

# South Bay Cities Council of Governments

## Transportation Committee

### **NOTE CHANGED LOCATION:**

**Hawthorne Memorial Center (Polaris Room)  
3901 W. El Segundo Blvd., Hawthorne, CA 90250**

### AGENDA

**Monday, March 9, 2020**

**10:30 a.m. – 11:45 a. m.**

- 10:30 a.m. Welcome / Self-Introductions**
- 10:32 a.m. Consent Calendar**
  - a. February 10, 2019 Transportation Committee Minutes (Attachment A) - Approve**
  - b. March 2020 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**
- 10:40 a. m. Monthly Project Status Update (To be distributed at meeting)**
- 10:45 a. m. Recommended Applications and Funding Allocations for FY 20-25 Measure M MSPs Metro Budget Request (Attachment C) – Recommend Approval**
- 11:00 a. m. Recommended Applications and Funding Allocations for FY 20-25 Measure R SBHP Metro Budget Request (Attachment D) –Recommend Approval**
- 11:15 a. m. Metro NextGen Study Impacts (Attachment E) – Review and Discuss, Provide Direction**
- 11:25 a. m. Metro Bus Rapid Transit Vision and Principles – Receive and File**
- 11:40 a. m. Three-Month Look Ahead (Attachment F) – Receive and File**
- 11:45 a. m. Announcements / Adjournment**

*Next Transportation Committee meeting –Monday, April 13, 2020, 10:30 a. m.*

*To include an item in the agenda, e-mail to: [lantzsh10@gmail.com](mailto:lantzsh10@gmail.com) by April 2, 2020.*

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee
February 10, 2020
Meeting Minutes

COMMITTEE CHAIR HORVATH CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 10:38 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)
James Butts (Inglewood)
Geoff Rizzo (Torrance)

Non-Voting Representatives

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

Also in attendance were the following persons:

- Cheryl Ebert (El Segundo)
Alex Chou (Lawndale)
Tunisia Johnson (Inglewood)
Lisa Tifiletti (Inglewood)
Omar Pulido (Inglewood)
Nasser Razepoor (Rancho Palos Verdes)
Kim Turner (Torrance Transit)
Leslie Scott (Beach Cities Transit)
Michael Ervin (Sup. Hahn's Office)
Maryam Adhami (LACDPW)
Jimmy Shih (Caltrans)
Daniel Kopulsky (Caltrans)
Mike Bohlke (Metro Deputy to James Butts)
Mark Dierking (Metro)
Craig Hoshijima (Metro)
Laurie Lombardi (Metro)
Scott Greene (Metro)
Jane Cataldo (Lynn Capouya Inc.)
David Leger (SBCCOG)
Natalie Champion (SBCCOG)
Steve Lantz (SBCCOG)
Kim Fuentes (SBCCOG)

II. Consent Calendar

- A. January 13, 2020 Transportation Committee Minutes - APPROVED
B. February 2020 Transportation Update - RECEIVED AND FILED

MOTION by Committee Member Butts, seconded by Committee Member Pimentel, 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 is scheduled to meet later this week so there is nothing new to report since the last meeting. Mr. Semaan noted that a sub-committee meeting was held with representatives from the IWG and Transit Operators Working Group to review Metro Budget Request match policies and project scoring.

B. Transit Operators Working Group Update

Mr. Lee reported that the TOWG met on February 6th and discussed the status of the Measure R Decennial Transfer policy under consideration by the Metro Board. There was additional discussion on the "Micro by Metro" initiative, which is Metro's foray into microtransit. The next TOWG meeting is scheduled for March 5th.

C. Metro Service Council

Mr. Szerlip reported that the Service Council has been focusing on Metro's NextGen Bus Plan. A NextGen Public Workshop was held on February 4th in San Pedro. The next meeting will be combined with a NextGen workshop and will include details on proposed changes to South Bay lines. Mr. Szerlip passed around the

schedule of NextGen workshops, available online here:

[http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation\\_committee/HANDOUT\\_Metro%20NextGen%20Workshops%20.pdf](http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_Metro%20NextGen%20Workshops%20.pdf)

#### **IV. Annual Performance Evaluation Report / Monthly Status Report**

Mr. Lantz explained that historically, Metro has required monthly and quarterly reports for Measure R and M projects. Metro recently eliminated the monthly reporting requirement. The monthly reports have provided the data for the Annual Performance Evaluation Report. The draft monthly status report was passed out showing the format going forward. The APE report will be distributed quarterly. The monthly status report is available online: [http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation\\_committee/HANDOUT\\_Draft%20SBHP%20Project%20updates.pdf](http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_Draft%20SBHP%20Project%20updates.pdf)

#### **V. Evaluation Criteria, Match Formula, Project Ranking for Recommended FY 20-21 Metro Budget Request Project Applications – DEFERRED TO MARCH MEETING**

Mr. Lantz reviewed Attachment C with the Committee. Mr. Lantz noted that in addition to \$340M in “cost to complete” projects, the SBCCOG received applications for 22 highway and 11 transit projects totaling over \$1B in funding requests. The project applications identified only 1.2% in matching funds in their applications. SBCCOG has had a matching policy for ten years that required no match for projects below \$2 million in cost with an increased match in increments as project costs got larger. The sub-committee of IWG/TOWG representatives proposed a new matching formula as shown in the Attachment C. However, SBCCOG staff is recommending the use of the existing Measure R SBHP policy for this budget request because it allows more projects to be funded (as it requires a greater matching share).

