

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

February 27, 2025

TO: SBCCOG Board of Directors

FROM: SBCCOG Transportation Committee

SUBJECT: Updates to Measure M Subregional Programs

BACKGROUND

Over the past several months, the Infrastructure Working Group (IWG) has been discussing updates to the Measure M and Measure R subregional programs. Specifically, the IWG has explored updates to the Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Programs (MSP) project selection criteria, as well as local match policies for Measure M MSPs and Measure R South Bay Highway Program (SBHP) and South Bay Transit Investment Program (SBTIP).

MSP Subcommittee

At the August IWG meeting, there was significant discussion surrounding the idea of including a geographic equity measure as part of the MSP project selection criteria. The IWG elected to form a subcommittee to consider how a geographic equity measure could be implemented. Subcommittee members included: Erik Zandvliet (Manhattan Beach), Lucho Rodriguez (Lawndale), David Wahba (Rolling Hills Estates), Tony Olmos (Inglewood), Andy Winje (Redondo Beach), and Andrew Vialpando (Lomita).

“Local Allocation Program”

At their first meeting, the subcommittee began exploring the idea of a “local allocation program” (LAP) instead of a geographic equity measure. The LAP would be funded through a 10% allocation of MSP funds available each year and then allocated to each SBCCOG member agency per a formula. The remaining 90% of funding available would remain as part of the regular competitive program. The subcommittee believed that the LAP would allow cities with less ability or capacity to apply for projects through the competitive process to still access MSP funds for eligible city projects. The subcommittee instructed SBCCOG staff to develop a LAP allocation formula that is equally weighted between SBCCOG annual dues and centerline road miles per city.

Using MSP allocation projections made available by Metro to the Inglewood Transit Connector team, SBCCOG staff created a 10-year projection of the LAP (Exhibit 1). The LAP set-aside would begin with FY27-28 allocations.

SBCCOG staff also believes a more formal policy document will be needed to support the updated program going forward. The policy document will incorporate rules for the LAP as well as the competitive program. Initial LAP policies could include:

- LAP projects must still be submitted to the SBCCOG for eligibility review and approval;
- Each LAP allocation may be retained by the city for 5 years, at which point if it is not programmed towards a project, the oldest or 1st year of funding returns to the competitive program;
- Cities may provide their LAP funds to another city, either as a loan or gift;

- Cities may “accelerate” a certain amount of future LAP funding depending on funding availability;
- An “Awarding Subcommittee” shall be formed from IWG members with the task of evaluating projects as part of the competitive program as well as ensuring LAP allocations are used in a timely manner. The Awards subcommittee would make funding recommendations to the IWG, which would subsequently make recommendations to the Transportation Committee for Board final approval.

The IWG is recommending the Transportation Committee recommend SBCCOG Board approval of the LAP. Upon creation of the LAP by the SBCCOG Board of Directors, the IWG will begin drafting a formal policy manual.

“MSP Project Selection Criteria”

With the creation of the LAP, the subcommittee also revised MSP project selection criteria to remove and reallocate the geographic equity points. Although the measures and metrics vary between the Measure M HEOI and Measure M TSMIP programs, the points allocated to each were made the same. The recommended MSP project selection criteria are included as Exhibit 2.

“Measure R and Measure M Local Match Policy”

The subcommittee also developed a revised local match policy that would be applied towards future projects. The policy is largely the same as the current policy, with changes to the project cost increments. The changes include:

- Increment 2 is changed from \$20M-\$35M to \$20M-\$50M
- Increment 3 is changed from \$35M-\$75M to \$50M-\$75M

The Measure R-M/local share of each increment were unchanged. The current and recommended match policies are included in Exhibit 3 (which demonstrates how a \$70M project would be different under each policy).

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend the SBCCOG Board of Directors approve the creation of the Measure M MSP Local Allocation Program; the updated MSP Project Selection Criteria and direct the Infrastructure Working Group to explore reasonable methods to quantify the selection criteria; and the updated Measure R and Measure M Local Match Policy.

