

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

**Transportation Committee
Katy Geissert Civic Center Library
3301 Torrance Blvd
Torrance, CA 90503**

AGENDA

**Monday, December 9, 2019
10:30 a.m. – Noon**

- 10:30 a.m. Welcome / Self-Introductions**
- 10:32 a.m. Consent Calendar**
- a. November 14, 2019 Transportation Committee Minutes (Attachment A) – Approve**
 - b. December 2019 Transportation Update (Attachment B) – Receive and File**
- 10:35 a.m. Transportation Working Group Updates**
- a. Infrastructure Working Group**
 - b. Transit Operators Working Group**
 - c. Metro Service Council**
- 10:45 a.m. Annual Performance Evaluation Report (To be distributed separately)**
- 10:55 a.m. Evaluation Process for Applications Submitted for FY20-21 Metro Budget Request (Attachment C) – Approve**
- 11:55 a.m. Three-Month Look Ahead (Attachment D) – Receive and File**
- Noon Announcements / Adjournment**

*Next Transportation Committee meeting –Monday, January 13, 2020, 10:30 a. m.
To include an item in the agenda, e-mail to: lantzsh10@gmail.com by **January 3, 2020.***

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee
November 14, 2019
Meeting Minutes

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)	James Butts (Inglewood)
Drew Boyles (El Segundo)	James Gazeley (Lomita)
Rodney Tanaka (Gardena)	Hildy Stern (Manhattan Beach)
Olivia Valentine (Hawthorne)	Milton Herring (Torrance)

In attendance were the following non-voting elected officials:

Pat Furey (Torrance)

Non-Voting Representatives

Ted Semaan, IWG (Redondo Beach)	Don Szerlip (Metro South Bay Service Council)
Joyce Rooney, Transit Operators (Beach Cities Transit)	Michael Ervin (Sup. Hahn's Office)

Also in attendance were the following persons:

Jason Jo (Carson)	Mark Dierking (Metro)
Coby King (El Segundo)	Jimmy Shih (Caltrans)
Scott Mitnick (El Segundo)	Sarah Horn (Caltrans)
Ken Berkman (El Segundo)	Daniel Kopulsky (Caltrans)
Louis Atwell (Inglewood)	Rafael Molina (Caltrans)
Lisa Trifiletti (Inglewood)	Olina Wibroe (Sen. Allen's Office)
Tunisia Johnson (Inglewood)	Tami Podesta (HNTB)
Omar Pulido (Inglewood)	William Gorham (Plenary Group)
Elias Sassoon (Rancho Palos Verdes)	Julie Ann Anopol (Willdan Fin. Services)
Leslie Scott (Beach Cities Transit)	David Leger (SBCCOG)
Ernie Crespo (GTrans)	Steve Lantz (SBCCOG)
Godfrey Offoegbu (Torrance Transit)	Jacki Bacharach (SBCCOG)
Mike Bohlke (Metro BOD)	

II. Consent Calendar

A. August 12, 2019 Transportation Committee Minutes

B. October 2019 Transportation Update

MOTION by Committee Member Butts, 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 yesterday and discussed the potential transfer of funds from the Measure R South Bay Highway Program. The working group also heard presentations from Caltrans on the I-405 work being done as well as the Sepulveda / Pacific Coast Highway resurfacing project scheduled for FY 2021/22.

B. Transit Operators Working Group Update

Ms. Rooney reported that at the last TOWG meeting, the group discussed the potential Measure R SBHP transfer and potential project applications they were considering submitting.

C. Metro Service Council – Don Szerlip

Mr. Szerlip reported that the Service Council will be meeting at the Lennox Library beginning in January, not the Carson Community Center as previously reported. Mr. Szerlip also brought the committee's attention to a time-sensitive issue being handled by Metro's Planning Committee regarding inclusion of Green Line improvements in the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) for 2020. Mr. Szerlip passed out copies of a letter submitted by the South Bay Service Council to Metro urging the inclusion of improvements such as station platform extensions, traction power upgrades, and grade separation of one of the rail lines at the Wye intersection with the Crenshaw/LAX line. Mr. Szerlip suggested the committee consider submitting a similar letter. The Service Council's letter is available here:

http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_SBSC%20GL%20RTIP%20Letter.pdf

Chair Horvath asked if the RTIP coincided with the Green Line mid-life re-build. Mr. Szerlip explained that the RTIP is done annually and covers approximately 5 years of vision, compared to the Long-Range Transportation Plan that covers about 20 years. So the RTIP does not necessarily correlate to the mid-life updates of rail lines.

MOTION by Committee Member Tanaka, seconded by Committee Member Herring, to submit a letter to Metro urging the inclusion of the Green Line upgrades in the RTIP.

IV. Annual Performance Evaluation Report – Received and Filed

Mr. Lantz gave an overview of the report, explaining that it tracks progress against an annual set of milestone goals established by city staff in July of each year. This tool is used to monitor project delivery and can help track potential delay-causing issues. The report is available online here:

http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_October%202019%20APE%20report.pdf

MOTION by Committee Member Butts, seconded by Committee Member Valentine, to **RECEIVE and FILE** the Annual Performance Evaluation Report. No objection. So ordered.

V. Evaluation of Applications Submitted for Measure M & R Call for Projects

Updated Exhibits were handed out and are available here:

http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_REVISED%20Attachment%20D%20C%20Exhibit%201%20-%20Measure%20R%20Revenue%20vs.%20application%20summary%20v2.pdf; and http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_%20REVISED_Attachment%20D%20Exhibit%202%20-%202010.31.2019%20project%20applications%20for%20fund%20transfer%20considerations.pdf

Mr. Lantz began by giving an overview of the transfer option, explaining that the Measure R ordinance allows a transfer of funds between the Measure R Highway Sub-Fund and the Measure R Transit Sub-Fund once every 10 years, the first time being 2020. Mr. Lantz noted that he learned earlier this morning that sufficient SBHP contingency fund would be transferred from the highway sub-fund to the transit sub-fund to provide appropriate contingency capacity if the transfer occurs. Metro also needs to set a public hearing and provide 30-day notice to the public prior to the Board considering the transfer so the earliest action could be taken would be the January 23, 2020 Metro Board Meeting.

Mr. Lantz also noted that SBCCOG staff is recommending Board approval of a recommendation to Metro that the South Bay's entire \$130 million Measure M Sub-Regional Equity Program funding be accelerated (from its 2043 programmed year) and be used for the regionally-significant Centinela Grade separation project on the Crenshaw-LAX line.

Mr. Lantz reported that the SBCCOG received 48 project applications by the October 31 deadline, 34 of which are highway projects and the remaining 14 being transit projects. Working off Exhibit 1, Mr. Lantz explained that there is approximately \$918M available through FY29 in uncommitted Measure R SBHP and Measure M MSP projects. The Green Line South extension would require a 3% local match which could be provided by the funds, which is approximately \$40-60M based off current cost estimates for the extension. Approximately \$741M would remain in Measure R and M sub-regional programs through FY29 after those costs. The SBCCOG received

about \$1.3B in applications. The majority of the highway project applications were for freeway improvements along the I-405 (South Bay Curve project). Ms. Bacharach cautioned that the project applications have not been vetted yet and that some may not be eligible but added that substantial changes in funding needed are unlikely.