Mr. Semaan noted that the sub-committee’s proposal was written in a way to stimulate project development since it would eliminate the local match up to \$20M and the match has been prohibitive for most SBCCOG cities. He suggested that the breakdown could be revised to still stimulate city projects without requiring a match above the \$2M level like the existing policy requires.

Mr. Szerlip asked if these were the only two options to choose from. Committee Chair Horvath explained that these are just recommendations and that the Committee can adopt whatever breakdown it feels is best.

Ms. Turner asked if the project applications that were submitted in October would be subject to these match breakdowns. Mr. Lantz explained that that is the plan, and that the one policy would apply to both highway and transit project applications.

Committee Member Butts shared his view that the projects and their schedules should drive the funding matrices. He added that he requested Metro staff attend this meeting to provide clarification on what funding is available to be used. Committee Member Butts then introduced Ms. Lombardi and Mr. Hoshijima who explained that in Measure M, there is an annual limit on the amount available to be spent in each MSP. However, in Measure R there is no annual maximum. This means that the SBCCOG can choose to spend up to the balance of the \$906M available through 2039. Mr. Hoshijima clarified that during the Great Recession, the Metro Board enacted a policy that eliminated the use of “inflation funds” previously identified in Metro financial documents, and that since the organization has not recovered from the recession yet, that policy is still in place. This means that the Measure R SBHP only has \$906M in funding, not \$1.5B adjusted for inflation.

Committee Member Butts added that his policy aims to increase the flexibility of the funding and that transit projects have better chances to reduce VMT and GHG emissions more than Caltrans highway projects, and therefore should take priority over Caltrans projects. Mr. Lantz added that the SBHP was originally created to fund highway projects and was expanded through SBCCOG advocacy to also include local projects benefitting the state highway/freeway system.

Committee Member Rizzo shared his view that this item contains too many action items that also require additional information. He recommended that Item 1 be removed from the list, Item 4 requires a decision on the match formula, so the only items to act on would be #2 and #3. Committee Member Rizzo made a MOTION to APPROVE the match formula as recommended by the Subcommittee. Committee Member Butts seconded the motion. Upon further discussion, Committee Member Butts noted that as Metro Chair, he will provide the SBCCOG additional time to submit its Metro Budget Request, and subsequently withdrew his second to the motion. With no second, Committee Member Rizzo withdrew his motion.

Committee Member Butts made a **MOTION** to order the Subcommittee to look at both match scenarios, what projects could be funded under each, and to make a decision at the March meeting. Second by Committee Member Rizzo. No objection. So ordered.

Committee Chair Horvath reminded the Committee that the SBCCOG Board is dark in March, and the Steering Committee acts as Board. Therefore, this item will be acted on by the Transportation Committee and immediately transmitted to the Steering Committee following that meeting for approval. Please be sure to attend these meetings.

#### **VI. Metro NextGen Transit Study Update – RECEIVED AND FILED**

Mr. Greene provided a quick presentation to the Committee on Metro's NextGen Bus Plan. Mr. Greene explained that the plan was driven by data (TAP cards and cell phone data) and was used to increase the efficiency of the Metro bus system. A series of workshops are being held throughout the county to review specific changes taking place in each Service Council region. Due to limited time remaining, Mr. Greene urged everyone to check out the Metro website which includes several tools to see proposed route changes, including a trip planner to show current vs. proposed trip times under the new plan. There will also be a presentation to the SBCCOG Board in February on the NextGen Plan. If approved by the Metro Board, implementation would begin December 2020 and continue through 2021.

Mr. Lantz asked if there was coordination with the local municipal operators. Mr. Greene noted that Metro is working closely with the municipal operators to identify overlap and opportunities for the local operators to take over lines Metro no longer will be running.

Mr. Greene handed out a copy of his presentation which is available online here: [http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation\\_committee/HANDOUT\\_NextGen%20Bus%20Plan%20presentation.pdf](http://southbaycities.org/sites/default/files/transportation_committee/HANDOUT_NextGen%20Bus%20Plan%20presentation.pdf)

#### **VII. Three Month Look-Ahead**

No discussion on this item.

#### **VIII. Announcements / Adjournment**

Committee Chair Horvath adjourned the meeting at 11:47 a.m. to March 9, 2020.

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

March 9, 2020

TO: SBCCOG Transportation Committee  
 SBCCOG Board of Directors

FROM: Steve Lantz, SBCCOG Transportation Director

RE: SBCCOG Transportation Update Covering February 2020

**Adherence to Strategic Plan:**

*Goal A: Environment, Transportation and Economic Development.* Facilitate, implement and/or educate members and others about environmental, transportation and economic development programs that benefit the South Bay.

**FEDERAL**

**President’s FY 2021 Budget Proposes \$1 Trillion Infrastructure Investment**

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

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

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

**Builders and Truckers At Odds Over Options To Fund Highways, Roads, Bridges**

The American Trucking Association and the American Road & Transportation Builders Association initiated competing campaigns on February 24<sup>th</sup> to influence U. S. Senate deliberations on how to pay for a five-year, \$287 billion highway bill (S. 2302). Senate

committees are considering a new commercial vehicle-mileage tax as one of three pillars—along with indexing the motor fuels tax and taxing electric vehicles—to pay for highways, roads, and bridges.