Prepared by: David Leger, SBCCOG Senior Project Manager

Attachments:

Exhibit 1 – 10-year Local Allocation Program scenario

Exhibit 2 – Draft Measure M MSP Project Selection Criteria

Exhibit 3 – Local Match Policy proposal

Exhibit 1

	Projected annual allocation from Metro:	\$81M	\$82.4M	\$83.5M	\$85.2M	\$233M
	Allocation Percentage	FY 28 - \$8.1M	FY 29 - \$8.24M	FY 30 - \$8.35M	FY 31 - \$8.52M	FY 32 - \$23.3M
Carson	8.40%	\$680,400	\$692,160	\$701,400	\$715,680	\$1,957,200
El Segundo	3.39%	\$274,590	\$279,336	\$283,065	\$288,828	\$789,870
Gardena	5.33%	\$431,730	\$439,192	\$445,055	\$454,116	\$1,241,890
Hawthorne	5.87%	\$475,470	\$483,688	\$490,145	\$500,124	\$1,367,710
Hermosa Beach	2.58%	\$208,980	\$212,592	\$215,430	\$219,816	\$601,140
Inglewood	8.93%	\$723,330	\$735,832	\$745,655	\$760,836	\$2,080,690
Lawndale	2.90%	\$234,900	\$238,960	\$242,150	\$247,080	\$675,700
Lomita	2.24%	\$181,440	\$184,576	\$187,040	\$190,848	\$521,920
Los Angeles (City)	15.09%	\$1,222,290	\$1,243,416	\$1,260,015	\$1,285,668	\$3,515,970
Los Angeles County	10.20%	\$826,200	\$840,480	\$851,700	\$869,040	\$2,376,600
Manhattan Beach	4.52%	\$366,120	\$372,448	\$377,420	\$385,104	\$1,053,160
Palos Verdes Estates	3.06%	\$247,860	\$252,144	\$255,510	\$260,712	\$712,980
Rancho Palos Verdes	5.38%	\$435,780	\$443,312	\$449,230	\$458,376	\$1,253,540
Redondo Beach	6.07%	\$491,670	\$500,168	\$506,845	\$517,164	\$1,414,310
Rolling Hills	0.81%	\$65,610	\$66,744	\$67,635	\$69,012	\$188,730
Rolling Hills Estates	1.91%	\$154,710	\$157,384	\$159,485	\$162,732	\$445,030
Torrance	13.32%	\$1,078,920	\$1,097,568	\$1,112,220	\$1,134,864	\$3,103,560
TOTAL	100%	\$8,100,000	\$8,240,000	\$8,350,000	\$8,520,000	\$23,300,000

	Projected annual allocation from Metro:	\$62.1M	\$63.9M	\$65.9M	\$67.9M	\$69.9M	
	Allocation Percentage	FY 33 - \$6.21M	FY 34 - \$6.39M	FY 35 - \$6.59M	FY 36 - \$6.79M	FY 37 - \$6.99M	Estimated 10 year total
Carson	8.40%	\$521,640	\$536,760	\$553,560	\$570,360	\$587,160	\$7,516,320
El Segundo	3.39%	\$210,519	\$216,621	\$223,401	\$230,181	\$236,961	\$3,033,372
Gardena	5.33%	\$330,993	\$340,587	\$351,247	\$361,907	\$372,567	\$4,769,284
Hawthorne	5.87%	\$364,527	\$375,093	\$386,833	\$398,573	\$410,313	\$5,252,476
Hermosa Beach	2.58%	\$160,218	\$164,862	\$170,022	\$175,182	\$180,342	\$2,308,584
Inglewood	8.93%	\$554,553	\$570,627	\$588,487	\$606,347	\$624,207	\$7,990,564
Lawndale	2.90%	\$180,090	\$185,310	\$191,110	\$196,910	\$202,710	\$2,594,920
Lomita	2.24%	\$139,104	\$143,136	\$147,616	\$152,096	\$156,576	\$2,004,352
Los Angeles (City)	15.09%	\$937,089	\$964,251	\$994,431	\$1,024,611	\$1,054,791	\$13,502,532
Los Angeles County	10.20%	\$633,420	\$651,780	\$672,180	\$692,580	\$712,980	\$9,126,960
Manhattan Beach	4.52%	\$280,692	\$288,828	\$297,868	\$306,908	\$315,948	\$4,044,496
Palos Verdes Estates	3.06%	\$190,026	\$195,534	\$201,654	\$207,774	\$213,894	\$2,738,088
Rancho Palos Verdes	5.38%	\$334,098	\$343,782	\$354,542	\$365,302	\$376,062	\$4,814,024
Redondo Beach	6.07%	\$376,947	\$387,873	\$400,013	\$412,153	\$424,293	\$5,431,436
Rolling Hills	0.81%	\$50,301	\$51,759	\$53,379	\$54,999	\$56,619	\$724,788
Rolling Hills Estates	1.91%	\$118,611	\$122,049	\$125,869	\$129,689	\$133,509	\$1,709,068
Torrance	13.32%	\$827,172	\$851,148	\$877,788	\$904,428	\$931,068	\$11,918,736
TOTAL	100%	\$6,210,000	\$6,390,000	\$6,590,000	\$6,790,000	\$6,990,000	\$89,480,000