Ms. Rooney asked if there was a timeframe in which Metro is expected to act on the transfer. Mr. Lantz explained that all subregions must transfer at the same time and that the North County may be considering a transfer. The Metro Board will have to approve the transfer by a 2/3 majority.

Mr. Kopulsky shared that Caltrans looks to Measure R as a major source of funding since much of their funding is for rehab/maintenance and that operational improvement funds are often allocated using a state-wide competitive application.

Chair Horvath asked if the SBHP matching requirements would apply to the transit funding as well. Mr. Lantz explained that it is a decision for the SBCCOG Board to make but cautioned that the program might be best served by including a matching policy. Ms. Bacharach took this time to pass out the revised Exhibit B which lists the local match needed by projects should the same SBHP policies be applied. Also handed out was a list of potential funding sources that could be used to complement funds requested from the SBCCOG's programs (for both highway and transit projects). This handout is available here:

http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_Selected%20Transportation%20Funding%20Sources.pdf

Mr. Semaan commented that historically, there has always been excess funding available. On behalf of the IWG, he shared the group's concern that a potential allocation of significant size could jeopardize the delivery of crucial infrastructure projects over the next decade due to financial constraints. The working group is requesting the Committee take no action this month to allow for further review of applications and a refinement of the project lists.

Committee Member Butts took the opportunity to share his view on the transfer and why it is needed. He explained that during his career as a police officer, there are always going to be elected officials who have reasons why processes must be created and followed. However, if he sat back and waited for all of the processes to happen, the progress he achieved would not have been possible. This is why he feels the \$560M transfer should be made. He explained that his motion (available here: http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_2019.11.14_SBCOG_Mayor%20Butts%20Motion%20RE%20Highway%20Transfer%20%28003%29.pdf) would allow for increased flexibility in the South Bay by allowing cities to spend the funding on both highway AND transit projects. He revised his motion to note that unused transit funds should automatically revert back to highway funding.

Committee Member Boyles added that he is a co-author of the motion and supports the transfer. The benefits of what happens in Inglewood will benefit all of the South Bay and will have huge impacts on traffic everyone deals with.

Mayor Furey added that he feels important for the South Bay to take control of this funding and noted that now is the opportunity to do so. He also mentioned that Torrance, as a net contributor of hundreds of millions of dollars to the transportation sales taxes, wants to make sure the money is spent in the South Bay on transit systems that will help alleviate traffic.

Mr. Szerlip asked to confirm that should the transfer be done and there are unused funds, can those funds be used for highway projects without having to be re-transferred back to the highway program. Mr. Lantz noted that it would be dependent on the Metro Board motion. Committee Member Butts stated again that it is all about providing the South Bay the flexibility to fund both highway and transit projects.

Mr. Ervin shared that Supervisor Hahn will support the will of the cities. He also noted that the metrics by which projects were judged (level of service) when Measure R was passed has now shifted to reduction in vehicle miles travelled, so there is a big push to get people out of their cars and into transit.

After no further discussion, Chair Horvath noted the **MOTION** on the table by Committee Member Butts, seconded by Committee Member Boyles that the South Bay Cities Council of Governments ("COG") adopt and direct the use and adhere to the following framework to justify the transfer of Measure R Highway Funds to Transit Funds, as allowed in Section 11 of the Measure R Ordinance, as follows:

1. At the COG November 21, 2019 Board Meeting adopt this Motion to formally request that the Metro Board set for Public Hearing as prescribed in Section 11 the approval of a total transfer of \$560M from the South Bay COG Measure R Highway Capital Subfund (Line 33 in the Measure R Expenditure Plan) to the Measure R Transit Capital Subfund for January 23, 2020.
2. In collaboration with the Metro Chief Planning Officer, finalize a list of transit projects from South Bay project sponsors through a robust and transparent vetting process to be completed by January 2020. The selection of the projects should advance transportation sustainability goals (e.g. transit, transit-related infrastructure and clean bus technology) and the reduction of greenhouse gases and VMT.
3. In preparation for the January 23, 2020 Public Hearing, issue a report to the Metro Chief Executive Officer that includes the following:
 - A. A proposed list of South Bay Transit Capital Projects and Project Sponsors that the Metro Board would consider approving by a majority vote as part of the South Bay COG's normally scheduled Budget Request process.
 1. The COG should consider waiving Measure R local match requirements to be consistent Measure M requirements for transit-related projects.
 2. Should transit funds not be utilized, such funds would automatically revert back to the Measure R Highway Fund at any time.
 - B. Consider Measure R Highway Operational Improvement Funds and any other transit-related Metro capital funding as a match to funding transferred from the Measure R Highway Sub-Fund to the Transit Sub-Fund by the 2/3 vote of the Metro Board.
4. Provide a report back to the COG's Steering Committee once the Metro Board approved all items above at the January 23, 2020.

No objection. So ordered.

Mr. Lantz gave a brief background on the Centinela Grade separation project, explaining that when the line was first designed, the Inglewood Entertainment District was not conceived, and no consideration was given to a grade separation of the line as it crosses Centinela Ave just north of the intersection of Florence/Centinela. Current projections anticipated level F service at this intersection almost all day long due to the frequent street closures to allow the train to pass. In order to reduce this delay, rail line must be grade separated (either trenched or aerial).

Mr. Szerlip asked to confirm that the rail line would be opened first, then the tracks would be re-routed during construction of the grade separation. Committee Member Butts confirmed that that would be the process, and that federal funds would be jeopardized if the rail line didn't open on time.

Committee Member Butts, seconded by Committee Member Boyles, **MOVED** that South Bay Cities Council of Governments request Metro to use \$130 million in South Bay Sub-Regional Equity Program funding to the Centinela Grade Separation Project and inform the Metro Board of its decision in this matter; and further **MOVED** THAT the COG Board send a formal Request to the Metro Board requesting the Metro Board to recognize the COG's decision and commit to funding the Centinela Project and instruct the CEO and Metro staff to finalize negotiations with the South Bay Cities Council of Governments its *Subregional Equity Program* allocation in the not to exceed amount of \$130 million in order to ensure the construction of the Centinela Grade Separation construction project; and In similar fashion to the July 24, 2019 Metro Board Action regarding the Metro Gold Line Extension to Claremont, the sources of funds for the recommended action include but are not limited to eligible discretionary regional Proposition A, Proposition C, Measure R and Measure M sales tax revenues and other regional, state, or federal funds, based on availability, in accordance with the cash flow needs of the project.

No objection. So ordered.