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

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

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

### **U. S. Pedestrian Fatalities In 2019 Highest Since 1988**

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

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

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

In addition to examining pedestrian fatality crash characteristics, the report discusses comprehensive strategies to reduce pedestrian and motor vehicle crashes, addressing promising infrastructural, educational and enforcement approaches. It also outlines specific examples from states, such as targeted law enforcement efforts, outreach in high-risk areas, pedestrian safety assessments and road safety audits, and support for engineering efforts.

The full report, including infographics and state-by-state data, is available at: [ghsa.org/resources/Pedestrians20](https://ghsa.org/resources/Pedestrians20).



## **Cargo Fee Legislation Re-Introduced To Support Federal Freight Mobility Network**

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

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

## **STATE**

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

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

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

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

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

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

AB 2121, introduced on February 6<sup>th</sup>, would require Caltrans to convene a committee of external street design experts to work on revisions to the state's Highway Design Manual, which mandates the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile method. The bill would essentially pause the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile rule and allow local governments to retain current speed limits for specific zones, like school zones, business districts and residential areas — if road surveys show more traffic crashes are happening on those roads.

The bill also would require the California Traffic Safety Program to include a traffic safety monitoring program that identifies and addresses locations with pedestrian- and bicyclist-related crashes but does not include any change to speed enforcement cameras.

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

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

## **REGION**

### **Crime Down On Metro Buses and Trains**

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

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

### **L. A. City Transportation Committee Approves Bus, Walk, Bike Network Improvements**

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

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

The implementation plan also calls for a comprehensive Citywide network of active transportation corridors for walking, bicycling, and micro-mobility. The motion requires the implementation plan to complete at least one major regional project and one neighborhood-oriented network per year. The projects will be prioritized based on the Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles' Community Equity and Health Index. The implementation plan must also include projected mobility benefits and emission reductions.

The L. A. City Department of Transportation is also directed by the City Council action to develop a congestion pricing pilot program with the goal of unveiling a joint proposal with Metro by January 2021.

Read the full text of the Mayor's February 10<sup>th</sup> Executive Directive at:  
<https://www.lamayor.org/sites/g/files/wph446/f/page/file/20200210ExecutiveDirective25.pdf>.

### **L.A. Metro To Launch Three-Year MicroTransit Pilot Program For Short Trips**

The L. A. Metro Board at its February 27<sup>th</sup> meeting approved a three-year ride-hailing MicroTransit pilot project for short trips within six designated service zones.

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

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

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

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

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

For more information, visit [www.metro.net/projects/microtransit/](http://www.metro.net/projects/microtransit/).

## **TRENDS**

### **Mobility Trends To Look Out For In 2020**

Here are some of the trends that transportation experts are predicting will change mobility in the next year:

- Increased focus on urban travel time goals as technology-enabled mobility services emerge.
- Auto ownership will continue to decline as Mobility As A Service (MAAS) surges.

MAAS begins with a trip planner that is linked to one-stop payment for a range of mobility services – ride-hailing, e-scooters, e-bikes, taxis, public transport, and tolls. MAAS will continue to become integrated multi-modally with anonymized open-data trip planning and secure payment systems that include all mobility choices and payments. MAAS has attracted \$6.8 billion to date, but is expected to grow to over US\$100 billion by 2030.

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

### **TRB Publishes Report On Technology's Impact On Transportation And Land Use**

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

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

The report is available at: <http://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/179645.aspx>

# South Bay Cities Council of Governments

## Attachment C

March 9, 2020

To: SBCCOG Transportation Committee  
SBCCOG Steering Committee

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

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

### Adherence to Strategic Plan:

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

### BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

Once Metro approves the SBCCOG's funding requests, Metro and the lead agency execute a funding agreement for some or all of the project phases. Metro structures its funding agreement cashflow plans based on anticipated reimbursements tied to anticipated progress on major project

phases (e.g.: environmental clearance, design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction). Metro requires lead agencies to document full funding of each implementation phase that is included in a funding agreement. Consequently, SBCCOG must request funding for each implementation phase for which the lead agency expects to be reimbursed during the upcoming five years. Since a project phase can require reimbursements over multiple years and multiple phases may be completed during the five year period, the SBCCOG five-year Measure M Metro Budget Request provides Metro and the project lead agencies a planning basis for establishing reasonable funding reimbursement schedules over the next five years.

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

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

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

1. Updated schedules and funding requests for Active project phases in current funding agreements;
2. “Cost to complete” estimates provided by lead agencies for projects that have a current funding agreement but will need additional funding amended into an active funding agreement for project implementation phases that are not currently in the active funding agreements; and,
3. New project requests that were submitted by October 31, 2019 by lead agency applicants for which new funding agreements will be needed.

Project Application Evaluation and Scoring

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

<u>MSP Increment of Project Cost</u>	<u>MSP Funding Share</u>
Under \$20 million	100%
\$20 million to \$35 million	90%
\$35 million to \$75 million	30%
\$75 million +	20%

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### NEXT STEPS

The subcommittee recommendations will be considered by the Transportation Committee at its March 9, 2020 meeting. Because there is no Board of Directors meeting in March, the Steering Committee is delegated SBCCOG approval authority and will consider the Transportation Committee recommendations immediately after the March 9<sup>th</sup> Transportation Committee

meeting. The SBCCOG Request should be transmitted to L. A. Metro immediately after SBCCOG Steering Committee approval for inclusion in L. A. Metro's FY 2020-21 budget which begins July 1, 2020.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. The funding share formula recommended by the IWG/TOWG Subcommittee be used to calculate Measure M MSP commitments needed to complete active and new Measure M MSP projects.
2. The annual funding allocations listed in Exhibit 1 for recommended projects.
3. The SBCCOG Measure M MSPs Metro Budget Request be transmitted to the L. A. Metro Chair and Board of Directors by March 13, 2020.

