South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Infrastructure Working Group (IWG)

AGENDA
Wednesday, July 9, 2025
12:00 pm – 1:30 pm
<mark>VIRTUAL ONLY</mark>

ACCESSING THE VIRTUAL MEETING:
After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.
https://us06web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZYoce-ppjMsHNDt3mur9Jcx0Uud3D3dSa3l

12:00 pm   **Call to Order –** Erik Zandvliet, Chair

12:01 pm   **Consent Calendar**
- **June 11, 2025 IWG Meeting Notes** (Attachment A)
- **Transportation Report Covering June 2025** (Attachment B)

12:05 pm   **Agency & Other Update Reports**
- **SBCCOG Program Update** – Jacki Bacharach/David Leger, SBCCOG
  - LAX Metro Station Tour
- **L.A. County Public Works – South Bay Traffic Forum Update**
- **L.A. Metro Updates**
  - **ITS Program –** Ed Alegre, Metro
  - **Metro Board Actions –** David Leger, SBCCOG
- **Metro TAC & Streets and Freeway Subcommittee Actions**
  - **Metro TAC Report**
- **Opportunities to Serve: TAC delegate, Streets and Freeway alternate, Metro South Bay Service Council**
- **Caltrans South Bay Projects Update**

12:25 pm   **Spotlight Presentation: Metro Urban Greening Grant Program** – Joanny Leyva, Estolano Advisors

12:50 pm   **Measure M Updates**
- **Local Allocation Program Policies** (Attachment C)
- **MSP Selection Criteria Rubric** (Attachment D)

1:20 pm   **3-Month Look Ahead** (Attachment E)
- **Suggest 'Spotlight' ideas for future meetings**

1:30 pm   **Announcements / Adjournment –** *Next meeting September 10*
IWG will be dark in August.

To propose an item for the next meeting agenda, e-mail to DavidL@southbaycities.org no later than 10 days prior to the meeting.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Infrastructure Working Group (IWG) - June 11, 2025

Attendees: Erik Zandvliet (Chair, Manhattan Beach); Andy Winje (Vice-chair, Redondo Beach); Shin Furukawa, Caleb Cho (Torrance); William Mendoza (Gardena); DJ Torado (Hawthorne); Rachel Junken, Kimberly Venegas, Aksel Palacios (LA City); Pat Smith, Marty Amundson (LACPW); Jeannie Naughton (Rolling Hills Estates); Tony Olmos (Inglewood); Lucho Rodriguez (Lawndale); Gilbert Gamboa (Manhattan Beach); Russ Bryden (Rancho Palos Verdes); Constance Turner (SCE); Janna McKhann (NexTech Systems); Jacki Bacharach, David Leger, Jake Romoff, Anne Tsai (SBCCOG)

I. **May 14, 2025 IWG Meeting Notes and May Transportation Report** – Mr. Zandvliet called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. The meeting notes and report were accepted as presented.

II. **Agency & Other Update Reports**
   a) SBCCOG: Mr. Leger reported the following important dates:
      - SBCCOG Office Move: The SBCCOG will be relocating to 357 Van Ness Way Suite 110 (Suite 90 for meetings) starting July 1, 2025.
      - LTN RFQ: The SBCCOG has released an RFQ to establish a consultant bench in support of city LTN implementation.
      - REAP 2.0 Mobility Hubs: The SBCCOG has released an RFP for a mobility hub study.

   b) L.A. County Public Works – South Bay Traffic Forum Update:
      Mr. Smith provided updates on South Bay traffic forum projects, which are available here:
      https://cdn.southbaycities.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/11103432/HANDOUT_LACounty_TSSP_June_2025.pdf

      Mr. Smith reported that grants have lapsed for the seven projects in procurement and that grant extensions have been requested. Mr. Zandvliet suggested that the monthly update report be sorted by date.

   c) L.A. Metro Updates –
      1) ITS Program: No representative was present.
      2) Metro Board Actions: No Metro representatives were present.

         Ms. Bacharach shared that the SBCCOG will be arranging a tour of the new LAX/Metro Transit Center and Rail to Rail Corridor for the Board.

