measure M SREP funding be committed to a grade separation project of the Crenshaw/LAX line crossing through Centinela Boulevard and in the initial 5-year program, Metro Highway staff over committed the TSMIP I revenues available over the upcoming five years and expects to borrow funds from the TSMIP II program should TSMIP cashflow be exhausted during the period.

As a consequence, the SBCCOG’s Measure M Metro Budget Request (Exhibit A) includes recommended cashflow reimbursements from the HOIP and TSMIP II programs for each project for each fiscal year over the upcoming five fiscal years (FY 2021-2025). The programming is based on funding requests provided by lead agencies by October 31, 2019 for FY 2020-21 through FY 2024-25.

Lead agencies submit their new project cash flow plans for their entire project. SBCCOG’s Metro Budget Request includes an estimate of the annual funding needed to reimburse project expenses over the upcoming five years. Most projects can be completed within five years, but some complex projects with complex environmental or right of way phases may take longer. The funding needed beyond five years for these more complex projects is added in subsequent annual Metro Budget Requests.

Once Metro approves the SBCCOG’s funding requests, Metro and the lead agency execute a funding agreement for some or all of the project phases. Metro structures its funding agreement
cashflow plans based on anticipated reimbursements tied to anticipated progress on major project phases (e.g.: environmental clearance, design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction). Metro requires lead agencies to document full funding of each implementation phase that is included in a funding agreement. Consequently, SBCCOG must request funding for each implementation phase for which the lead agency expects to be reimbursed during the upcoming five years. Since a project phase can require reimbursements over multiple years and multiple phases may be completed during the five year period, the SBCCOG five-year Measure M Metro Budget Request provides Metro and the project lead agencies a planning basis for establishing reasonable funding reimbursement schedules over the next five years.

Exhibit 1 also includes a column reflecting the estimated “cost to complete” the projects beyond FY 2025. This column, for information only, provides early estimates of project reimbursements that will need to be programmed in subsequent Metro Budget requests based on project schedule adherence and the need to reimburse expenses incurred after FY 2025.

Some projects in the 5-year Metro Budget Request will not be completed or fully reimbursed within the upcoming five years. These projects include those that will not be initiated until year 3-5, larger projects that will require a significant match from non-subregional funding sources, or those projects that will require full environmental impact evaluation process or acquisition of right-of-way. Funding for the post-2025 phases will be included in subsequent Measure M MSP Metro Budget Requests when reimbursement schedules and amounts are able to be more accurately projected.

The Measure M MSP reimbursement amounts and schedules in Exhibit 1 are based on:

1. Updated schedules and funding requests for Active project phases in current funding agreements;

2. “Cost to complete” estimates provided by lead agencies for projects that have a current funding agreement but will need additional funding amended into an active funding agreement for project implementation phases that are not currently in the active funding agreements; and,

3. New project requests that were submitted by October 31, 2019 by lead agency applicants for which new funding agreements will be needed.

**Project Application Evaluation and Scoring**

A 5-member subcommittee of the Infrastructure Working Group and Transit Operators Working Group evaluated and scored the applications. One of the significant subcommittee tasks was to determine the proportion of cost for each project to be recommended from Measure M MSP subregional revenues over the five-year period. The Subcommittee considered several formula options and ultimately recommended that the subregional funding share of each project be calculated based on an incremental formula, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSP Increment of Project Cost</th>
<th>MSP Funding Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $20 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 million to $35 million</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35 million to $75 million</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subcommittee also recommended that the maximum cumulative subregional funding share for each project, whether from Measure R SBHP, Measure MSPs or both, be capped at $250 million.