Attachment:

Exhibit 1 – FY 2021-2025 Funding allocations for Measure M MSP active projects and new project applications



FY21-25 South Bay Measure M MSPs Metro Budget Request Exhibit 1

Measure M Highway Efficiency & Operational Improvements (HEOI) Program				FY19-20	FY20-21	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24	FY24-25	FY26-29 Funding Needed	
Project Number	Lead Agency/Project Description	HEOI Funding Requested	Match Funds								
MM5507.01 PSE, ROW, C	Hawthorne North East Hawthorne Mobility Improvement Project	\$2,950,000	\$0	\$400,000	\$800,000	\$950,000	\$800,000			\$0	
NEW	Caltrans Interstate 110 (I-110) southbound off-ramp to Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) by widening the mainline to add one auxiliary lane and widening the off-ramp to provide a two-lane exit. (EA 34810) PAED/PSE FUNDING ONLY	\$5,781,000	\$0		\$1,850,000	\$1,600,000	\$800,000	\$1,531,000		\$0	
NEW	Caltrans At 405/110 Separation, add auxiliary lanes and widen connectors from Northbound and Southbound 405 to Route 110. (EA 35710) PAED/PSE FUNDING ONLY	\$21,500,000	\$150,000		\$3,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$6,500,000	\$5,000,000	\$4,850,000	\$0	
NEW	Carson Carson Street ITS Project	\$700,000	\$0		\$700,000					\$0	
NEW	Carson Avalon Blvd. TSSP Project	\$1,530,000	\$0		\$130,000	\$700,000	\$700,000			\$0	
NEW	Carson Sepulveda Blvd. Widening from Alameda Street to ICTF	\$8,700,000	\$0		\$1,072,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,628,000		\$0	
NEW	Gardena Redondo Beach Blvd. Arterial Improvements	\$5,567,000	\$0		\$815,000	\$4,752,000				\$0	
NEW	Inglewood Manchester Blvd. Improvements	\$17,000,000	\$0			\$8,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$0	
NEW	Inglewood Downtown ITS	\$11,100,000	\$0			\$3,100,000	\$8,000,000			\$0	
NEW	Inglewood Prairie Avenue Improvements	\$9,000,000	\$0					\$8,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	
Total HEOI Funds requested FY20-24:		\$83,828,000									
				FY19-20	FY20-21	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24	FY24-25		
				HEOI - FY Start Balance	\$22,174,570	\$33,318,008	\$36,786,440	\$25,312,652	\$10,475,428	\$5,130,355	
				HEOI - New Funding	\$11,579,438	\$11,868,932	\$12,153,776	\$12,495,297	\$12,813,927	\$13,159,903	
				FY Total Previously Requested	\$400,000	\$800,000	\$950,000	\$800,000	\$0	\$0	
				FY Total New Request	\$0	\$7,567,000	\$22,652,000	\$26,500,000	\$18,159,000	\$5,850,000	
				FY Total Request	\$400,000	\$8,367,000	\$23,602,000	\$27,300,000	\$18,159,000	\$5,850,000	
				.5% SBCCOG Admin/Proj. Dev.	\$36,000	\$33,500	\$25,564	\$32,521			
				HEOI - End Balance	\$33,318,008	\$36,786,440	\$25,312,652	\$10,475,428	\$5,130,355	\$12,440,258	
Measure M Transportation System & Mobility Improvements (TSMI) Program 1				FY19-20	FY20-21	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24	FY24-25	FY26-29 Funding Needed	
Project Number	Lead Agency/Project Description	TSMI 1 Funding Requested	Match Funds								
MM5502.02 C	Inglewood ITS Improvements	\$13,500,000		\$6,000,000	\$7,500,000					\$0	
MM5502.03 PAED, PSE, C	Inglewood Intermodal Transit/Park and Ride Facility	\$9,193,082		\$4,596,541	\$4,596,541					\$0	
MM5502.09 PSE, C	Inglewood Prairie Ave Reversible Lane System	\$13,120,000		\$6,560,000	\$6,560,000					\$0	
MM4601.01 PAED, PSE, C	LA City San Pedro Pedestrian Improvements and Multimodal Access	\$7,245,710		\$774,500	\$456,155	\$1,759,559	\$4,255,496			\$0	
MM4601.02 PAED, PSE, C	LA City Wilmington Neighborhood Friendly Streets	\$3,000,600			\$175,035	\$187,538	\$2,638,027			\$0	
MM4601.03 C	LA City Avalon Promenade and Gateway	\$8,050,000					\$8,050,000			\$0	
MM5502.04 PAED, PSE, C	LA County 182nd St/Alberston St Traffic Signal Synchronization Program	\$4,228,500					\$4,228,500			\$0	
MM5502.07 PAED, PSE, C	LA County Del Amo Blvd (East) Traffic Signal Synchronization Program	\$1,324,500					\$1,324,500			\$0	
MM5502.06 PAED, PSE, C	LA County Van Ness Traffic Signal Synchronization Program	\$1,702,000					\$1,702,000			\$0	
MM4601.04 PAED, PSE, C	LA County Westmont/West Athens Pedestrian Plan Implementation (Phase 1)	\$6,682,000		\$571,200	\$428,400	\$2,021,066	\$3,661,334			\$0	
MM5502.05 C	SBCCOG South Bay Fiber Network	\$4,389,365		\$4,165,114	\$224,251					\$0	
MM4601.05 PSE, C	Torrance Torrance Schools Safety and Accessibility Program	\$5,027,800		\$51,600	\$2,406,500	\$1,839,200	\$730,500			\$0	
MM5502.08 PAED, PSE, ROW, C	Rolling Hills Estates Palos Verdes Drive North at Dapplegray School intersection enhancements and ADA improvements	\$1,554,300		\$51,300	\$63,000	\$1,440,000				\$0	
Total TSMI 1 Funds requested FY20-24:		\$79,017,857									
				FY19-20	FY20-21	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24	FY24-25		
				TSMI 1 - FY Start Balance	\$7,054,200	-\$12,050,089	-\$30,701,897	-\$34,100,644	-\$56,755,490	-\$52,678,331	
				TSMI 1 - New Funding	\$3,684,366	\$3,776,474	\$3,867,111	\$3,975,776	\$4,077,159	\$4,187,242	
				FY Total Previously Requested	\$22,770,255	\$22,409,882	\$7,247,363	\$26,590,357	\$0	\$0	
				FY Total New Request	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
				FY Total Request	\$22,770,255	\$22,409,882	\$7,247,363	\$26,590,357	\$0	\$0	
				.5% SBCCOG Admin/Proj. Dev.	\$18,400	\$18,400	\$18,495	\$40,265			
				TSMI 1 - End Balance	-\$12,050,089	-\$30,701,897	-\$34,100,644	-\$56,755,490	-\$52,678,331	-\$48,491,089	

