South Bay Cities Council of Governments

SBCCOG Transportation Committee Meeting
Monday, December 14, 2020 @10:30 a.m.
Conducted via Zoom

PUBLIC COMMENTS:
To address the SBCCOG Transportation Committee on any item or a matter within the Transportation Committee’s purview, please provide written comments by 5 p. m. December 11, 2020 via email to davidl@southbaycities.org. All written comments submitted will become part of the official record. Unless otherwise noted in the Agenda, the Public can only provide written comment on SBCCOG related business that is within the jurisdiction of the SBCCOG and/or items listed on the Agenda which will addressed during the Public Comment portion of the meeting.

ACCESSING THE MEETING:
Receive Zoom meeting credentials in advance of the meeting by using the below link: https://zoom.us/meeting/register/tJwkfuqurDsjEtXrrw8SuNAP0LjuhNNTUt3zV
OR to access the Zoom meeting, visit https://zoom.us/join/ call (669) 900-9128 and use Meeting ID: 989 9362 0981; Passcode: 722264

AGENDA
10:30 a.m. Welcome / Self-Introductions
10:32 a.m. Public Comment
10:34 a.m. Consent Calendar
   a. November 9, 2020 Transportation Committee Minutes (Attachment A) – Approve
   b. December 2020 Transportation Update (Attachment B) – Receive and File
10:35 a.m. SBCCOG Transportation Working Group Updates
   a. Infrastructure Working Group
   b. Transit Operators Working Group
   c. Metro Service Council
10:50 a.m. Presentation: Los Angeles World Airports Update on Landside Access Modernization Program
11:20 a.m. Measure R SBHP / Measure M MSP Updates
   a. Metro Budget Request Process Initiation and Overview
   b. Modernizing the Metro Highway Program (Attachment C)
11:35 a.m. Updates on Metro Projects, Programs, and Initiatives
11:40 a.m. Three Month Look Ahead (Attachment D) – Receive and File
11:45 a.m. Announcements / Adjournment

Next Transportation Committee meeting – Monday, January 11, 2021, 10:30 a. m.
To include an item in the agenda, e-mail to: lantzsh10@gmail.com by January 2, 2021.
South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee
November 9, 2020
Meeting Minutes
(Held virtually via Zoom)

COMMITTEE CHAIR HORVATH CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 10:30 A.M.

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions
In attendance were the following voting SBCCOG Board Members:
Christian Horvath, Chair (Redondo Beach)
Chris Pimentel (El Segundo)
Olivia Valentine (Hawthorne)
George Chen (Torrance)

Non-Voting Representatives
Ted Semaan, IWG (Redondo Beach)
James Lee, TOWG (Beach Cities Transit)
Don Szerlip, Metro South Bay Service Council

Also in attendance were the following persons:
Jason Jo (Carson)
Kevin Kwak (Gardena)
Reed Salan (Hermosa Beach)
Ramzi Awwad (Rancho Palos Verdes)
Craig Bilezerian (Torrance)
Steve Finton (Torrance)
Shin Furukawa (Torrance)
Art Reyes (Torrance)
Leslie Scott (Beach Cities Transit)
Gregory Farr (Caltrans)
Robert So (Caltrans)
Sarah Horn (Caltrans)
Jimmy Shih (Caltrans)
Sergio Carvajal (Caltrans)
Mark Dierking (Metro)
Isidro Panuco (Metro)
Mike Bohlke (Metro Deputy to James Butts)
Tami Podesta (HNTB)
Jacki Bacharach (SBCCOG)
Steve Lantz (SBCCOG)
David Leger (SBCCOG)

II. Public Comment – no public comments received.

III. Consent Calendar
A. September 14, 2020 Transportation Committee Minutes - APPROVED
B. October 12, 2020 Transportation Committee Meeting Notes – RECEIVED AND FILED
C. November 2020 Transportation Update – RECEIVED AND FILED

MOTION by Committee Member Valentine, seconded by Committee Member Pimentel, to APPROVE the consent calendar. Approved without objection.

IV. SBCCOG Transportation Working Group Updates
A. Infrastructure Working Group Update
Mr. Semaan reported that the IWG met in October and heard presentations on the Caltrans Ambassadors Program as well as an update on the Metropolitan Water District’s Regional Recycled Water Advanced Purification Center. It was also reported that Caltrans District 7 Director John Bulinski is retiring.

B. Transit Operators Working Group Update
Mr. Lee reported that the TOWG met in October and continued discussing impacts of COVID-19 on Transit, including the agency efforts to accommodate social distancing, barriers, and schedule modifications. Additionally, the Torrance Transit Center Park & Ride facility has re-started construction and is expected to be completed by August 2021.