The formula is designed so that as the project cost rises, the proportionate subregional share of incremental costs declines. As an example, a $50 million project would be eligible for a subregional share of $38 million (76%), as follows:

$20 million (100% of the first $20 million in project costs) + 
$13.5 million (90% of the $15 million incremental project cost between $20 and $35 million) + 
$4.5 million (30% of the $15 million incremental project cost between $35 and $50 million) = 
$38 million total

In another example, a $500 million project would be eligible for a subregional share of $130.5 million (26 %), as follows:

$20 million (100% of the first $20 million in project costs) + 
$13.5 million (90% of the $15 million incremental project cost between $20 and $35 million) + 
$12 million (30% of the $40 million incremental project cost between $35 and $75 million) + 
$85 million (20% of the $425 million incremental project cost between $75 and $500 million) = 
$130.5 million total

The subcommittee-recommended formula accommodates all anticipated project reimbursement requests within the upcoming five years. For those lead agencies that will need additional funding after FY 2025 to complete their projects, the subcommittee recommended that lead agencies with executed funding agreements be allowed to request an amendment of their project funding agreement to add funds up to the recommended cap of $250 million based on more definitive “cost to complete” project estimates developed in advance of subsequent annual Metro Budget Request cycles.

The subcommittee recommends that Caltrans projects on freeways be required to obtain a match from state or federal funds. In order to not delay project development, the subcommittee recommends that Measure R SBHP or Measure M MSP allocations for Caltrans applications be restricted to PAED and design phases in the current Metro Budget Request. The subcommittee recommends that Caltrans be required to secure commitments from State funds for right-of-way acquisition and/or construction.

In addition to the recommended MSP funding for active and new projects, the Metro Budget Request item includes a line item for SBCCOG project development and administration.

**NEXT STEPS**

The subcommittee recommendations will be considered by the Transportation Committee at its March 9, 2020 meeting. Because there is no Board of Directors meeting in March, the Steering Committee is delegated SBCCOG approval authority and will consider the Transportation
Committee recommendations immediately after the March 9th Transportation Committee meeting. The SBCCOG Request should be transmitted to L. A. Metro immediately after SBCCOG Steering Committee approval for inclusion in L. A. Metro’s FY 2020-21 budget which begins July 1, 2020.

RECOMMENDATIONS
The SBCCOG Transportation Committee and Steering Committee approve the following actions:

1. The funding share formula recommended by the IWG/TOWG Subcommittee be used to calculate Measure M MSP commitments needed to complete active and new Measure M MSP projects.

2. The annual funding allocations listed in Exhibit 1 for recommended projects.

3. The SBCCOG Measure M MSPs Metro Budget Request be transmitted to the L. A. Metro Chair and Board of Directors by March 13, 2020.

Attachment:

Exhibit 1 – FY 2021-2025 Funding allocations for Measure M MSP active projects and new project applications
## FY21-25 South Bay Measure M MSPs Metro Budget Request  
### Exhibit 1

### Measure M
**Highway Efficiency & Operational Improvements (HEO) Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Lead Agency/Project Description</th>
<th>FY19-20</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
<th>FY21-22</th>
<th>FY22-23</th>
<th>FY23-24</th>
<th>FY24-25</th>
<th>FY26-29 Funding Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM5507.21</td>
<td>PSE, ROW, C</td>
<td>$2,950,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Hawthorne North East Hawthorne Mobility Improvement Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Caltrans Interstate 110 (I-110) southbound off-ramp to Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) by widening the marine to add one auxiliary lane and widening the off-ramp to provide a two-lane (EA 34010)</td>
<td>$5,782,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,850,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$1,511,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Caltrans Hi 405/110 Separation, add auxiliary lanes and widen connectors from Northbound and Southbound 405 to Route 110 (EA 34020)</td>
<td>$31,500,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$4,850,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Carson Carson Street ITS Project</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Carson Sepulveda Blvd. Widening from Alameda Street to I-110</td>
<td>$8,700,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,072,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,628,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Gardena Redondo Beach Blvd. Arterial Improvements</td>
<td>$5,567,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$215,000</td>
<td>$4,712,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Inglewood Manchester Blvd. Improvements</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Inglewood Downtown ITS</td>
<td>$31,100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Inglewood Prairie Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total HEO Funds requested FY20-24: | $83,828,000 |