FY21-25 South Bay Measure M MSPs Metro Budget Request Exhibit 1

Measure M Transportation System & Mobility Improvements (TSMI) Program 2				FY19-20	FY20-21	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24	FY24-25	FY26-29 Funding Needed	
Project Number	Lead Agency/Project Description	TSMI 2 Funding Requested									
MM4602.01 C	Beach Cities Health District Beach Cities Health District Bike Path	\$1,833,877		\$1,833,877						\$0	
MM4602.02 PAED, PSE, C	El Segundo El Segundo Blvd. rehabilitation and improvements, bike lane installation, and pedestrian accessibility improvements	\$4,050,000			\$465,000	\$3,585,000				\$0	
MM4602.03 PSE, ROW, C	Hawthorne Moneta Garden Mobility Improvement Program	\$3,320,000		\$200,000	\$800,000	\$1,220,000	\$1,100,000			\$0	
MM5508.01 PAED, PSE, C	LA City 5 signal modifications and operational improvements	\$2,800,000		\$230,000	\$240,000	\$90,000	\$2,240,000			\$0	
MM4602.04 PAED, PSE, C	LA City Crossing Upgrades: Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons and Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons at Uncontrolled Crosswalks	\$3,260,625		\$185,531	\$466,594	\$1,308,770	\$1,299,730			\$0	
MM5508.02 PSE, C	LA City ATSAC Communication System Resiliency Improvement in San Pedro	\$2,500,000		\$250,000	\$750,000	\$1,500,000				\$0	
MM5508.03 PAED, PSE, C	LA City ATSAC Fiber Communications Network Integration with LA County	\$2,000,000		\$40,000	\$160,000	\$400,000	\$1,400,000			\$0	
MM4602.05 PAED, PSE, C	LA County Dominguez Channel Greenway Extension	\$3,600,000			\$408,000	\$259,500	\$2,932,500			\$0	
MM5508.04 PSE, C	Manhattan Beach Advanced Traffic Signal System	\$5,440,000		\$1,100,000	\$2,540,000	\$1,800,000				\$0	
MM5508.05 C	Redondo Beach Redondo Beach Transit Center Construction Project	\$4,500,000		\$4,000,000	\$500,000					\$0	
MM5508.06 PSE, C	Torrance Transportation Management System Improvements	\$390,000		\$30,000	\$360,000					\$0	
NEW	Hawthorne Rosecrans Avenue Mobility Improvement Project Phase II from Prairie Ave to Crenshaw Blvd.	\$4,500,000	\$0		\$20,000	\$20,000	\$40,000	\$180,000	\$380,000	\$3,860,000	
NEW	Hawthorne Crenshaw Blvd. Signal Improvement and intersection capacity enhancements from 120th St. to Rosecrans Ave.	\$9,000,000	\$0		\$20,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	\$80,000	\$400,000	\$8,420,000	
NEW	Hermosa Beach Pacific Coast Highway Mobility and Accessibility Improvement Project	\$16,400,000	\$0		\$500,000	\$1,200,000	\$14,700,000			\$0	
NEW	Inglewood First/Last Mile Improvements	\$6,500,000	\$0		\$4,500,000	\$2,000,000				\$0	
NEW	Inglewood Changeable Message Sign and CCTV Project	\$7,000,000	\$0					\$7,000,000		\$0	
NEW	Los Angeles County Westmont/West Athens Community Pedestrian Plan Implementation (Phase 2)	\$1,165,000	\$0		\$84,000	\$84,000	\$362,000	\$635,000		\$0	
NEW	Palos Verdes Estates Palos Verdes Drive West Corridor Expansion Project	\$11,786,500	\$0		\$520,000	\$156,500	\$960,000	\$8,900,000	\$1,250,000	\$0	
NEW	Rancho Palos Verdes Western Avenue Congestion Improvement Project from 25th Street to Palos Verdes Drive North	\$3,330,000	\$0			\$90,000	\$120,000	\$120,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,400,000	
NEW	Redondo Beach North Redondo Beach Bikeway (NRBB) Extension – Felton Lane to Inglewood Avenue	\$1,000,000	\$0		\$500,000	\$500,000				\$0	
NEW	Redondo Beach North Redondo Beach Bikeway (NRBB) Extension – Inglewood Avenue	\$200,000	\$0		\$60,000	\$140,000				\$0	
NEW	Redondo Beach Traffic Signal Communications and Network System	\$2,000,000	\$0		\$200,000	\$1,800,000				\$0	
MM5502.05 Cost to Complete	SBCCOG South Bay Fiber Network (additional funds)	\$2,500,000	\$0		\$2,500,000					\$0	
Total TSMI 2 Funds requested FY20-24: \$99,076,002				FY19-20	FY20-21	FY21-22	FY22-23	FY23-24	FY24-25		
				TSMI 2 - FY Start Balance	\$39,436,067	\$52,061,020	\$57,476,721	\$62,799,087	\$59,716,242	\$65,594,500	
				TSMI 2 - New Funding	\$20,597,361	\$21,112,295	\$21,618,990	\$22,336,483	\$22,793,258	\$23,408,676	
				FY Total Previously Requested	\$7,869,408	\$6,689,594	\$10,163,270	\$8,972,230	\$0	\$0	
				FY Total New Request	\$0	\$8,904,000	\$6,030,500	\$16,222,000	\$16,915,000	\$3,630,000	
				FY Total Request	\$7,869,408	\$15,593,594	\$16,193,770	\$25,194,230	\$16,915,000	\$3,630,000	
				.5% SBCCOG Admin/Proj. Dev.	\$103,000	\$103,000	\$102,854	\$225,098			
				TSMI 2 - End Balance	\$52,061,020	\$57,476,721	\$62,799,087	\$59,716,242	\$65,594,500	\$85,373,176	