Committee Member Boyles then raised the issue of El Segundo's Park Place project currently underway. The EIR was funded through the Measure R SBHP and the project would provide a new roadway to connect the El Segundo Employment Area to Rosecrans east of PCH which would help alleviate congestion on PCH. The City

has been receiving pushback from Metro Staff regarding the eligibility of the project and is requesting the SBCCOG officially endorse the project and agree that it meets Measure R eligibility requirements.

MOTION by Committee Member Boyles, seconded by Committee Member Butts, to have the SBCCOG Board send a letter to Metro supporting the completion of the Park Place project in El Segundo which the SBCCOG continues to support as an eligible project which meets Measure R requirements. **No objection. So ordered.**

Ms. Bacharach summarized that the following actions that will be going to the SBCCOG Board on November 21st:

- Report on the letter to Metro regarding the Green Line improvements/RTIP: must be submitted prior to the SBCCOG Board meeting, so the Committee action will be reported to the SBCCOG Board;
- Recommendation on the transfer of funds to transit;
- Recommendation on use of sub-regional equity funding on the Centinela Grade Separation project;
- Recommendation that a letter be submitted to Metro officializing the SBCCOG Board's support of El Segundo's Park Place project and its eligibility under Measure R.

VI. Three Month Look-Ahead – Received and Filed

MOTION by Committee Member Butts, seconded by Committee Member Tanaka to **RECEIVE and FILE** the three-month look ahead. No objection. So ordered.

VII. Announcements / Adjournment

Committee Chair Horvath adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m. to December 9, 2019.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

December 2, 2019

TO: SBCCOG Transportation Committee
SBCCOG Board of Directors

FROM: Steve Lantz, SBCCOG Transportation Director

RE: SBCCOG Transportation Update Covering November 2019

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

USDOT Shifts Funding Emphasis To Roads

The U.S. Department of Transportation announced \$900 million in new infrastructure grants in November for 55 projects in 35 states. More than 72% of the grant funds are going to states that supported President Trump in the 2016 election. The latest annual grants continue a three-year shift to rural roads and away from former President Obama’s emphasis on funding bus and rail transit, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian projects.

Here’s how the Obama and Trump transportation priorities compare:

	Obama <u>FY14-FY16</u>	Trump <u>FY17-FY19</u>
Road/Bridge	34.8%	70.4%
Mass Transit	27.8%	8.5%
Rail	15.7%	9.2%
Port/Maritime	11.2%	11.2%
Bike/Ped	10.5%	0.0%
Aviation	0.0%	0.7%

STATE

New Federal Vehicle Emission Rules Worry California Transportation Planners

The Trump Administration lowered national emissions standards on Nov. 26th for new cars and trucks, pre-empting California’s tougher state emission restrictions. California has sued. Officials with CALCOG, which represents transportation planning agencies around the state, said the new federal emissions standards could lead to almost 15 million more metric tons of ??? per year by 2025 and that nearly \$130 billion in new projects could face project delivery delays or a loss of funding.

Fearing loss of millions of dollars in federal funds for key road projects, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) on November 18th rushed its new Metropolitan Transportation Plan to the Federal Highway Administration in hopes that it will be judged

under existing California emission standards rather than the Trump Administration's less stringent "Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient Vehicles Rule for Model Years 2021-2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks." Planners are worried that the new emissions regulations could cause metropolitan areas around the state to fall out of compliance with federal Clean Air Act air quality rules. If that happens, those areas may no longer qualify for federal funds needed to build infrastructure to keep up with planned growth.

Transportation planning areas at risk of losing federal funds include the Sacramento Area, the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, Los Angeles and five surrounding counties, San Diego County and the San Joaquin Valley. Sacramento is most at risk because it is the first metropolitan area required to submit a new transportation plan for federal approval.

Uber, Lyft Tout California Ballot Measure As Good For Drivers, Academics Disagree
Tech employers in California are seeking to place a proposition on the November 2020 state ballot that will challenge AB 5, the landmark labor law that guides whether workers are independent contractors or employees.

Under California law, employees are entitled to greater labor protections, such as minimum wage laws, sick leave, and unemployment and workers' compensation benefits, which do not apply to independent contractors. An "ABC test", that came out of a State Supreme Court ruling on the subject, allows for the classification of independent contractors only if employers can verify that the worker:

- (A) is free from the control and direction of the hirer in connection with the performance of the work, both under the contract for the performance of such work
- (B) performs work that is outside the usual course of the hiring entity's business
- (C) is customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, or business of the same nature as the work performed for the hiring entity.

Uber, Lyft and DoorDash officially filed the "Protect App-Based Drivers and Services Act" to the California Attorney General's Office on Oct. 29, saying it will help workers maintain independence without forgoing benefits that would be mandatory under AB 5. The companies have pledged \$90 million for the campaign.

If supporters can collect the necessary 660,000 signatures to put the initiative on the November 2020 ballot, the California Labor Federation, an organization that represents 1,200 unions, is preparing to go head-to-head with the companies.

A new report from University of California, Berkeley's Labor Center concluded that loopholes in the proposal could leave some drivers with less than \$6 an hour — far beneath California's soon-to-be \$13 an hour minimum wage. While the ballot initiative claims Lyft and Uber will guarantee drivers at least 120% of the minimum wage, the analysts concluded that instead of a promised \$15.60, the actual wage paid could end up being roughly \$5.64 per hour due to unpaid waiting time and related expenses, underpayment of driving expenses, and unpaid payroll taxes and employee benefits.

REGION

Hundreds Of Metro Bikeshare Bikes Stolen, Stripped

David Goldstein, of CBS LA News, reported on November 7th that almost one-third of bicycles provided through Metro's taxpayer-funded Bike Share program have been lost, stolen

or stripped for parts. The 973 missing bikes total approximately \$1.7 million in losses. Metro says 329 bikes have been recovered, but has not estimated of the cost to make repairs needed to return the recovered bikes to the active fleet.

The \$36 million, three-year Metro bike share program has approximately 3,000 bikes throughout the county in electronic racks, which can be unlocked using an app with your credit or debit card for \$5 a day.

Congestion Pricing Touted To Help Equity, Climate Efforts

Congestion pricing was on the agenda at the CoMotion LA conference held on November 17th and 18th as leaders from throughout the country discussed the potential of the pricing strategy to change driver behavior and generate new revenue for transit improvements that address equity and climate change.

New York City is set to be the first U.S. city to introduce a congestion pricing model. Seattle and Los Angeles are also studying its feasibility. But there needs to be the political will to stand up to initial opposition. Stockholm, Sweden ran into significant blowback when it introduced its congestion pricing plan, although officials say it has achieved the desired effect on traffic.

LA Metro CEO Phil Washington suggested a system should fund free transit, something he acknowledged is a "lofty goal". In his speech, Washington said congestion pricing would smooth the flow of traffic in the area being charged. But linking the revenues with free transit in the area and eliminating that expense could mean the difference in affordable housing and could impact homelessness.