### Measure M
**Transportation System & Mobility Improvements (TSMI) Program 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Lead Agency/Project Description</th>
<th>FY19-20</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
<th>FY21-22</th>
<th>FY22-23</th>
<th>FY23-24</th>
<th>FY24-25</th>
<th>FY26-29 Funding Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM5502.02</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$13,500,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Inglewood ITS Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5502.3</td>
<td>PASE, PSE, ROW, C</td>
<td>$8,199,082</td>
<td>$4,598,541</td>
<td>$4,598,541</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Inglewood Intermodal Transit/Park and Ride Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5502.09</td>
<td>PSE, ROW, C</td>
<td>$13,120,000</td>
<td>$6,560,000</td>
<td>$6,560,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4603.01</td>
<td>PASE, PSE, ROW, C</td>
<td>$7,245,710</td>
<td>$774,540</td>
<td>$456,155</td>
<td>$1,719,519</td>
<td>$4,255,496</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>LA City San Pedro-Pedestrian Improvements and Multimodal Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4603.02</td>
<td>PASE, PSE, ROW, C</td>
<td>$3,000,600</td>
<td>$137,035</td>
<td>$187,538</td>
<td>$2,618,027</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>LA City Wilmington Neighborhood Friendly Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4603.03</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$8,050,000</td>
<td>$8,050,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5502.04</td>
<td>PASE, PSE, C</td>
<td>$4,228,500</td>
<td>$4,228,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>LA County El Segundo/Palos Verdes St Traffic Signal Synchronization Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5502.07</td>
<td>PASE, PSE, C</td>
<td>$1,324,500</td>
<td>$1,324,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>LA County Del Amo Blvd (East) Traffic Signal Synchronization Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5502.35</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$4,942,000</td>
<td>$4,942,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>LA County Van Ness Traffic Signal Synchronization Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4601.24</td>
<td>PASE, PSE, C</td>
<td>$6,682,000</td>
<td>$571,200</td>
<td>$428,400</td>
<td>$2,021,066</td>
<td>$3,063,334</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>LA County Westminster/-West Athens Pedestrian Plan Implementation (Phase 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5502.35</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$4,389,365</td>
<td>$4,389,365</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Inglewood South Bay Fiber Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4601.35</td>
<td>PSE, C</td>
<td>$5,547,800</td>
<td>$5,547,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Torrance Torrance Schools Safety and Accessibility Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM5502.08</td>
<td>PASE, PSE, ROW, C</td>
<td>$1,514,300</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$1,440,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total TSMI 1 Funds requested FY20-24: | $79,057,857 |
## FY21-25 South Bay Measure M MSPs Metro Budget Request

### Exhibit 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure M Transportation System &amp; Mobility Improvements (TSMI) Program 2</th>
<th>FY19-20</th>
<th>FY20-21</th>
<th>FY21-22</th>
<th>FY22-23</th>
<th>FY23-24</th>
<th>FY24-25</th>
<th>FY26-29 Funding Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Agency/Project Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>TSMI 2 Funding Requested</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY20-21</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY21-22</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY22-23</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY23-24</strong></td>
<td><strong>FY24-25</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4602.01</td>
<td>Beach Cities Health District</td>
<td>$1,833,877</td>
<td>$1,833,877</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4602.02</td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>$4,050,000</td>
<td>$445,000</td>
<td>$5,585,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM4602.03</td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>$3,320,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$1,230,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM508.01</td>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$2,240,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM508.02</td>
<td>LA City</td>
<td>$185,531</td>
<td>$466,594</td>
<td>$1,308,770</td>
<td>$1,299,770</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM508.03</td>
<td>LA City</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM508.04</td>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM508.05</td>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$259,500</td>
<td>$2,035,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM508.06</td>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM508.07</td>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>$16,400,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$14,700,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>$1,165,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$615,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Palos Verdes Estates</td>
<td>$11,798,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$156,500</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$8,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
<td>$5,330,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM508.05</td>
<td>South Bay Fiber Network (additional funds)</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total TSMI 2 Funds requested FY20-26:** $90,076,002

**TSMI 2 - FY Start Balance:** $99,493,087

**TSMI 2 - FY New Funding:**
- FY 20-21: $39,577,016
- FY 21-22: $23,123,295
- FY 22-23: $35,612,096
- FY 23-24: $32,906,065
- FY 24-25: $29,784,258