# South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Attachment D

March 9, 2020

To: SBCCOG Transportation Committee  
SBCCOG Steering Committee

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

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

## Adherence to Strategic Plan:

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

## Background

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

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

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

Once Metro approves the SBCCOG's funding requests, Metro and the lead agency execute a funding agreement for some or all of the project phases. Metro structures its funding agreement cashflow plans based on anticipated reimbursements tied to anticipated progress on major project phases (e.g.: environmental clearance, design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction). Metro

## South Bay Cities Council of Governments

requires lead agencies to document full funding of each implementation phase that is included in a funding agreement. Consequently, SBCCOG must request funding for each implementation phase for which the lead agency expects to be reimbursed during the upcoming five years.

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

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

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

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

1. The assumption that the Metro Board of Directors will adopt a Measure R Decennial Transfer Policy before July 1 that allows Measure R SBHP funds to be used for highway and transit projects;
2. Updated schedules and funding requests for Active project phases in current funding agreements;
3. “Cost to complete” estimates provided by lead agencies for projects that have a current funding agreement but will need additional funding amended into active funding agreement for project implementation phases that are not in the active funding agreements; and,
4. New project requests submitted by October 31, 2019 by lead agency applicants for which new funding agreements will be needed.

### Project Application Evaluation And Scoring

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

# South Bay Cities Council of Governments

<u>SBHP Increment of Project Cost</u>	<u>MSP Funding Share</u>
Under \$20 million	100%
\$20 million to \$35 million	90%
\$35 million to \$75 million	30%
\$75 million +	20%

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

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

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

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

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

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

The subcommittee also recognized the regional, state and national significance of the estimated \$1 billion Inglewood Transit Connector and the city’s \$250 million request for subregional funds. However, initial five-year funding for the project was recommended to conform to the sub-regional formula that would make available \$230.5 million within the upcoming five years. The city develops more accurate cost estimates and reimbursement schedules, it can request the balance of its formula share up to the \$250 million cap in future Metro Budget Request cycles from funding available after FY 2025.

# South Bay Cities Council of Governments

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

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

## NEXT STEPS

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Included transit projects be approved contingent on approval of the Metro Measure R Transfer Policy;
2. The projects on the list that are noted as defer or deny be removed from the list and further consideration this year;
3. The funding share formula recommended by the IWG/TOWG Subcommittee be used to calculate Measure R SBHP commitments needed to complete active and new Measure R SBHP projects;
4. The annual funding allocations listed in Exhibit 1 for recommended Measure R SBHP projects; and
5. The SBCCOG Measure R SBHP Metro Budget Request be transmitted to the L. A. Metro Chair and Board of Directors by March 13, 2020.