After \$350 Million Revamp, Metro A Line Riders Could Save 5 Minutes, Or Not

During a November 2nd ceremonies marking the completion of a \$350 million renovation of Metro's 22-mile A Line from Downtown LA to Long Beach, officials promised time savings and improved reliability compared to the predecessor Blue Line.

When Metro officials announced the closure of the Blue Line for its mid-life rebuild, they said the improvements would shave 10 minutes from the travel time between Long Beach and Los Angeles, reducing a 58-minute trip to 48 minutes. However, the newly published A Line Schedule has a 53-minute end-to-end schedule, a 5-minute improvement over the pre-renovation Blue Line.

But that travel time assumes the revitalized line is reliable. So far, reliability has continued to be a significant issue. Two hours after the celebrations ended, a signal problem near downtown L.A. triggered a series of delays. In the weeks since, the line experienced more than two dozen delays linked to rail cars, gate crossings, overhead power lines and the signal system.

A major source of delays, stemmed from problems with the A Line's new power system. The wires were installed too low in five locations. As a result, the power system had to be fixed and half of the trains in the A Line's fleet were damaged and had to be repaired.

Metro also had to fix a crossing gate at 108th Street and Willowbrook Avenue, where the arms were coming down too slowly before trains entered the intersection. Until the gate was fixed, all trains had to stop before entering the crossing.

Metro staff attributed the failures to the shortened pre-opening testing period. Even with the opening delayed by a month, construction continued right up to the deadline. Before opening a new line, Metro typically spends at least a month running empty trains on the tracks to find and fix any problems. Such testing on the A Line was truncated to 30 hours.

L.A. City Teams With Private Sector In Transportation Technology Alliance

Los Angeles City is creating a public-private partnership to develop a range of transportation technology programs with partners initially including self-driving tech leader Waymo, ride-share operator Lyft, the Avis Budget Group, and Verizon.

The alliance, to be known as Urban Movement Labs, is the first-of-its-kind involving tech and transportation companies, along with the operator of Los Angeles International Airport, Los Angeles' Department of Transportation, the Port of Los Angeles, and the L.A. Cleantech Incubator. Input from L.A.'s diverse neighborhoods, nonprofits and academics from UCLA, the University of Southern California and Caltech will also help guide the effort.

The alliance will be tasked with managing the explosive growth in the use of ride-share services that have brought convenience but also contributed to congestion, and the surge in micro-mobility scooter and bike services that eliminate some car trips but can also clog sidewalks. Reducing the impact of massive volumes of freight trucked out of the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach will also be a focus of the new effort.

The program includes an "Urban Proving Grounds Initiative" to encourage testing of technology and services in different neighborhoods, that Garcetti said could range from enclosed environments like LAX to denser parts of the city such as downtown Los Angeles.

Uber Appeals L. A.'s Suspension Of Uber's Scooters And Bikes Permit, Sues City

Uber's permit to rent out Jump e-scooters and e-bikes was "temporarily suspended" by the Los Angeles Department of Transportation on November 4th due to the company's failure to comply with city requirements on real-time ridership data. But Uber has appealed the suspension and is suing the city.

Uber's Jump scooters and bikes can remain on the streets during the appeal hearing process which has not yet been scheduled. Officials from Uber, which owns Jump, freely admit the company has never been in full compliance from the start of LADOT's dockless mobility pilot program that is studying how they move throughout the city in an effort to create a data-based standard for how the vehicles will fit into L.A.'s big-picture mobility future.

All scooter and e-bike companies operating in the city are required by The L.A. Department of Transportation to submit real-time data on all their vehicles. If LADOT can't see where Jump's vehicles are in real-time, they can't check if they're obstructing building entrances and wheelchair access, or blocking fire hydrants or other emergency infrastructure. There are three key data points the city collects:

- location of trip start
- location of trip end
- the route taken to get from A to B

Uber is the only operator not in compliance with city guidelines because it has not provided key data in real-time. Uber is sending trip start and end data on a 24-hour delay. Uber argues its recalcitrance in releasing the required raw data with two key points:

- 1) It's too personal - LADOT says on its website that LADOT only collects information on the electric vehicles, not on the people riding them. Several data privacy organizations, including the Electronic Frontier Foundation and the Center for Democracy and Technology, have backed Uber's argument. The Center for Democracy and Technology, a nonprofit group of personal data advocates, expressed concern in an open letter that even de-identified location data can be re-identified to the device user with relative ease.
- 2) It's against policy - Uber's current privacy policy states that the company does not share data without the consent of the user. That includes sharing data with governments.

Uber has a good reason to approach data privacy with an abundance of caution, given its infamous 2016 data breach and cover-up. All 50 states and Washington D.C. filed lawsuits against the company. Uber ultimately agreed to pay \$148 million and put stronger data security measures in place.

Eight companies have permits to operate scooters and electric bikes in L.A., including Uber, Bird, Lime and Lyft. They collectively oversee a fleet of about 32,000 vehicles that make about 1 million trips per month.

TRENDS

Air Shuttle Aims To Fly Commuters Over The Gridlock

A team of entrepreneurs in Southern California wants to shuttle thousands of long-distance commuters between airports from Santa Barbara to San Diego. More than 3,000 people have signed up, company officials say.

Their new start-up is named Float — the name coined from “fly over all traffic”. The service expects to carry its first passengers in January for a monthly charge starting at \$1,250, approximately \$60 a day if used Monday through Friday. By comparison, helicopter companies charge roughly \$200 a trip for similar service.

Float, in partnership with Southern Airways Express, will use a fleet of Cessna Grand Caravans. The company plans to employ two Southern Airways pilots on each flight, double the federal requirement.

The nine-passenger airplanes will hop between dozens of small airports across the region, such as Van Nuys Airport in Los Angeles and Brown Field Municipal Airport in San Diego. Customers will be able to reserve seats using an app and board without the long lines caused by security checks.

The company is soliciting information from prospective customers through its website to determine which routes will have the highest demand. The initial routes will depend on demand. Customers can choose routes between nearly 40 commercial and general aviation airports, such as Zamperini Field in Torrance, Hawthorne Municipal Airport, Hollywood Burbank Airport, Van Nuys Airport, and Long Beach Airport.

No information was provided on the options and costs of first/last mile connections between the airports and the customer's origin and destinations.

Columbus, Ohio Pilots Curbside Management Program

Columbus, OH introduced a new curbside management pilot program on November 18th in partnership with mobility company curbFlow in a bid to manage demand for deliveries and ride-hailing pick-ups and drop-offs. The 12-month pilot program is managing nine locations in the city's downtown area and along one of its major commercial corridors.

Under the partnership, Columbus' Division of Parking Services clearly marked Loading Management Zones (LMZs) for use by commercial vehicles and private vehicles doing commercial work, like being used for ride-hailing. Drivers use a curbFlow app to reserve and check in and out of an LMZ.

CurbFlow partnered with Washington, DC earlier this year to research and analyze demand at nine locations where commercial deliveries often result in double parking. Company analysts collected data on the 12-week pilot as part of a study to determine curb space safety, utilization, productivity and equitable access.