South Bay Measure M Multi-Year Sub-Regional Programs Project Selection Criteria

The Project Selection Process Is Common To All MSPs

There are three South Bay subregional programs listed within the Measure M Ordinance: the Highway Efficiency Operational Improvement Program (HEOI), the Transportation System Mobility Improvement Program #1(TSMIP I), and the Transportation Mobility Improvement Program #2 (TSMIP II). All candidate MSP projects considered for funding within the South Bay Measure M Multi-Year Sub-Regional Programs (MSPs) are screened for eligibility based on project selection criteria that are unique to each of the MSPs and different from the Measure R South Bay Highway Program and South Bay Transit Investment Program.

The annual update cycle for South Bay MSPs includes a period for solicitation of additional funding for existing projects (consideration for cost-increases and next-phase funding needs) and new projects submitted by lead agencies. Funding priority is first given to existing projects and then to new project requests. The projects undergo an eligibility determination and assessment using the selection criteria to update MSP project lists.

MSP funding for projects is programmed within a 5-year South Bay MSP Funding Allocation Program (MSPFAP). The funding allocation schedule is intended to be as consistent as possible with the MSP reimbursement schedule requested in the project application subject to the results of the project assessment and annually available MSP funding within each of the three South Bay MSP programs. This project programming process may need to modify the funding allocation schedule requested for specific projects. The MSPFAP process also allows for the opportunity for projects that are completed or not actively being implemented by the lead agency to be removed from or rescheduled in the 5-year funding allocation list during the annual updates of the funding programs.

The 5-year MSPFAP must be approved by the South Bay Cities Council Board of Directors and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board of Directors. The MSPFAP may be updated annually.

Examples of potentially eligible projects and project selection criteria follows

Potentially eligible HEOI Project Examples:

- Freeway Capacity Expansion and Operational Improvements
- Interchange and ramp modifications / improvements
- Auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges
- Shoulder widening / improvements for enhanced operation of the roadway
- Freeway bypass / freeway-to-freeway connections providing traffic detours in case of incidents, shutdowns or emergency evacuations
- Managed Lanes – HOV Lanes / Express Lanes
- Turnouts for safety purposes
- Intersection and street widening / improvements on a State Highway or within one mile of a State Highway, or on major / minor arterials beyond one mile from a State Highway on a case-by-case basis
- Goods Movement on Countywide Strategic Truck Arterial Network (CSTAN)
- Left-turn or right-turn lanes on state highways or arterials
- Transportation Projects that support or augment the South Bay Fiber Network such as:
 - Signal Synchronization
 - Intelligent Transportation Systems
 - Autonomous Vehicle Infrastructure System
- Safety improvements that reduce incident delay
- Transit Centers, Park and Ride Lots/Parking Structures

HEOI Project Assessment and Selection

The following assessment and selection criteria are used to assist in the process of programming the South Bay Measure M Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements (HEOI) Program projects, as follows:

Assessment & Selection Criteria	Measures	Points
1. Mobility/Accessibility Improvement for Users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relieves congestion • Improves travel times • Improves effectiveness & reliability for street, highway and freeway users • Eliminates trips 	30pts
2. Project Readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project definition of scope, phasing, total budget and proposed funding sources, and Measure M reimbursement schedule • Must have Caltrans Project Development documents, project study report (or similar) and be ready to enter the environmental phase (Project Approval and Environmental Documentation/PA&ED) or later* • Initial public outreach process has been completed by lead agency • Project is supported by City Council in either an adopted Capital Improvement Program (or similar) or via a standalone action of support 	20pts

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MSP-funded phase will begin in the upcoming fiscal year • Overall project admin/oversight/support costs capped at 10% <p><i>*MSP funding is only available for PA&ED, PS&E, ROW, and/or Construction phases.</i></p>	
3. Project Need & Benefit to Transportation System	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional or Sub-regional mobility benefits • Integrates with goods movement • Reduces safety incidents/improves safety • Eliminates operational deficiencies 	2015pts
4. Regional Significance, Multi-Jurisdictional Effort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crosses jurisdictional boundaries • Shared priority for affected jurisdictions' decision makers • Supports regional program, goods movement such as Countywide Strategic Truck Arterial Network (CSTAN), connectivity/gap closure 	20pts
5. Environmental Compatibility, Sustainability, and Quality of Life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports local transportation and environmental policies • Reduces VMT/GHG emissions • Improves environmental quality, public health, quality of life • Supports goods movement • Reduces household transportation costs 	10pts
6. MSP Leverage (BONUS POINTS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents matching funds • Percentage of cost provided by non-MSP funding allocated to project • Support costs capped at 10% 	10pts (Bonus)
Total		100