Attachment:

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

FY21-25 South Bay Measure R Metro Budget Request

Exhibit 1

Phase: PAED PSE ROW Construction	Project Title/Description	Total Phase(s) Cost	Match Funds	Total Funds Requested	FY21-24 Funds Requested	20-21 Total	21-22 Total	22-23 Total	23-24 Total	24-25 Total	FY26-29 Funding Needed
<b>Measure R SBHP</b>											
MR312.01	SBCCOG Program Development/Oversight	\$1,061,827	\$0	\$1,061,827	\$1,061,827	\$200,000	\$206,000	\$212,180	\$218,545	\$225,102	\$0
MR312.25 Construction	Caltrans I-405/Crenshaw on/off ramps project (EA 29360)	\$62,000,000	\$0	\$62,000,000	\$62,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$0	\$0
PAED PSE	Caltrans On I-405 N/B construct auxiliary lanes from El Segundo to Imperial Highway (Route 105). Widen the northbound off-ramp to two lanes at the exit to provide two left-turn lanes and a separate right-turn lane. (EA 36570)	\$14,000,000	\$0	\$14,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PAED PSE	Caltrans Construct Transition Lanes along N/B and S/B on Route 405 between Artesia Blvd and El Segundo Blvd.(EA 35310)	\$13,200,000	\$0	\$13,200,000	\$13,200,000	\$10,200,000	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PAED PSE	Caltrans Construct Eastbound and Westbound Auxiliary Lanes between I-110/ Main Street and Wilmington Ave on I-405. (EA 35940)	\$13,200,000	\$0	\$13,200,000	\$13,200,000	\$7,000,000	\$3,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	Caltrans PCH (I-105 to I-110) Overlay Asphalt Concrete, add turn lanes and pockets at various location. (City Projects) (EA 32580)	\$8,400,000	\$0	\$8,400,000	\$8,400,000	\$4,400,000	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PSE Construction	Metro I-105 Integrated Corridor Management	\$23,309,750	\$330,975	\$22,978,775	\$19,509,750	\$650,000	\$1,550,000	\$2,000,000	\$7,309,750	\$8,000,000	\$3,469,025
MR312.57 PSE ROW Construction	City of El Segundo Park Place from Nash St. to Allied Way, Roadway gap closure and railroad grade separation	\$125,000,000	\$68,500,000	\$56,500,000	\$29,000,000	\$600,000	\$2,400,000	\$1,800,000	\$6,200,000	\$18,000,000	\$27,500,000
MR312.32 Construction	Port of Los Angeles State Route 47/Vincent Thomas Bridge & Front St./Harbor Blvd. Interchange Reconfiguration	\$47,982,252	\$10,587,576	\$37,394,676	\$37,394,676	\$0	\$23,250,001	\$12,678,550	\$1,466,125	\$0	\$0
MR312.38 Cost to Complete	City of Redondo Beach PCH at Anita St Improvements (left and right turn lanes)	\$2,100,000	\$0	\$2,100,000	\$2,100,000	\$0	\$2,100,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Measure R Transit Projects (Approval subject to Metro Board approval of the Countywide Decennial Measure R Transfer Policy)</b>											
PAED PSE ROW Construction	Carson Circuit Fashion Outlet Regional Transit Center	\$3,525,000	\$0	\$3,525,000	\$3,525,000	\$1,380,000	\$2,145,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Purchase	GTrans Purchase of up to 15 expansion buses	\$12,375,000	\$0	\$12,375,000	\$12,375,000	\$0	\$4,950,000	\$7,425,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	GTrans Solar Energy Generation/Bus Fueling Infrastructure Project	\$2,000,000	\$0	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$345,473	\$1,654,527	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PAED PSE Construction	Beach Cities Transit Transit Operations & Maintenance Facility	\$33,433,950	\$1,343,395	\$32,090,555	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$32,090,555
Purchase	Torrance Transit Return of the Red Car Urban Circulator Trolley	\$4,500,000	\$0	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Purchase	Torrance Transit Expansion Buses	\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$17,100,000	\$2,900,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	Torrance Transit Regional Transit Center Parking Structure	\$40,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$0	\$35,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Purchase	Torrance Transit MicroTransit Expansion of the Torrance Community Transit Program	\$240,000	\$0	\$240,000	\$240,000	\$60,000	\$180,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Construction	Torrance Transit Construction of Heavy-Duty Electric Vehicle Charging Station	\$3,500,000	\$0	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$3,000,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Design, ROW, Construction	City of Inglewood Inglewood Transit Connector Project	\$1,016,000,000	\$766,000,000	\$250,000,000	\$185,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$65,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$35,000,000	\$65,000,000
		\$1,445,827,779	\$851,761,946	\$594,065,833	\$466,006,253	\$101,935,473	\$178,935,528	\$67,715,730	\$56,194,420	\$61,225,102	\$128,059,580

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

**Exhibit 1**

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



# South Bay Cities Council of Governments

## Attachment E

March 9, 2020

To: SBCCOG Transportation Committee  
SBCCOG Steering Committee

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

Subject: Proposed Metro NextGen Study South Bay Bus Service Changes

### Adherence to Strategic Plan:

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

### BACKGROUND

The Metro bus network carries 70% of all transit riders in the county and had not had a major overhaul in 25 years. Over that time, L. A. County has evolved dramatically, with over a million residents added, the transformation of many local communities with new travel patterns, expansion of the Metro Rail network, and the emergence of new transportation options like ride hailing apps and bike share that have reduced bus and rail ridership in L. A. County (and throughout the nation).

In 2018, Metro began the process of reimagining its bus system to better meet the needs of current and future riders through the NextGen Bus Study by attracting new customers and winning back past customers. A draft NextGen Bus Plan was developed through consideration of both technical data and feedback from nearly 20,000 LA County residents through surveys, questionnaires and 300 meetings, events, presentations and workshops.

The technical analysis and community outreach informed a new Metro NextGen Regional Service Concept that defines the goals and objectives of the new bus network. The new Metro Regional Service Concept was approved by the Metro Board of Directors in Summer 2019. Using the policy, staff released its Draft Service Proposals in January 2020. The comprehensive document provides a detailed line-by-line proposal of changes being considered for implementation over the next 18 months.