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Attachment C

November 26, 2019

To: SBCCOG Infrastructure Working Group – December 4, 2019 Meeting
SBCCOG Transportation Committee – December 9, 2019 Meeting
SBCCOG Transit Operators Working Group – December 12, 2019 Meeting

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

Subject: Evaluation of Applications Submitted for FY 20-21 Metro Budget Request

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

Impacts of Measure R Decennial Transfer Board Actions

The SBCCOG Board of Directors unanimously approved motions (see Exhibit 1) at its November 21, 2019 meeting to:

1. Request Metro to transfer \$560 million in the Measure R Expenditure Plan line item titled “South Bay Ramp and Interchange Improvements: 1-405, I-110, 1-105, SR-91”, commonly referred to as the South Bay Highway Program (SBHP), from the Measure R Highway Sub-fund to the Measure R Transit Sub-fund.
2. SBCCOG to consider waiving the local match requirement for Measure R SBHP projects to be consistent with the SBCCOG Measure M MSP policy that does not require a local match
3. Request Metro provide funding now for the Crenshaw/LAX Rail Line Centinela Grade Separation Project using the South Bay’s Sub-Regional Equity Program funds of \$130 million.
4. Support the Park Place highway project in the City of El Segundo as an eligible Measure R SBHP project.

Exhibit 2 summarizes the funding available from the Measure R SBHP and Measure M MSPs for new projects by 2029. In addition to the potential \$560 million Measure R Transit Transfer, SBCCOG staff has identified approximately \$358 million in uncommitted Measure M funds over the next decade.

Matching Funds

The motion passed by the SBCCOG Board also stated that the COG should consider waiving Measure R local match requirements to be consistent with Measure M requirements for transit-related projects. There are no match requirements for Measure M transit-related projects because transit is not an approved expenditure for Measure M.

SBCCOG staff would advise that it is premature to consider waiving the local match requirements for Measure R when the highway and transit project applications have not been evaluated and the cost of applications significantly exceeds available funds over the next decade.

Current Funding Availability

SBCCOG staff has also identified the following additional potential priority uses of available Measure R & M funds:

1. Complete current SBHP projects – Beyond the project phases currently funded in active project funding agreements, approximately \$140 million is needed to complete project construction or procurements for project delivery phases that are not included in current funding agreements. This figure assumes no local match for future project phases of current projects and new projects. However, in order to fund as many new projects as possible, applications that include matching funds could be awarded incentive points in the project evaluation process. Potential matching fund sources could include, but are not limited to in-kind staff time, regional, state and federal grants, easements and land contributions for the transportation project, developer fees, and/or participation from other incremental income streams from development enabled by or benefitting from a private development.
2. Provide the 3% local match for the Green Line South Bay Extension to Torrance - Metro requires local jurisdictions through which it builds rail lines to contribute 3% of the construction cost if a station is located within, or within a ½ mile of the local jurisdiction boundary. Under this Metro policy, a contribution equal to the apportioned route-mile cost of constructing the project through the jurisdiction would be required from Redondo Beach and Torrance, and Lawndale. Metro policy requires the commitment to be made when final design reaches 30% which could occur by 2024-25 in order for the Green Line South Bay Extension to be completed by 2028. The local jurisdiction can provide the match from any source, but in the absence of other sources, Metro will allocate the local jurisdiction's Local Return funding for up to 15 years to meet the commitment.

The exact scope of work for which the funding will be applied, the exact funding amounts, allocations and timing will not be known until the EIR is completed and final design reached 30%. SBCCOG staff estimates this commitment will exceed \$40 million.

It is clear that the SBCCOG cannot fully fund \$410 million in new transit applications and \$972.6 million in new highway project applications submitted by Caltrans, Metro and local jurisdictions by 2029. However, Measure R continues through 2039 and the Measure M sales tax rate rises from a half-cent to one cent in 2030 and continues indefinitely. the FY 20-21 Metro Budget Request.

Next Steps

SBCCOG administers an annual call for project applications that results in an SBCCOG Metro Budget Request. The applications require lead agencies to describe project need and benefits, a projected project schedule and an annual financial plan that shows all sources of funding and the SBHP share. Using this data, SBCCOG reviews new projects for eligibility, evaluates eligible

projects for their relative merit by assigning points to each application, updates funding needed for current projects and compiles the annual funding that would be required to deliver the current and new projects. The data is then used to prepare a list of recommended project phases and a five-year projection of funding available for each current and new recommended project.

Prior to considering a Measure R sub-fund transfer, Metro must hold a public hearing and it must be noticed 30 days in advance of the decision by the Metro Board. For this reason, the Metro Board is expected to notice the required public hearing at its December 5, 2019 meeting and then consider the SBCCOG Board request along with other transfer requests from throughout L. A. County at its January 23, 2020 meeting. The Metro sub-fund transfer item requires a 2/3 affirmative vote by the Metro Board.

The FY 20-21 MBR will need to reflect the policy direction that will result from the Metro Board consideration of a Countywide Sub-Fund Transfer. Following approval of the Transfer policies by the Metro Board, the SBCCOG Board will be able to transmit a financially-constrained South Bay MBR for Metro Board consideration. Lead agencies and L. A. Metro staff will be able to execute a funding agreement amendment for existing projects or an initial funding agreement for approved new projects once their project(s) is/are approved by the Metro Board.

While Metro is determining whether to approve the Sub-Fund Transfer policy, SBCCOG staff will spend December and January focusing on the short-term process and data needed to develop the FY20-21 Metro Budget Request. South Bay lead agencies that submitted new highway and transit projects by the October 31, 2019 deadline will be asked to provide an estimate of the annual funding requested from the South Bay Measure R and/or M Sub-Funds for reimbursements during each year of the upcoming five-year project delivery period and the balance of South Bay Sub-Regional funding that would be anticipated beyond the five year period to complete the project.

This data will allow the SBCCOG and Metro to confirm the near-term cashflow requirements of the South Bay programs. During December 2019, SBCCOG, hopefully in coordination with Metro staff, will confirm project application eligibility and develop project selection evaluation criteria and scoring for the transit and highway funding categories.

During January 2020, SBCCOG staff will consult with Metro staff to confirm any Metro policy changes that would affect the amount of annual Measure R SBHP and Measure M MSPs funding that will be available during each of the next five years for South Bay highway and transit projects and confirm the cost to complete current SBHP projects. Staff also will rank the new applications within the transit or highway category.

Based on these reviews and the funding available in FY 20-21, SBCCOG staff will compile the draft FY 20-21 Metro Budget Request for SBCCOG Board consideration at its February 27, 2020 Board meeting. The Metro Board is expected to consider the SBCCOG Board's MBR at its April 23, 2020 Board meeting. Following the MBR approvals by Metro, each project lead agency will need to execute a funding agreement with Metro before initiating a project.

RECOMMENDATION

The Committees and Board may receive and file this report or provide new direction.