**FY TSMI 2 - New Funding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 20-21</th>
<th>FY 21-22</th>
<th>FY 22-23</th>
<th>FY 23-24</th>
<th>FY 24-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY Total Expenditures Requested</strong></td>
<td>$7,889,408</td>
<td>$6,589,594</td>
<td>$10,283,270</td>
<td>$6,872,270</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY Total New Request</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,894,000</td>
<td>$6,035,500</td>
<td>$16,232,000</td>
<td>$15,350,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$7,889,408</td>
<td>$13,483,594</td>
<td>$16,318,770</td>
<td>$23,095,270</td>
<td>$16,350,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY Total Request</strong></td>
<td>$7,889,408</td>
<td>$13,483,594</td>
<td>$16,318,770</td>
<td>$23,095,270</td>
<td>$16,350,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY Total Request</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,894,000</td>
<td>$6,035,500</td>
<td>$16,232,000</td>
<td>$15,350,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY Total Request</strong></td>
<td>$103,000</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
<td>$102,894</td>
<td>$225,098</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY TSMI 2 - End Balance:</strong></td>
<td>$52,001,222</td>
<td>$57,476,721</td>
<td>$62,799,087</td>
<td>$59,718,242</td>
<td>$60,594,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: SBCCOG Transportation Committee  
SBCCOG Steering Committee  

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

Subject: FY 21-25 Measure R Metro Budget Request Recommended Projects and Funding Commitments  

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  
The SBCCOG’s Measure R South Bay Highway Program (SBHP) Metro Budget Request includes cashflow estimates based on updated schedules identified in active Measure R project funding agreements, “cost to complete” estimates for projects that have current funding agreements but will need additional funding for project implementation phases that are not in the active funding agreements, and new project requests for which new funding agreements will be needed.

SBCCOG received 24 highway project applications and 14 transit project applications by the October 31, 2019 submittal deadline. The transit projects are being considered in anticipation of a new Metro Measure R SBHP Transfer Policy that would make both transit and highway projects eligible for Measure R SBHP funding for the first time. SBCCOG has assigned recommended transit projects SBHP funding consistent with the existing Measure R SBHP matching formula and contingent on Metro Board approval of a Measure R Transfer Policy. The Metro Board is expected to adopt a policy by May 2020.

SBCCOG’s Measure R SBHP Metro Budget Request includes an estimate of the annual funding needed to reimburse project expenses over the upcoming five years. Most projects can be completed within five years, but some complex projects with complex environmental or right-of-way phases may take longer. The funding needed beyond five years for these more complex projects is added in subsequent annual Metro Budget Requests.

Once Metro approves the SBCCOG’s funding requests, Metro and the lead agency execute a funding agreement for some or all of the project phases. Metro structures its funding agreement cashflow plans based on anticipated reimbursements tied to anticipated progress on major project phases (e.g.: environmental clearance, design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction). Metro requires lead agencies to document full funding of each implementation phase that is included in
a funding agreement. Consequently, SBCCOG must request funding for each implementation phase for which the lead agency expects to be reimbursed during the upcoming five years.

Since a project phase can require reimbursements over multiple years and multiple phases may be completed during the five-year period, the SBCCOG five-year Measure R SBHP Metro Budget Request provides Metro and the project lead agencies a planning basis for establishing reasonable funding reimbursement schedules over the next five years.

Exhibit 1 also includes a column reflecting the estimated “cost to complete” the projects beyond FY 2025. This column, for information only, provides early estimates of project reimbursements that will need to be programmed in subsequent Metro Budget requests based on project schedule adherence and the need to reimburse expenses incurred after FY 2025.

Some projects in the 5-year Metro Budget Request will not be completed or fully reimbursed within the upcoming five years. These projects include those that will not be initiated until year 3-5, larger projects that will require a significant match from non-subregional funding sources, or those projects that will require full environmental impact evaluation process or acquisition of right-of-way. Funding for the post-2025 phases will be included in subsequent Measure M MSP Metro Budget Requests when reimbursement schedules and amounts are able to be more accurately projected.