The Metro Operations Planning staff presented an executive summary of the draft service proposals at the February 27, 2020 SBCCOG Board Meeting but there was not time to discuss each of the specific changes proposed in the study. SBCCOG staff has reviewed the draft service proposals for Metro bus lines that serve the South Bay.

In order to attract new riders across the regional bus and rail network, increase service frequency, and expand service hours without incurring significant additional operating costs, several outlying lines with relatively low ridership have been consolidated, Rapid Lines have been merged into local service, lines have been shortened or

## South Bay Cities Council of Governments

eliminated. In addition, to improve travel times, the distance between bus stops on some routes has been lengthened and stops have been consolidated or eliminated. The study also identifies a \$1 billion capital improvement program that would provide bus signal priority at intersections, bus lanes on streets, and all-door boarding. The changes recommended for Metro's South Bay bus services are summarized in Exhibit 1.

### RECOMMENDATION

The SBCCOG Transportation Committee may receive and file this report.

Exhibit 1 – Metro NextGen South Bay Bus Service Changes

# South Bay Cities Council of Governments

## **Exhibit 1: Summary of Significant Proposed Metro NextGen Service Changes In The South Bay**

<b>Line #s</b>	<b>Current Line Description</b>	<b>Proposed Changes</b>
40, 740	L. A. Union Station to Inglewood Via Crenshaw Bl. & Florence Av	Increase frequency; eliminate owl service; simplify route
52	DTLA to CSUDH via Avalon Bl	Merge lines 51, 52, 351; increase mid-day/evening frequency
126	Redondo Beach Local Route	Eliminate line
202	Green Line to Wilmington via Alameda Bl., Anaheim St	Discontinue route south of A (Blue) Line
204, 754	Vermont Av. From Hollywood Bl. to I-105	Add service on line 204; only run Rapid (754) service in peak hours on weekdays; consolidate underutilized line 204 bus stops
209	Franklin to 130 <sup>th</sup> on Van Ness Ave.	Eliminate line
210, 710	Crenshaw Bl to Redondo Bch.	Merge 210, 710 to double frequency, add owl service, discontinue north segment between Wilshire Bl and Sunset and segment south of El Camino College
212, 312 40, 710	La Brea Av. / Hawthorne Bl. from Hollywood to S. B. Galleria	Merge line 212, 312; eliminate 40, 710; increase frequency; add owl service
246	Avalon Bl. From S. B. Galleria to San Pedro	Increase frequency, eliminate owl service, minor re-routing
344	Artesia Bl. / Hawthorne Bl. From Harbor Gateway T. C. to PV Penn.	Discontinue route south of Silver Spur Rd. through Rancho Palos Verdes; increase mid-day service
442	La Brea/Manchester/Figueroa from Green Line to DTLA	Eliminate line which is peak weekday express service
510, 950	Silver Line service on I-110 frwy.	Shorten 950 to serve El Monte to Harbor Gateway; add new 510 between San Pedro and I-105 with reduced service frequency; introduce a 510/950 transfer
550	Express Bus from San Pedro to Exposition Park / USC	Eliminate line that currently runs 7-days a week
607	Circular route serving South Central, Windsor Hills, Inglewood, Crenshaw	Eliminate line that provides peak weekday service
625	Green Line Shuttle on Imperial Bl. between LAX and La Cienega Bl.	Eliminate line that provides peak weekday service

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

## South Bay Measure R / Measure M Highway Programs

March 2020	April 2020	May 2020
<p><b>9. SBCCOG Transportation Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBHP Projects Monthly Status Report</li> <li>• Measure R/M Metro Budget Requests</li> <li>• Metro NextGen Transit Study</li> <li>• Metro BRT Vision and Principles Study</li> </ul> <p><b>9. SBCCOG Steering Committee</b></p> <p><b>11. IWG Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBHP Projects Monthly Status Report</li> <li>• Spotlight: Illegal Dumping Collaboration</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Transit Operators Working Group</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measure R/M Metro Budget Requests</li> <li>• Metro NextGen Transit Study</li> </ul> <p><b>13. Metro South Bay Service Council</b></p> <p><b>19. SBCCOG General Assembly</b></p> <p><b>26. Metro Board meeting</b></p> <p><b>SBCCOG Board Meeting is Dark in March</b></p>	<p><b>13. SBCCOG Transportation Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBHP Project Quarterly APE Report</li> </ul> <p><b>13. SBCCOG Steering Committee</b></p> <p><b>15. IWG Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBHP Project Quarterly APE Report</li> <li>• Spotlight: TBD</li> </ul> <p><b>TBD. Transit Operators Working Group</b></p> <p><b>10. Metro South Bay Service Council</b></p> <p><b>23. Metro Board meeting</b></p> <p><b>23. SBCCOG Board Meeting</b></p>	<p><b>11. SBCCOG Transportation Committee</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBHP Monthly Projects Status Report</li> </ul> <p><b>11. SBCCOG Steering Committee</b></p> <p><b>13. IWG Meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SBHP Monthly Projects Status Report</li> <li>• Spotlight: TBD</li> </ul> <p><b>TBD. Transit Operators Working Group</b></p> <p><b>8. Metro South Bay Service Council</b></p> <p><b>28. Metro Board meeting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measure R Decennial Transfer Policy</li> </ul> <p><b>28. SBCCOG Board Meeting</b></p>

**THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**