Exhibit 1 – SBCCOG Board Motion approved on November 21, 2019

Exhibit 2 - Measure R SBHP and Measure MSP Funding Availability by 2029

Exhibit 3 – FY 2020-21 Metro Budget Request Project Applications List

Exhibit 4 – Project Applications by Jurisdiction

AMENDMENTS TO MOTION BY

Mayor James T. Butts, City of Inglewood, Mayor Patrick J. Furey, City of Torrance, and Mayor Drew Boyles, City of El Segundo

November 2114, 2019

Los Angeles County voters approved in 2008 Measure R, a 30-year half-cent sales-tax formally known as: The Traffic Relief and Rail Expansion Program. Measure R aims to ease traffic congestion within the region and provide alternative modes of transportation for Los Angeles County residents and visitors. This includes the South Bay Subregion where major transportation investments and programs are required.

The South Bay Cities Council of Governments (“COG”), a joint powers authority, representing the local jurisdictions in this subregion, serves a co-program manager with Metro to help guide and oversee the South Bay Measure R program. The COG has examined the growing needs to fund a broad array of transit-related Capital Projects throughout the South Bay subregion to implement transit mobility improvements, including transit-related infrastructure, and is reconsidering the previous emphasis on Highway Capital Projects.

Measure R recognizes that over the thirty (30) year legislative lifespan of the Ordinance, the likelihood that highway and transit priorities within the individual Subregions may change, especially during the second and third decades of the Ordinance.

To address the emerging and unforeseen priorities, the Measure R voter approved Ordinance includes a provision that allows the transfer of Subregional net revenues to transfer from the Highway Capital Fund Category in Measure R to the Transit Capital Fund Category (See Attachment A “Ordinance #08-01 Traffic Relief and Rail Expansion Ordinance” Section 11a and 11b”).

Now, on January 1, 2020, this provision would allow the Metro Board to transfer Net Revenues from the Highway Capital Fund to Transit Capital Fund with a two-thirds majority vote of the Board. 2

This week, the Metro Chief Executive Officer briefed the Planning and Programming, and Executive Management Committees, requesting to develop a process by which the Metro Board will consider such a transfer to address transit needs countywide. Metro staff reconfirmed that Measure R identifies allowable uses for the transfer including Capital Project Contingency to pay interest on debt, and noted that that there is insufficient future sales tax revenue to pay the transit interest, including planned future transit debt, and stated that a future \$500 million transfer is estimated to be needed from highway to transit. While staff will develop a transparent vetting process and ultimately make a future recommendation for the transfer, staff also noted that it will work with the South Bay subregion on the reprogramming of funds to another project or projects of regional benefit.

Today, it is appropriate for the South Bay COG to consider this transfer given the passage and implementation of Senate Bill 743, which shifts emphasis away from vehicle level of service (LOS)

and now focuses on trip reduction and reductions in vehicle miles of travel (VMT). To address climate change, the South Bay COG should work to align its program with State's goals to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and improve public health through more active transportation and transit. Additionally, because the transfer can occur only once and is now anticipated to occur in 2020, the time is now for the South Bay COG to authorize its desire for such a transfer to address critical transit needs in the subregion.

WE MOVE THAT the South Bay Cities Council of Governments ("COG") adopt and direct the use and adhere to the following framework to justify the transfer of Measure R Highway Funds to Transit Funds, as allowed in Section 11 of the Measure R Ordinance, as follows:

1. At the COG November 21, 2019 Board Meeting adopt this Motion to formally request that the Metro Board ~~set for Public Hearing as prescribed in Section 11 the approval of~~ incorporate into the Measure R Amendment Process -a total transfer of \$560M from the South Bay COG Measure R Highway Capital Subfund (Line 33 in the Measure R Expenditure Plan) to ~~the-a new~~ Measure R Transit Capital Subfund as part of its Measure R Amendment and transfer process in for January, 2020, -and request staff to include the reprogramming of such funds in all staff reports and recommendations associated with this transfer process.
2. In collaboration with the Metro Chief Planning Officer, finalize a list of transit projects from South Bay project sponsors through a robust and transparent vetting process to be completed by January in 2020. The selection of the projects should advance transportation sustainability goals (e.g. transit, transit-related infrastructure and clean bus technology) and the reduction of greenhouse gases and VMT.
3. ~~In preparation for the January 23, 2020 Public Hearing,~~ Issue a report to the Metro Chief Executive Officer that includes the following:
 - a. A proposed list of South Bay Transit Capital Projects and Project Sponsors that the Metro Board would consider approving by a majority vote as part of the South Bay COG's normally scheduled Budget Request process.
 - i. The COG should consider waiving Measure R local match requirements to be consistent Measure M requirements for transit- related projects.
 - ii. Should transit funds not be utilized, such funds would automatically revert back to the Measure R Highway Fund at any time.
 - b. Consider Measure R Highway Operational Improvement Funds and any other transit-related Metro capital funding as a match to funding transferred from the Measure R Highway Sub-Fund to the Transit Sub-Fund by the 2/3 vote of the Metro Board.
4. Provide ~~a-monthly~~ report backs to the COG's Steering Committee regarding the countywide transfer process and provide a report back once the Metro Board approved all items, including the total transfer of \$560M from the South Bay COG Measure R Highway Capital Subfund (Line 33 in the Measure R Expenditure Plan) to the Measure R Transit Capital Subfund. -above at the January 23, 2020.

###

ATTACHMENT A:

Ordinance # 08-01 - SECTION 11. "AMENDMENTS"

a. Metro may amend this Ordinance, including Attachment A, with the 9 exception of Section 11, for any purpose, including as necessary to account for the results of any environmental review required under the California Environmental Quality Act of the individual specific projects listed in Attachment A. Any such amendments shall be approved by a vote of not less than two-thirds (2/3) of the Metro Board of Directors. Metro shall hold a public meeting on proposed amendments prior to adoption. Metro shall provide notice to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the city council of each city in Los Angeles County, and the public of the public meeting and proposed amendments, and provide them with a copy of the proposed amendments, at least 30 days prior to the public meeting. Amendments shall become effective forty-five days after adoption.

b. Notwithstanding Section 11(a) of this Ordinance, Metro shall not adopt any amendment to this Ordinance, including Attachment A, that reduces total Net Revenues allocated to the sum of the Transit Capital Subfund and the Highway Capital Subfund. Not more than once in any ten (10) year period commencing after the year 2019, Metro may adopt an amendment transferring Net Revenues between the Transit Capital Subfund and the Highway Capital Subfund. c. Notwithstanding Section 11(a) of this Ordinance, Metro shall not adopt any amendment to this Ordinance, including Attachment A, that reduces Net Revenues allocated to the Operations Subfund or the Local Return Subfund. d. Metro may amend Section 11 of this Ordinance if such amendments are approved by a vote of not less than two-thirds (2/3) of the Metro Board of Directors and are approved by a simple majority vote of the electors voting on a measure to approve the amendment. Metro shall hold a public meeting on proposed amendments prior to adoption by the Board. Metro shall provide notice to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, the city council of each city in Los Angeles County, and the public of the public meeting and proposed amendments, and provide them with a copy of the proposed amendments, at least 30 days prior to the 2 public meeting. Amendments shall become effective forty-five days after adoption by 3 the electors.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Highway Programs Revenues vs Project Requests