C. Metro Service Council
Mr. Szerlip reported that the Service Council has not met since the last Transportation Committee meeting.
V. Measure R SBHP / Measure M MSP Updates
   a. Measure M MSP Cashflow Update discussion and City Meetings
   Mr. Lantz explained that SBCCOG staff is reviewing Metro’s new MSP funding allocations and overall MSP funding availability. SBCCOG and Metro staff will begin working with lead agency staff to discuss project statuses, potential project funding shortfalls, and new project requests. Due to the current financial constraints of the Measure R SBHP and Measure M MSPs, priority will be given to projects in or entering the construction phase. Following that, priority will be given to projects in design and environmental phases. Third priority will be given to new project requests.

   b. City of Torrance Request for Additional Funds - APPROVED
   Mr. Lantz explained that this item is being brought back from last month’s agenda due to a lack of quorum in October. The City is requesting additional funding due to a shortfall for the Transit Center Park & Ride project and an accompanying roadway improvement project. Due to the cashflow needs of the City, the action is being recommended out of cycle from the normal Metro Budget Request process. Metro requires SBCCOG Board action prior to programming any new funds for this project.

   Committee Member Pimentel asked if there was any risk in Metro not identifying funds for the request. Ms. Bacharach explained that this would come from the South Bay’s subregional funds and would only reduce the amount of funding available for other South Bay projects.

   MOTION by Committee Member Chen, seconded by Committee Member Valentine, to APPROVE the City of Torrance’s request for additional funds. Approved without objection.

VI. Updates on Metro Projects, Programs, and Initiatives
   Mr. Lantz shared that Metro is still studying its pandemic recovery strategy. Green Line Extension scoping meetings are being scheduled for early 2021.

   A question was asked about Metro’s Free Fare program. Mr. Dierking explained that Metro staff is still studying the concept and is reaching out to municipal operators and other impacted parties. Mr. Lantz added that the Metro Board is somewhat concerned about a unilateral free fare policy and may be more supportive of categorical approach (such as low income riders, seniors, students, etc.). The Board is also considering a fare capping strategy if a free fare is not adopted systemwide. This strategy would allow a rider to pay daily until the cost of a period pass (day, week, 30-day) was reached then ride for free for the balance of that pass period.

VII. Three Month Look-Ahead – Received and Filed

VIII. Announcements / Adjournment
   Ms. Bacharach announced that the South Bay Fiber Network connection celebration is taking place November 17th via Zoom. Instructions on how to register are on the SBCCOG website.

   Mr. Farr announced that the new Caltrans District 7 Director will be Tony Tavares, coming from Caltrans District 4. He will begin his new role at the beginning of December.

   Committee Chair Horvath adjourned the meeting at 10:56 a.m. to December 14, 2020.
Adherence to Strategic Plan:
Goal A: Environment, Transportation and Economic Development. Facilitate, implement and/or educate members and others about environmental, transportation and economic development programs that benefit the South Bay.

Federal

Federal Transition: 5 Potential Transportation Policy Changes
The new administration may change federal policy in the following five areas:
1. SAFE Rule Elimination. In August 2018, the National Highway Traffic Safety Agency (NHTSA) and the US Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) proposed the Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicle Rule. The Rule creates national fuel efficiency standards for cars and light trucks at 2020 levels and repeals California’s higher fuel efficiency standards, The Biden Administration will likely withdraw the rule.
2. Climate Change and Transportation. Biden will include climate experts across many agencies with a strong focus on transportation. California may be a national model as Phil Washington (LA Metro CEO) and Therese McMillian (MTC CEO) are key members of Biden’s transportation transition team. Agency transition teams are in charge of reviewing current projects and ongoing initiatives, meeting with career federal employees, and preparing the members of the incoming cabinet for their roles and priorities.
3. COVID Relief v. Infrastructure Stimulus v. Reauthorization. There will be only so much room to adopt new spending measures in a divided Congress. With a COVID relief (including transit subsidies) a near certainty, and a surface transportation reauthorization due late in 2021, a "bipartisan" infrastructure bill may be a tough sell.
4. Reauthorization? Biden has proposed a $2 trillion infrastructure plan to promote clean energy and modernize current U.S. systems. But expect more tinkering with the INVEST Act (the transportation reauthorization adopted in June). Earmarks may make a comeback. How to pay for it remains an open question.
5. State Exodus? Federal agencies modeling California policies are likely to hire away expertise from the Golden State. ARB Chair Mary Nichols is a potential selection to head US EPA. How many other state leaders will head to D. C.?
Federal Transportation Funding Bill Advances
The transportation funding bill authored by U.S. Sen. Susan Collins (R-ME) moved out of committee November 10th. Collins, Chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, was one of the authors of the FY 2021 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development funding bill, which has broad, bipartisan input and support. The bill will now go to Conference Committee before heading to the House and Senate floors for a vote.

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

State

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Road pricing has become a common policy tool and urban planners are beginning to focus on its cousin, the curb, by asking about valuing the various uses of curbs that are provided free to
parked automobiles. In their view, curb space should be charged for, using technology that can calculate a curb's current occupancy rate, its latent demand and what its market price should be used for to prevent overcrowding and suboptimal curb use. Some interesting uses:

**Toll lanes:** If those lanes were subject to tolls, they could function as an express toll lane with a policy that allows buses to use the lanes for free.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

‘Live and Work From Anywhere’ Is Here To Stay
Working from home was intended to be a temporary measure for millions of workers in the early days of COVID-19. With no clear end in sight eight months later, employers are offering
a perk that would have been unthinkable at the start of the year: Live and work from wherever you want — permanently.