Potentially eligible TSMIP I & II Project Examples:

- Transportation Projects that support or augment the South Bay Fiber Network such as:
 - Signal Synchronization
 - Intelligent Transportation Systems
 - Autonomous Vehicle Infrastructure System
 - Broadband Regional Connectivity Infrastructure
 - Transportation Management Systems (Traffic Operations Centers, Emergency Management)
- Local Travel Network, Slow Speed Infrastructure, Bicycle Infrastructure
- Pedestrian Infrastructure, ADA Improvements
- Complete Streets
- Transit Centers / Park and Ride Lots and Parking Structures
- Sustainable SB Plan (Neighborhood-Oriented Development, First / Last Mile Infrastructure, Land Use and Transportation Projects that reduce vehicle miles travelled)

- Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

TSMIP I & II Project Assessment Criteria

The following assessment criteria are used to assist in the process of programming the South Bay Measure M Transportation System and Mobility Improvement Program I & II projects, as follows:

Assessment Criteria	Measures	Points
1. Mobility/Accessibility Improvement for Users	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases travel by transit, paratransit, bicycle, micromobility, and pedestrian modes • Improves travel times • Improves effectiveness and reliability 	30 25pts
2. Project Readiness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project definition of scope, phasing, total budget and proposed funding sources, and Measure M reimbursement schedule • Must have Caltrans Project Development documents, project study report (or similar) and be ready to enter the environmental phase (Project Approval and Environmental Documentation/PA&ED) or later* • Initial public outreach process has been completed by lead agency • Project is supported by City Council in either an adopted Capital Improvement Program (or similar) or via a standalone action of support • MSP-funded phase will begin in the upcoming fiscal year • Overall project admin/oversight/support costs capped at 10% <p><i>*MSP funding is only available for PA&ED, PS&E, ROW, and/or Construction phases.</i></p>	20pts
3. Project Need & Benefit to Transportation System Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional or subregional mobility benefits • Reduces safety incidents/improves safety • Improves transportation options • Improves first/last mile connections to transit 	20pts
4. Regional Benefit, Multi-Jurisdictional Effort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crosses jurisdictional boundaries • Shared priority for affected jurisdictions' decision makers • Supports South Bay Fiber Network, Local Travel Network, or other subregional initiatives 	20pts
5. Environmental Compatibility, Sustainability, and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports local transportation and environmental policies • Reduces VMT/GHG emissions 	10pts

Exhibit 2

Quality of Life	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves environmental quality, public health, quality of life • Supports goods movement • Reduces household transportation costs 	
6. MSP Leverage (BONUS POINTS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documents matching funds • Percentage of cost provided by non-MSP funding allocated to project • Support costs capped at 10% 	10pts (Bonus)
Total		100

DRAFT

Exhibit 3

INPUT PROJECT COST HERE:

\$70,000,000

Total Project Cost:		\$70,000,000				
Current Cost Share Breakdown	Project Cost Increment	MR/MM Funding %	Local Match %	Incremental Cost	MR/MM Share of Cost (\$)	Local Share of Cost (\$)
	\$0 - \$20,000,000	100%	0%	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$0
	\$20,000,000 - \$35,000,000	90%	10%	\$15,000,000	\$13,500,000	\$1,500,000
	\$35,000,000 - \$75,000,000	30%	70%	\$35,000,000	\$10,500,000	\$24,500,000
	\$75,000,000 +	20%	80%	\$0	\$0	\$0
			Total:	\$70,000,000	\$44,000,000	\$26,000,000
			Avg Total Share:	100%	63%	37%

Total Project Cost:		\$70,000,000				
MSP Subcommittee Recommendation	Project Cost Increment	MR/MM Funding %	Local Match %	Incremental Cost	MR/MM Share of Cost (\$)	Local Share of Cost (\$)
	\$1 - \$20,000,000	100%	0%	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$0
	\$20,000,001 - \$50,000,000	90%	10%	\$29,999,999	\$26,999,999	\$3,000,000
	\$50,000,001 - \$75,000,000	30%	70%	\$20,000,001	\$6,000,000	\$14,000,001
	\$75,000,001 +	20%	80%	\$0	\$0	\$0
			Total:	\$70,000,000	\$52,999,999	\$17,000,001
			Avg Total Share:	100%	76%	24%