Revenues

Measure R Uncommitted Revenues Through 2029: \$560 million

Measure M Uncommitted Revenues in 3 MSPs through 2029 \$358 million

Total Funds Available \$918 million

Possible Commitments

Cost to Complete active SBHP and MSP projects: (\$140 million)

Green Line South 3% Local Match (\$ 50 million)

Total Possible Commitments (\$190 million)

Net M/R Sub-Regional Funds available through 2029 \$728 million

Total Highway and Transit Applications received as of 10/31/19 \$1.3 billion

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Attachment C, Exhibit 3: Fy 2020/2029 Measure R Commitments & Fund Transfer Project Applications

Metro FA Project ID	Lead Agency/Description	Project Type (Hwy/Transit)	New Funding Requested Through 2029				Potential Measure R/M Funding**	Potential Local Match required**
			MR SBHP	MM HOIP	MM TSMMP	MM SREP		
New Project Requests								
1	Beach Cities Transit Operations and Maintenance Facility	T	\$33,433,950				\$20,116,975	\$13,316,975
2	Beach Cities Transit* CNG Bus Replacement (nine vehicles)	T	\$5,611,895				\$4,889,516	\$722,379
3	Beach Cities Transit* Zero Emission Bus Conversion (eight vehicles)	T	\$11,000,000				\$8,900,000	\$2,100,000
4	Carson Circuit Regional Transit Center	T	\$2,745,000				\$2,596,000	\$149,000
5	Gardena Transit Solar Charging Fueling System Expansion	T	\$2,000,000				\$2,000,000	\$0
6	Gardena Transit* Bus Replacement (CNG/EV - 15 vehicles)	T	\$12,375,000				\$9,587,500	\$2,787,500
7	Gardena Transit Service Expansion Bus Purchase (CNG/EV - 30 vehicles)	T	\$24,750,000				\$15,775,000	\$8,975,000
8	Inglewood Transit Centinela Grade Separation	T				\$130,000,000	\$130,000,000	\$0
9	Inglewood Transit Transit Connector Project	T	\$250,000,000				\$34,350,000***	\$1,110,650,000
10	Torrance Transit Expansion Buses (20 CNG/4 EV)	T	\$20,000,000				\$13,400,000	\$6,600,000
11	Torrance Transit Return of the Red Car Urban Circulator Trolley	T	\$4,500,000				\$4,000,000	\$500,000
12	Torrance Transit Regional Transit Center Parking Structure	T	\$40,000,000				\$23,400,000	\$16,600,000
13	Torrance Transit MicroTransit Expansion	T	\$240,000				\$240,000	\$0
14	Torrance Transit Construction of Heavy-Duty Electric Vehicle Charging Station	T	\$3,500,000				\$3,200,000	\$300,000
Totals:			\$410,155,845			\$130,000,000	\$272,454,991	\$1,162,700,854
1	Caltrans/Metro I-110 Improvements at PCH off-ramp (EA34810)	H	\$43,000,000				\$24,900,000	\$18,100,000
2	Caltrans/Metro Auxiliary lanes on Route 405 from Artesia Boulevard to El Segundo Boulevard (EA 35310)	H	\$145,800,000				\$76,300,000	\$69,500,000
3	Caltrans/Metro I-405 from El Segundo Blvd. to Imperial Highway - northbound Aux Lanes and Ramp Widening (EA 36570)	H	\$154,200,000				\$80,500,000	\$73,700,000
4	Caltrans/Metro I-405 Improvements from Main Street to Western Avenue	H	\$200,000,000				\$103,400,000	\$96,600,000
5	Caltrans/Metro I-405 from I-110/Main Street to Wilmington Avenue - Aux Lanes (EA 35940)	H	\$145,800,000				\$76,300,000	\$69,500,000
6	Caltrans/Metro Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) Improvements (EA 32580) (Local Projects)	H	\$8,400,000				\$7,120,000	\$1,280,000
7	Metro/Caltrans I-405 Improvements from Western to Crenshaw	H	\$60,000,000				\$33,400,000	\$26,600,000
8	Metro/Caltrans I-105 Integrated Corridor Management	H	\$23,309,750				\$15,054,875	\$8,254,875
9	Carson ITS-fiber, cameras, hardware, and communication devices	H		\$700,000			\$700,000	\$0
10	Carson Avalon Blvd TSSP	H		\$1,530,000			\$1,530,000	\$0
11	Carson Sepulveda Blvd. Widening	H	\$7,360,000				\$6,288,000	\$1,072,000
12	El Segundo Park Place Gap Closure (Design/ROW support)	H	\$5,000,000				\$4,400,000	\$600,000
13	El Segundo Park Place Gap Closure (ROW/Construction)	H	\$120,000,000				\$63,400,000	\$56,600,000
14	Gardena Redondo Beach Blvd. Operational Improvements	H	\$5,567,000				\$4,853,600	\$713,400
15	Hawthorne Crenshaw Blvd Mobility Project	H			\$9,000,000		\$7,600,000	\$1,400,000
16	Hawthorne Rosecrans Ave Mobility Project Phase II	H			\$4,500,000		\$4,000,000	\$500,000
17	Hermosa Beach Pacific Coast Highway Mobility and Accessibility Project	H		\$11,400,000			\$9,100,000	\$2,300,000
18	Inglewood Changeable Message Signs and CCTV	H		\$7,000,000			\$6,000,000	\$1,000,000
19	Inglewood Connected Vehicles	H		\$10,000,000			\$8,400,000	\$1,600,000
20	Inglewood Downtown ITS	H		\$11,100,000			\$8,950,000	\$2,150,000
21	Inglewood First/Last Mile	H			\$6,500,000		\$5,600,000	\$900,000
22	Inglewood* I-405 Overpass project	H	\$21,000,000				\$13,900,000	\$7,100,000
23	Inglewood Manchester Blvd Improvement Project	H			\$17,000,000		\$11,900,000	\$5,100,000
24	Inglewood Prairie Avenue Improvement Project	H			\$9,000,000		\$7,600,000	\$1,400,000
25	Inglewood TMC Expansion	H		\$4,000,000			\$3,600,000	\$400,000
26	LA County DPW Westmont/West Athens Pedestrian Plan Phase II	H			\$1,165,000		\$1,165,000	\$0
27	Palos Verdes Estates PV Drive West Corridor Expansion	H		\$676,500			\$676,500	\$0
28	Port of Los Angeles SR-47/Vincent Thomas Bridge / Front Street/Harbor Blvd reconfiguration	H	\$25,170,760				\$15,985,380	\$9,185,380
29	Rancho Palos Verdes Western Avenue Improvements Project	H	\$3,300,000				\$3,040,000	\$260,000
30	Redondo Beach Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) Improvements at Palos Verdes Boulevard	H	\$4,700,000				\$4,160,000	\$540,000
31	Redondo Beach North Redondo Beach Bikeway (NRBB) Extension - Felton Lane to Inglewood Avenue - Construction	H			\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	\$0
32	Redondo Beach North Redondo Beach Bikeway (NRBB) Extension - Inglewood Avenue - Design	H			\$200,000		\$200,000	\$0
33	Redondo Beach Traffic Signal Communications and Network System	H		\$2,000,000			\$2,000,000	\$0
34	SBCCOG South Bay Fiber Network	H		\$2,500,000			\$2,400,000	\$100,000
Totals:			\$972,607,510	\$50,906,500	\$48,365,000		\$615,423,355	\$456,455,655