It is a monumental shift for corporate America, one that’s forcing companies to rethink the ways they conduct business, manage employees and shape their corporate cultures. But there is often a catch.

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

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

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

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

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

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

For those who move to less-expensive cities, some companies that allow working from anywhere are adjusting pay based on factors including the cost of labor and income tax rates in an employee’s new location. In some cases, employees have seen their salaries cut by more than 10% based on the cost of living differential between their former workspace and their new home office. Other companies are eliminating geographic compensation zones in the U.S. by putting all employees on the same highest compensation regardless of where they live and work.
Private Sector Is Developing Flying Taxis in Time For The 2028 Los Angeles Olympics

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

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

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

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

Subject: Modernizing the Metro Highway Program

Adherence to Strategic Plan:
*Goal A: Environment, Transportation, and Economic Development.* Facilitate, implement, and/or educate members and others about environmental, transportation, and economic development programs that benefit the South Bay. Strategy 5 – Actively pursue opportunities for infrastructure funding for member agencies.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the Metro Board:

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

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

ISSUE

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

BACKGROUND

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

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

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

DISCUSSION

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

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

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

The subcommittee’s recommendations are as follows:

Metro as Planner

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

Metro should:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Metro as Funder**

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

Metro should:

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

Metro as Leader

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

Metro should:

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

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

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

FINANCIAL IMPACT

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

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

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

NEXT STEPS

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

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Recommended Revisions to Measure R Highway Program Criteria
Attachment B – Recommended Revisions to Measure M Guidelines
Attachment C – Literature Review
ATTACHMENT A

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO MEASURE R HIGHWAY PROGRAM CRITERIA

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

Project Eligibility for Highway Operational Improvements and Ramp/Interchange Improvements

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

Examples of eligible improvement projects include:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies

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

“Multi-Modal Connectivity” definition:

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

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- Transportation Center expansions
- Park and Ride expansions
- Multi-modal access improvements
- New mode and access accommodations
- First/last mile infrastructure

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

“Freeway Interchange Improvements” definition:

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

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

**“Arterial Street Improvements” definition:**

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

Examples of Eligible Projects:

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

LITERATURE REVIEW

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

- Board motion on Status Report on Financial Forecast to Deliver Twenty-Eight by ’28 (February 2019)
- Metro’s “Vision 2028 Plan” (June 2018)
- City College of New York’s Complete Streets Considerations for Freight and Emergency Vehicle Operations (May 2018)
- Board-adopted Measure M Master Guidelines including Substitute Motion (June 2017)
- Measure M Ordinance (June 2016)
- Los Angeles County Strategic Goods Movement Arterial Plan (CSTAN) (May 2015)
- Subregional Mobility Matrices (April 2015)
- Board-adopted Complete Streets Policy (October 2014)
- Recommendations from the Reconvened Measure R Highway Advisory Committee (2014)
- Board-approval of the updated project list of the Measure R Highway Subregional Programs in six subregions (November 2013)
- Clarification Board Item on Project Eligibility for Measure R Highway Operational Improvements and Ramp Interchange Improvements (June 2012)
- Board-adopted 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan for Los Angeles County including Attachment D-1, Clarification on Project Eligibility for Highway Operational Improvement and Ramp/Interchange Improvements, of the Measure R Highway Program Funding Strategy (October 2009)
- Measure R Ordinance (2008)
- Proposition C Ordinance (1990)
- Proposition A Ordinance (1980)
Attachment C, Exhibit 2

Draft SBCCOG Letter

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

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

Dear Mr. Washington:

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Olivia Valentine, Chair
South Bay Cities Council of Governments

c.c.: SBCCOG Board of Directors
      Metro Board of Directors
**South Bay Measure R / Measure M Highway Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December 2020</th>
<th>January 2021</th>
<th>February 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. IWG Meeting</td>
<td>8. Metro South Bay Service Council Meeting</td>
<td>8. SBCCOG Transportation Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metro Budget Request Process</td>
<td>11. SBCCOG Transportation Committee Meeting</td>
<td>• Metro Budget Request Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parametric Design &amp; Curb Asset Management Presentation</td>
<td>11. SBCCOG Steering Committee Meeting</td>
<td>8. SBCCOG Steering Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Metro South Bay Service Council Meeting</td>
<td>13. IWG meeting</td>
<td>10. IWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBCCOG Transportation Committee Meeting</td>
<td>28. Metro Board Meeting</td>
<td>• Metro Budget Request Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LAMP Update by LAWA</td>
<td>28. SBCCOG Board Meeting</td>
<td>12. Metro South Bay Service Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. SBCCOG Steering Committee Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>25. Metro Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Transit Operators Working Group-DARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>25. SBCCOG Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. SBCCOG Board Meeting-DARK</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Metro Budget Request Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>