The Measure R SBHP reimbursement amounts and schedules in Exhibit 1 are based on:

1. The assumption that the Metro Board of Directors will adopt a Measure R Decennial Transfer Policy before July 1 that allows Measure R SBHP funds to be used for highway and transit projects;

2. Updated schedules and funding requests for Active project phases in current funding agreements;

3. “Cost to complete” estimates provided by lead agencies for projects that have a current funding agreement but will need additional funding amended into active funding agreement for project implementation phases that are not in the active funding agreements; and,

4. New project requests submitted by October 31, 2019 by lead agency applicants for which new funding agreements will be needed.

Project Application Evaluation And Scoring
A 5-member subcommittee of the Infrastructure Working Group and Transit Operators Working Group evaluated and scored the applications. One of the significant subcommittee tasks was to determine the proportion of cost for each project to be recommended from Measure R SBHP subregional revenues over the five-year period. The Subcommittee considered several formula options and ultimately recommended that the subregional funding share of each project be calculated based on an incremental formula, as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBHP Increment of Project Cost</th>
<th>MSP Funding Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $20 million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 million to $35 million</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35 million to $75 million</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75 million +</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subcommittee also recommended that the maximum cumulative subregional funding share for each project, whether from Measure R SBHP, Measure MSPs or both, be capped at $250 million.

The formula is designed so that as the project cost rises, the proportionate subregional share of incremental costs declines. As an example, a $50 million project would be eligible for a subregional share of $38 million (76%), as follows:

$20 million (100% of the first $20 million in project costs) +
$13.5 million (90% of the $15 million incremental project cost between $20 and $35 million) +
$4.5 million (30% of the $15 million incremental project cost between $35 and $50 million) =
$38 million total

In another example, a $500 million project would be eligible for a subregional share of $130.5 million (26%), as follows:

$20 million (100% of the first $20 million in project costs) +
$13.5 million (90% of the $15 million incremental project cost between $20 and $35 million) +
$12 million (30% of the $40 million incremental project cost between $35 and $75 million) +
$85 million (20% of the $425 million incremental project cost between $75 and $500 million) =
$130.5 million total

In applying the recommended formula to specific funding requests, SBCCOG staff realized that the formula worked well for project requests under $100 million, but was somewhat too low to cover requested amounts for projects larger than $100 million. However, the subcommittee-recommended formula accommodates all anticipated project reimbursements within the upcoming five years. For those lead agencies that will need funding after FY 2025 to complete their projects, the subcommittee recommended that lead agencies with executed funding agreements be allowed to request an amendment of their project funding agreement to add funds up to the recommended cap of $250 million based on more definitive “cost to complete” project estimates developed in advance of subsequent annual Metro Budget Request cycles.

The subcommittee also recognized the regional, state and national significance of the estimated $1 billion Inglewood Transit Connector and the city’s $250 million request for subregional funds. However, initial five-year funding for the project was recommended to conform to the sub-regional formula that would make available $230.5 million within the upcoming five years. The city develops more accurate cost estimates and reimbursement schedules, it can request the balance of its formula share up to the $250 million cap in future Metro Budget Request cycles from funding available after FY 2025.
The subcommittee recommends that Caltrans projects on freeways be required to obtain a match from state or federal funds. In order to not delay project development, the subcommittee recommends that Measure R SBHP or Measure M MSP allocations for Caltrans applications be restricted to PAED and design phases in the current Metro Budget Request. The subcommittee recommends that Caltrans be required to secure commitments from State funds for right-of-way acquisition and/or construction.

In addition to the recommended SBHP and MSP funding for active and new projects, the Metro Budget Request item includes a line item for SBCCOG project development and administration. Exhibit 1 also includes a list of Measure R SBHP applications that the subcommittee recommends be deferred or denied.

NEXT STEPS
Staff recommendations will be considered by the Transportation Committee at its March 9, 2020 meeting. Because there is no Board of Directors meeting in March, the Steering Committee is delegated SBCCOG approval authority and will consider the Transportation Committee recommendations immediately after the March 9th Transportation Committee meeting. The SBCCOG Request should be transmitted to L. A. Metro immediately after SBCCOG approval for inclusion in L. A. Metro’s FY 2020-21 budget which begins July 1, 2020.

RECOMMENDATIONS
The SBCCOG Transportation Committee and Steering Committee approve the following policies and actions:

1. Included transit projects be approved contingent on approval of the Metro Measure R Transfer Policy;

2. The projects on the list that are noted as defer or deny be removed from the list and further consideration this year;

3. The funding share formula recommended by the IWG/TOWG Subcommittee be used to calculate Measure R SBHP commitments needed to complete active and new Measure R SBHP projects;

4. The annual funding allocations listed in Exhibit 1 for recommended Measure R SBHP projects; and

5. The SBCCOG Measure R SBHP Metro Budget Request be transmitted to the L. A. Metro Chair and Board of Directors by March 13, 2020.

Attachment:

Exhibit 1 – FY 2021-2025 Funding allocations for Measure R SBHP active projects and new project applications
### Measure R SWIF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase: PAID PSE ROW Construction</th>
<th>Project Title/Description</th>
<th>Total Phase(s) Cost</th>
<th>Match Funds</th>
<th>Total Funds Requested</th>
<th>FY21-24 Funds Requested</th>
<th>FY25 Total Cost</th>
<th>FY25 Total Funding Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inglewood Transit Connector Project</td>
<td>$33,433,950</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$33,433,950</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
<td>$1,445,827,779</td>
<td>$1,445,827,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$5,525,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,525,000</td>
<td>$3,125,000</td>
<td>$1,380,000</td>
<td>$1,380,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$12,375,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$12,375,000</td>
<td>$12,375,000</td>
<td>$4,950,000</td>
<td>$4,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$695,000</td>
<td>$695,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$13,433,950</td>
<td>$1,343,195</td>
<td>$12,090,755</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$17,100,000</td>
<td>$17,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$1,616,000,000</td>
<td>$766,000,000</td>
<td>$850,000,000</td>
<td>$145,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$1,486,827,779</td>
<td>$851,761,946</td>
<td>$634,065,833</td>
<td>$466,006,153</td>
<td>$101,935,478</td>
<td>$101,935,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$85,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$85,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$1,016,000,000</td>
<td>$766,000,000</td>
<td>$250,000,000</td>
<td>$145,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$1,486,827,779</td>
<td>$851,761,946</td>
<td>$634,065,833</td>
<td>$466,006,153</td>
<td>$101,935,478</td>
<td>$101,935,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$65,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$85,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$85,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson GTrans Purchase</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit 1**

**FY21-25 South Bay Measure R Metro Budget Request**

**Budget Requested**: $10,200,000

**Funding Needed**: $4,950,000

**Total Cost**: $13,800,000

**Total Funding Needed**: $13,800,000
### FY21-25 South Bay Measure R Metro Budget Request

#### Exhibit 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Agency/Project Description</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defer</td>
<td>Inglewood TMC Expansion Project</td>
<td>Application not complete enough to evaluate. Re-apply in future call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Inglewood I-405 Overpass Project</td>
<td>ineligible scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defer</td>
<td>Inglewood Connected Vehicles Project</td>
<td>Application not complete enough to evaluate. Re-apply in future call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Inglewood PCH at PV Blvd Improvements</td>
<td>Project scope included in Caltrans PCH project, subsequently withdrawn by City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Inglewood Centinela Grade Separation</td>
<td>SBCCOG Board supported use of Measure M Sub-Regional Equity Funds for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Beach Cities Transit Replacement Buses</td>
<td>Expansion vehicles purchases only (increases mobility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Beach Cities Transit Zero Emission Bus Replacement</td>
<td>Expansion vehicles purchases only (increases mobility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deny</td>
<td>Beach Cities Transit CNG Bus Replacement</td>
<td>Expansion vehicles purchases only (increases mobility)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>