* indicates potentially ineligible project

**Match breakdown is as follows

Requests:	Total Measure R Transit	Total Measure R Hwy	Total Measure M Hwy	Total Measure M TSMI	Total Measure M SREP	Total Requests
	\$410,155,845	\$972,607,510	\$50,906,500	\$48,365,000	\$130,000,000	\$1,612,034,855
***Rail - Metro Rail local match policy						
Funding would serve as the 3% local match to the total project cost						
0% on first \$2M						
20% on amount between \$2M and \$10M						
50% on amount over \$10M						

Program	Funding Available	Committed Funds through FY29	Total Uncommitted Funds through FY29	Estimated Cost to Complete Current Commitments	Net Available Funds through FY29
Total Measure R Transit	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total Measure R Hwy	\$801,100,000	\$236,685,000	\$564,415,000	\$126,925,000	\$437,490,000
Total Measure M Hwy	\$152,767,625	\$2,950,000	\$149,817,625	\$474,397	\$149,343,228
Total Measure M TSMI	\$321,184,308	\$112,712,359	\$208,471,949	\$5,879,094	\$202,492,855
Total Measure M SREP	\$130,000,000	\$0	\$130,000,000	\$0	\$130,000,000

Program	Funding Requested FY20-29	Net Available Funds through FY29	Net Surplus/Deficit
Measure R Transit	\$410,155,845	\$437,490,000	-\$945,273,355
Measure R Hwy	\$972,607,510	\$149,343,228	\$98,436,778
Measure M Hwy	\$50,906,500	\$202,492,855	\$154,127,855
Measure M TSMI	\$48,365,000	\$130,000,000	\$0

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Attachment C, Exhibit 4

<u>Lead Agency Applicant</u>	Amt. Requested	Requested for:		# of projects:	
		Highway	Transit	Hwy.	Trans.
Beach Cities Transit (for HB, MB, RB)	\$ 50,045,845		\$ 50,045,845		3
Caltrans/Metro					
I-110	\$ 43,000,000	\$ 43,000,000	\$ -	1	
I-405 South Bay Curve	\$ 507,800,000	\$ 507,800,000	\$ -	5	
PCH - Local agency elements	\$ 8,400,000	\$ 8,400,000	\$ -	1	
I-105	\$ 23,309,750	\$ 23,309,750	\$ -	1	
Carson	\$ 12,335,000	\$ 9,590,000	\$ 2,745,000	3	1
El Segundo	\$ 125,000,000	\$ 125,000,000	\$ -	2	
Gardena	\$ 44,692,000	\$ 5,567,000	\$ 39,125,000	1	3
Hawthorne	\$ 13,500,000	\$ 13,500,000	\$ -	2	
Hermosa Beach (beyond BCT 1/3 req.)	\$ 11,400,000	\$ 11,400,000	\$ -	1	
Inglewood (incl. \$130 mil. SREP project)	\$ 465,600,000	\$ 85,600,000	\$ 380,000,000	8	2
Lawndale	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Lomita	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Los Angeles City (Port of LA)	\$ 25,170,760	\$ 25,170,760	\$ -	1	
Los Angeles County	\$ 1,165,000	\$ 1,165,000	\$ -	1	
Manhattan Beach (beyond BCT 1/3 req.)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Palos Verdes Estates	\$ 676,500	\$ 676,500	\$ -	1	
Rancho Palos Verdes	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 3,300,000	\$ -	1	
Redondo Beach (beyond BCT 1/3 req.)	\$ 7,900,000	\$ 7,900,000	\$ -	4	
Rolling Hills	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Rolling Hills Estates	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
SBCCOG	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 2,500,000	\$ -	1	
Torrance	\$ 68,240,000	\$ -	\$ 68,240,000		5
Total Requested During 10-Year Transfer	\$ 1,414,034,855	\$ 873,879,010	\$ 540,155,845	34	14

Sub-Regional R/M Funding Available by June 2025 for new transit or highway projects

Measure R/M Funding Available by June 2025	\$ 298,000,000
Funding programmed for current projects by June 2025	\$ (115,000,000)
Add'l funding needed for current projects by June 2025	\$ (144,000,000)
Net available for new projects by June 2025	\$ 39,000,000

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Measure R / Measure M Highway Programs

December 2019	January 2020	February 2020
<p>4. IWG Agencies Only Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBHP Project APE Report • FY 2020-21 Metro Budget Request Project list recommendation <p>5. Metro Board meeting NOTE: Combined Metro November / December meeting will be held on on December 5, 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to set hearing date to allow transfer of SBHP funds from Measure R Highway to Transit Subfund • Motion to use SB SREF for Centinela Grade Separation Project <p>9. SBCCOG Transportation Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBHP Project APE Report • FY 2020-21 Metro Budget Request project list recommendation <p>9. SBCCOG Steering Committee</p> <p>12. Transit Operators Working Group (tentative)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2020-21 Metro Budget Request project list recommendation <p>13. Metro South Bay Service Council</p> <p>NOTE: No SBCCOG Board Meeting in December</p>	<p>8. IWG Open to the Public Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2020-21 Metro Budget Request Recommendation • SBHP Project APE Report • Spotlight: Illegal Dumping <p>9. Transit Operators Working Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2020-21 Metro Budget Request Recommendation <p>10. Metro South Bay Service Council</p> <p>3. SBCCOG Transportation Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBHP Project APE Report • FY 2020-21 Metro Budget Request Recommendation • South Bay Measure M MSP Development Program Update <p>13. SBCCOG Steering Committee</p> <p>23. Metro Board meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to transfer SBHP funds from Measure R Highway Subfund to Transit Subfund <p>23. SBCCOG Board Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FY 2020-21 Metro Budget Request Approval 	<p>12. IWG Open to the Public Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBHP Project APE Report • Spotlight: Pavement Preservation and Rehabilitation <p>10. SBCCOG Transportation Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SBHP Project APE Report <p>10. SBCCOG Steering Committee</p> <p>13. Transit Operators Working Group</p> <p>14. Metro South Bay Service Council</p> <p>27. Metro Board meeting</p> <p>27. SBCCOG Board Meeting</p>

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK