

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee
January 13, 2020
Meeting Minutes

COMMITTEE CHAIR HORVATH CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 10:39 A.M.

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions

In attendance were the following voting SBCCOG Board Members:

Christian Horvath, Chair (Redondo Beach)	Olivia Valentine (Hawthorne)
Drew Boyles (El Segundo)	Geoff Rizzo (Torrance)
Dan Medina (Gardena)	

In attendance were the following non-voting elected officials:

Chris Pimentel (El Segundo)

Non-Voting Representatives

Ted Semaan, IWG (Redondo Beach)

Also in attendance were the following persons:

Jason Jo (Carson)	Sergio Carvajal (Caltrans)
Louis Atwell (Inglewood)	Mike Bohlke (Metro Deputy to James Butts)
Nasser Razepoor (Rancho Palos Verdes)	Mark Dierking (Metro)
Ernie Crespo (GTrans)	Julie Ann Anopol (Willdan Fin. Services)
Leslie Scott (Beach Cities Transit)	David Leger (SBCCOG)
Maryam Adhami (LACDPW)	Natalie Champion (SBCCOG)
Jimmy Shih (Caltrans)	Steve Lantz (SBCCOG)
Daniel Kopulsky (Caltrans)	Jacki Bacharach (SBCCOG)
Olivia Harris (Caltrans)	

II. Consent Calendar

A. December 9, 2019 Transportation Committee Minutes - APPROVED

B. January 2020 Transportation Update – RECEIVED AND FILED

MOTION by Committee Member Valentine, seconded by Committee Member Boyles, to **APPROVE** the consent calendar. No objection. So ordered.

III. SBCCOG Transportation Working Group Updates

A. Infrastructure Working Group Update

Mr. Semaan reported that the IWG met on January 8th and discussed the diminished funding availability in the Measure R program. Mr. Semaan added that in light of this new information, the IWG would largely support completing active projects and not awarding any new projects at this time.

B. Transit Operators Working Group Update

No update given. Mr. Lantz reported that he briefed the working group on the same information provided to the IWG the day before.

C. Metro Service Council

Committee Member Medina reported that the Service Council is continuing to work on service issues to LAX.

IV. Annual Performance Evaluation Report

Mr. Lantz explained that historically, Metro has required monthly and quarterly reports for Measure R and M projects. They have recently eliminated the monthly reporting requirement. The monthly reports have provided the data for the Annual Performance Evaluation Report. Mr. Lantz asked the Committee if they would like to continue receiving monthly status updates on the projects, in a different format than the APE, or if they would like to continue the APE provided quarterly. The Committee preferred that monthly reports be given.

V. Evaluation Process for Applications Submitted for FY20-21 Metro Budget Request – APPROVED

Ms. Bacharach informed the Committee that Metro staff provided the SBCCOG with revised funding availability for the Measure R South Bay Highway Program (SBHP) and Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Programs (MSPs). *Links to the handouts are below.* Ms. Bacharach explained that there is only about \$50M in new SBHP funding over the next five years which is significantly less than previously projected and severely reduces the funding available to transfer. Ms. Bacharach then reviewed the Attachment C Exhibit 1 which shows an approximate cost to complete active SBHP projects (for project phases not covered in the current funding agreement). Ms. Bacharach noted that SBCCOG staff will likely recommend completing current projects with the limited funding available and will likely not recommend funding any transit projects until the Measure R Transfer Policy is adopted by L. A. Metro and there is more certainty about the amount of funding available and eligible uses. Mr. Lantz added that there is still funding available in Measure M for new highway projects through 2027. At that point, Measure M MSPs would be eligible for a transit transfer like the Measure R transfer.

Mr. Lantz then reviewed a handout (*link to document is below*) that showed Measure R funding allocation changes in three versions of Metro's financial forecast for the SBHP. Mr. Lantz explained that when Measure R was passed, the SBHP was allocated \$906M by the ordinance. In 2012, the SBHP was forecast \$881M; in 2014 it was forecast \$902.5M; and in 2016 it was forecast \$861.4M. These are relatively close to what was expected. However, the draft financial forecast provided by Metro staff last week only forecast \$577.2M, more than \$300M less than what voters approved in 2008. Mr. Bohlke will be working with Metro Chair Butts and Metro staff to find out the reason for the shortfall and how it will be remedied. Mr. Bohlke also noted that the Transfer process should not be impacted as it is a very flexible process and that projects can be reviewed and can be ready for when the funding is available.

Mr. Lantz moved on to discuss the SBHP and MSP match policies. He explained the MSPs do not currently have a required match and that SBHP has a graduated match policy in which Measure R covers the first \$2M of all projects; then 80% of the portion between \$2M - \$10M; and 50% of the portion above \$10M. These brackets were designed for smaller, early action projects maxing out at \$20-\$30M. However, the SBCCOG is being asked to provide a match for the Inglewood Transit Connector, a nearly \$1B project. Mr. Lantz reviewed a proposed new matching policy as outlined in the memo. SBCCOG Board Member Butts' motion to recommend a Transfer also requested the SBCCOG consider eliminating the match requirement in the SBHP to be consistent with Measure M MSPs. This item was discussed at both the IWG and TOWG meetings and both groups did not recommend elimination of matching requirements. Each program will be able to fund more projects by requiring some sort of matching funds. Although there is not yet a new matching policy, a subcommittee consisting of IWG and TOWG representatives will meet to discuss the topic and will make a recommendation to the Transportation Committee at an upcoming meeting.

- Measure R SBHP Funding Availability handout:
http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_SBHP%20Funding%20Availability.pdf
- Measure M MSP Funding Availability handout:
http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_MSP%20Funding%20Availability.pdf
- Measure R SBHP Allocation changes handout:
http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_SBHP%20allocation%20changes.pdf

Committee Member Medina asked Ms. Bacharach to clarify if these recent changes eliminated the need to vote on this item today. Ms. Bacharach noted that the Committee could vote to eliminate the match per the Butts Motion.

Mr. Lantz continued reviewing Recommendation 2b from the memo and explained that during the project scoring and project selection process, it is being recommended that a portion of the score be based on the cumulative SBHP/MSP share of total project costs. Chair Horvath suggested this item be included in the subcommittee agenda. Committee Member Rizzo suggested that matching funds should be considered "bonus points" during

the evaluation process. Ms. Bacharach added that beyond bonus points for a match, the sub-committee may also want to consider geographic equity be considered (for those cities that have been ineligible for SBHP funds), etc.

Chair Horvath shared his thoughts that 1) anything being discussed or acted on at this Committee should first be run through the sub-committee and 2) IWG and TOWG make a recommendation to the Committee as related to Recommendations 2a and 2b as well as discuss concerns related to the of funding to regional highway projects. He believes that it is a big ask of a subregion to fully fund the improvement to a regional freeway system such as the I-405 with no funding from the State or Federal governments. Improvements along PCH could be considered differently as it serves mostly local traffic, but a regional highway like the I-405 serves residents throughout the Southern California area as pass through the South Bay every day. Mr. Lantz cautioned that although he does not disagree with this sentiment, the line item in the Measure R ordinance listed the 91, 110, 105, and 405 freeways, not the SBHP. The local arterial street improvements were approved after the SBCCOG lobbied the Metro Board to expand eligibility to include State Highways (such as PCH and Western Avenue) which traverse much of the South Bay. The Metro Board agreed and created the SBHP and allowed for improvements on local arterials within a mile of a freeway or state highway to also be eligible. Ms. Bacharach echoed the Chair's comments and noted that the SBCCOG will be visiting Sacramento to meet with legislators on a variety of issues, one of which will be State funding to build these Caltrans projects.

Chair Horvath also wanted to find out if other subregions have identified other reductions in funding like the SBCCOG identified in the SBHP.

With no further discussion, Chair Horvath called for a motion on the item.

MOTION by Committee Member Medina, seconded by Committee Member Valentine, to request the IWG and TOWG subcommittee develop recommendations for a single match policy for SBHP and MSP projects and consider using the matching funds as bonus points during the project selection process, No objection. So ordered.

VI. Transit Operator Working Group Recommended DRAFT Selection Criteria for Measure R SBHP Transfer Policy Transit Projects – RECEIVED AND FILED

Motion by Committee Member Rizzo, seconded Committee Member Medina, to Receive and File. No objection. So ordered.

VII. Three Month Look-Ahead

No discussion on this item.

VIII. Announcements / Adjournment

Committee Chair Horvath adjourned the meeting at 11:49 a.m. to February 10, 2020.