         Ms. Bacharach asked Mr. Zandvliet if he could identify a contact for LOCUS tool from the Metro TAC.

   d) Metro TAC – Mr. Leger shared that the TAC made funding recommendations for the Access for All awards and addressed Call for Projects appeals at the June meeting. The TAC will be meeting in July but will not meet in August.

   e) Streets and Freeways Subcommittee: Mr. Zandvliet reported that at the May meeting, the subcommittee received a presentation on the LA28 Mobility Concept Plan.

      Mr. Olmos shared that the City of Inglewood has been working extensively with stakeholders to coordinate mobility projects for LA28. The group expressed interest in a Mobility Concept Plan presentation at a future meeting.

Ms. Bacharach announced that an opening on the Metro South Bay Service Council may become available, which will be confirmed in July.

f) Caltrans South Bay Projects Update: The quarterly Caltrans report is available here: https://cdn.southbaycities.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/09101742/HANDOUT_Caltrans_June_2025.pdf

The next report will be available in September.

III. **Measure M Updates**

1) Local Allocation Program Policies (Attachment C)

Mr. Leger shared a revised version of the Local Allocation Program (LAP) policies based on agency feedback from a previous IWG meeting. Mr. Zandvliet asked if the performance metrics are different from the performance metrics generated for the competitive program. Mr. Leger responded that the competitive program does not monitor performance metrics. The intent of establishing performance metrics for the LAP is to evaluate its usage. The competitive program does not include a mechanism to connect project scoring to an agency's project delivery rate. Mr. Zandvliet felt that LAP expenditures should be tied to competitive program spending and that both should be monitored together. Ms. Bacharach said that this may be a good way to monitor cost overruns. The group decided that requiring agencies to program LAP funds within five years (lapsing policy) may already function as the performance metric. Mr. Leger asked if for reporting purposes, the SBCCOG should collect quarterly reimbursement reports from agencies. The group agreed to start tracking this again.

The group also discussed how to define a commitment of funds. Mr. Olmos asked if there is flexibility in reallocating LAP funds to a new project if circumstances change (such as permitted by SB1 policies). Mr. Leger explained that an allocation must be formalized through a funding agreement with Metro. If the agency plans change, the agency must undergo a de-obligation process with Metro. Mr. Winje countered that because funding agreements often take months to execute, defining an allocation through a formalized funding agreement may be difficult. Mr. Leger made a note to clarify the policy language to define a commitment of funds as an SBCCOG Board-approved project.

Mr. Zandvliet asked if in the scenario that an agency decides to gift their LAP funding to another agency, the five-year policy restarts. The group agreed to add a clarification that gifted money is subject to the original five-year expiration date. Mr. Furukawa suggested adding a year to not disincentivize agencies from gifting money. Mr. Winje noted that agencies are simply responsible for submitting an MM application, not delivering projects. The group decided to keep the five-year policy for gifting and committing funds.

Mr. Zandvliet expressed that the description of the process for determining centerline road mile does not necessarily need to be included in the policy document due to the weakness of the process and because the centerline road miles will not require frequent updating. Mr. Olmos stated that the process can be summarized as a footnote.

Ms. Bacharach approached the topic of imposing limits on project extensions and cost overruns. Mr. Olmos mentioned that OCTA has implemented an extension limit policy. Ms. McKhann offered to provide SBCCOG staff with a contact at OCTA. The group discussed

whether a new extension and cost overrun policy should be finalized by the call for projects this fall but ultimately decided to complete the LAP policy this summer while revisiting extensions and cost overruns during a future cycle.

2) **Summary of May Brainstorm Session on MSP Selection Criteria & Potential Alternatives Rubric** (Attachment D)

Mr. Leger introduced two follow-up worksheets to the May IWG discussion concerning increasing objectivity in the MSP project selection criteria: a summary of brainstormed metrics from the May meeting (Attachment D1) and a new scoring rubric modeled after the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG)'s MSP policies (Attachment D2). This rubric would allow an evaluator to score a project application according to whether it "clearly and convincingly," "sufficiently," or "somewhat" demonstrates a specific criterion. Mr. Leger explained that the rubric incorporates more objectivity into the project evaluation process by stratifying the points system.

Ms. Junken commented that many of the ideas recorded from the brainstorm may overly burden city staff and that the rubric from SGVCOG is more closely aligned with other grant processes while allowing applicants to pull from readily available data rather than running intensive analyses. Emphasizing narratives and references to best practices and studies would be more feasible for agencies applying for funding. Mr. Olmos agreed that objective analyses would be more burdensome for agencies.

Mr. Winje noted that because the Measure M program is evolving into a competitive program, an agency that uses one or more of the ideas provided in Attachment D1 in its application will differentiate itself from other applicants and should be rewarded for investing more effort in the application.

Mr. Zandvliet liked components of Attachment D1 and D2, suggesting that the brainstorm summary can serve as a menu of ideas for agencies to pull from and that the example rubric can be simplified to be less repetitive. He felt that rubric should also include a scoring level for "does not demonstrate." The group agreed to proceed with this approach and set a goal to recommend the LAP and project selection criteria to the Transportation Committee in July.

IV. **3-Month Look Ahead:** Received and filed.

The IWG will not meet in August. The Metro Board VMT policy discussion will be moved to September. SBCCOG staff will plan for an Olympics Games Mobility Plan presentation in October.

Mr. Winje suggested an IWG spotlight presentation from Citian's traffic and collision analysis software.

V. **Announcements/Adjournment:**

Ms. Bacharach shared that the new owner of the South Bay Fiber Network is interested in accessing city-owned conduit to build open access networks. The SBCCOG will be reaching out to cities for maps of city-owned fiber and conduit locations.

Mr. Zandvliet adjourned the meeting at 1:25 p.m. Next meeting July 9th in-person and online at the NEW SBCCOG office.

To propose an item for the next meeting agenda, please e-mail DavidL@southbaycities.org
Meeting notes prepared by Anne Tsai, Transportation Project Coordinator

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

MONTHLY SBCCOG TRANSPORTATION REPORT

A summary of recent federal, state, regional and local developments and trends in transportation

COVERING JUNE 2025

Edited by Anne Tsai

Federal

U.S. Transportation Secretary Sean P. Duffy Streamlines Exemption Process for Noncompliant Automated Vehicles

U.S. Department of Transportation Secretary Sean P. Duffy announced that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration will further accelerate the safe development of automated vehicles by streamlining the Part 555 exemption process.

The exemption will continue to allow manufacturers to sell up to 2,500 motor vehicles per year that do not fully comply with the Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards. This includes vehicles that do not have traditional steering wheels, driver-operated brakes, or rearview mirrors. Manufacturers must demonstrate that their vehicles provide an equivalent safety level as compliant vehicles and that the exemption is in the public interest. This latest development builds on Secretary Duffy's innovation agenda and NHTSA's AV Framework.

The streamlined Part 555 exemption also involves improvements to NHTSA's internal processes to expedite processing time, improve transparency, and increase engagement with applicants. NHTSA will issue improved instructions to give applicants a better idea of what to expect and ensure they provide necessary information up front.

President Trump's Transportation Secretary Sean Duffy Announces Availability of $5.4 Billion in Bridge Funding to Get America Building Again

The U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) announced nearly $4.9 billion in available funding for major bridge projects through the Bridge Investment Program, and up to $500 million for repairing or replacing bridges in rural areas through the Competitive Highway Bridge Program.

This announcement will help address the tens of thousands of bridges across the country – including approximately 42,000 bridges in poor condition – that are in dire need of repair.

Example of Removed Climate Change and Environmental Justice Requirements:

"Applicants must address how the project will consider climate change and environmental justice in the planning stage and in project delivery. In particular, applicants must address how the project reduces greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector, incorporates evidence-based climate resilience measures and features, and reduces the lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions from the project materials. Applicants also must address the extent to which the project avoids adverse environmental impacts to air or water quality, wetlands, and endangered species, as well as address disproportionate negative impacts of climate change and pollution on disadvantaged or other affected communities, including natural disasters, with a focus on prevention, response, and recovery."

State

HDR to deliver engineering and design services for California high-speed rail

HDR has been chosen by the High Desert Corridor Joint Powers Agency to deliver engineering and design services for a 54-mile rail segment of California's high-speed rail project between Palmdale and Victorville.

Under the terms of a five-year contract, HDR's responsibilities will span a broad spectrum of engineering disciplines, including rail and bridge design, systems and station integration, and the planning of operations and maintenance facilities.

Additionally, HDR will provide support for right-of-way coordination, environmental services, stakeholder engagement, risk management, procurement, and contract administration.

The new rail service between Palmdale and Victorville is expected to operate at speeds of up to 180 miles per hour.

It will offer a fast link from the Antelope Valley's multimodal transportation hub in Los Angeles County to the planned Brightline West station in San Bernardino County.

The broader vision for the network includes connections to Northern California, Las Vegas, and additional destinations, reshaping access to housing, employment, and cultural sites.

The project is currently finalizing environmental documentation and preliminary engineering with plans to move to the construction phase in the early 2030s.

In the 2024 Economic Impact Analysis Report announced in January, it was revealed that the California high-speed rail project has produced $21.8 billion in economic activity following an investment of $13 billion by the California High-Speed Rail Authority from July 2006 to June 2024.

Region

A trip to LAX without a car? Metro opens long-awaited LAX station

Decades after rail first broke ground in Los Angeles County, Angelenos are one step closer to an airport connection with the opening of the LAX/Metro Transit Center.

The station at Aviation Boulevard and 96th Street connects to the K Line and C Line and, starting next year, to Los Angeles International Airport's long-awaited automated people mover train. For now, free shuttle buses running every 10 minutes will transport travelers along the 2.5-mile route between the center and LAX.

The transit center was budgeted at $900 million and includes a 16-bay bus plaza with electric bus infrastructure and a bicycle hub. When the people mover is running, Metro riders will take two escalators up past a mural, now showcasing the 2026 FIFA World Cup, to board.

Most major cities already have a direct airport rail connection. The absence at LAX has long left travelers baffled, particularly first-time visitors and international passengers expecting a world destination like Los Angeles to have streamlined transit to its main airport.

A variety of factors led to the delay, including reported concerns among airport officials over potential lost parking profits, Federal Aviation Administration pushback, and competing interests over taxpayer dollars.

The debate was renewed more than a decade ago, and plans for the airport's people mover connection and Metro's station were ultimately approved. The station is one of Metro's "28 by 28" transit projects ahead of the Olympics.

The train is the most anticipated project under the airport's $30-billion overhaul ahead of the FIFA World Cup in 2026 and the Olympics and Paralympics in 2028. Airport leaders and transit experts believe the automated train will significantly ease traffic at 1 World Way.

Trends

Your Packages Could Soon Be Delivered By Honda's Electric Quadricycle

Honda has always been more than just a car company. The Japanese manufacturer got its start assembling motorcycles and has dabbled in everything from lawnmowers and motorized tillers to jet-powered airplanes and outboard boat engines. Now, Honda is venturing into another vehicular realm with Fastport, a new business that will produce an all-electric quadricycle that can fit in a bike lane and is aimed at last-mile delivery.

Fastport's first product is the eQuad, a narrow four-wheeled contraption that is operated like a bicycle and features a large storage box behind the rider. Honda says the eQuad is designed to "help address urban congestion and rising consumer demand for faster, more frequent deliveries." The eQuad is designed to travel in bike lanes, appearing to just squeeze into the painted lines in the photos we have of the quadricycle traveling in New York City. Honda does note, however, that the eQuad's ability to drive in bike lanes will be dependent on local regulations.

The eQuad will be offered in two sizes and with two cargo box sizes, in order to meet the needs of different businesses across both Europe and North America. The smaller eQuad is 133.9 inches long, 82.7 inches tall, and 39.4 inches wide, while the larger eQuad measures 144 inches long, 84 inches tall, and 48 inches wide.

Honda says the eQuad's modular design allows it to be easily customized for the specific use case of the business. The small cargo container's length/width/height is 75 by 57.5 by 38.4 inches, while the bigger box's dimensions are 89 by 47.9 by 60 inches. In its larger configuration, the eQuad has a payload of 650 pounds; the smaller eQuad can carry up to 320 pounds.

The powertrain is described as "pedal-by-wire pedal-assist," and the eQuad also features regenerative braking. The eQuad can travel up to 12 mph, regardless of the configuration, and Honda quotes a range of up to 23 miles for the larger version. A range estimate for the small model is not yet available.

While the eQuad is essentially a bike with four wheels, Honda also added a couple of amenities for rider comfort. The eQuad's canopy has a UV coating and a ceramic tint option to shield the rider from the sun, while a ventilation fan helps the rider stay cool. The prototype also appears to feature a headlight and a camera-based rearview mirror. Fastport will also provide a "Fleet-as-a-Service" (FaaS) platform that not only includes the swappable batteries and cargo containers but also service and maintenance plans and real-time data for driver and fleet management. The eQuad will be capable of over-the-air software updates.

The Fastport eQuad prototype will make its in-person debut at Eurobike in Frankfurt, Germany, next week. Honda aims to deliver the first units in late 2025 before mass production gets underway in the summer of 2026. The eQuad will be built at Honda's Performance Manufacturing Center in Ohio, where it previously built the Acura NSX and currently assembles the CR-V e:FCEV hydrogen SUV. Honda says that Fastport is already in discussions with major logistics and delivery companies in North America and Europe for use in pilot test programs.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Local Allocation Program Policies

Local Allocation Program (LAP) Formula:

- The initial allocation formula was developed through an equally weighted formula consisting of a city's percentage of SBCCOG dues and its percentage of centerline road miles[1] in the South Bay. (% of dues + % of centerline road miles) divided by two.
  - SBCCOG dues are based on a combination of city population and city budget.
  - Centerline road miles in this case are defined as follows:
    - City centerline road miles include: 1) All public roadways that intersect with the municipality or are maintained by the agency; 2) State highways; and 3) Walk streets, multi-use trails, or any public pathways that are not traditional automobile rights-of-way but are eligible for Measure M funding. Private roads and alleys are excluded.
    - Roadways bordering two jurisdictions are attributed 100% to both agencies. For example, a portion of Western Ave is shared between Rancho Palos Verdes and the City of Los Angeles (and is Caltrans-owned). For the purposes of the LAP, the same segment of Western Ave is included in calculations for both Rancho Palos Verdes and City of Los Angeles.)
    - Roadways with divided medians are counted as a single centerline.

Eligibility and Project Review:

- LAP funded projects must meet Measure M MSP eligibility requirements. SBCCOG member cities may utilize LAP funds by submitting a Measure M MSP application for review and approval by both the SBCCOG and Metro Board of Directors as part of the annual program update process.

Awarding Subcommittee Formation and Role:

---

[1] Centerline road mile data was determined through a comparison exercise between city self-reported data and a GIS analysis generated by SBCCOG. SBCCOG staff used existing GIS layers and publicly available pavement management data to produce a uniform analysis. The agency self-reported centerline miles were used if they were within 5% of SBCCOG-generated calculations. If there was a greater than 5% discrepancy between the number generated by the SBCCOG and self-reported by an agency, agencies were asked to provide additional information to reconcile the anomalies and reach a consensus.

- An Awarding Subcommittee shall be formed annually to be composed of three IWG members selected by the IWG chair with representation from South Bay cities of various sizes and no more than two SBCCOG staff representative who is responsible for:
    o Evaluating projects under both the LAP and competitive programs.
    o Monitoring the timely use of allocated funds.
    o Making funding and process recommendations to the IWG, which then advises the Transportation Committee.

Five-Year Funding Retention Limit:

- Cities may retain annual LAP allocations for a maximum of five years. At the end of the five-year period, if funds have not been committed to an eligible project, the earliest (oldest) year's allocation reverts to the competitive program. Funds are considered committed when a city has submitted a Measure M MSP application and received approval by the SBCCOG Board through the annual Measure M annual cycle. A city in jeopardy of losing unused funds will be notified as part of the annual Fall one-on-one meetings with the SBCCOG.

Transfer of Funds Between Jurisdictions:

- Cities are allowed to transfer LAP funds to another member agency either as a gift or loan, subject to the Awarding Subcommittee's approval. Such transfers must be accompanied by documentation (facilitated by the SBCCOG) detailing the purpose and terms of the transfer to maintain accountability and eligibility. Transferred funds are subject to their original five-year retention limits.

Acceleration of Future Allocations:

- Cities may request to accelerate their future LAP allocations up to three years in advance if additional funds are available. SBCCOG staff would be required to review the request and determine funding availability. This would be a no interest loan against their future allocations.

Regular Program Reviews:

- A review of the LAP will be conducted along with the adopted policies to assess the effectiveness of the allocation mechanism, including its impact on more equitable access to Measure M MSP dollars for jurisdictions of all sizes. The first review should be made after three years and should be conducted every two years following the first review. SBCCOG staff will make the assessment in consultation with the Awarding

Subcommittee and present it to the IWG, Transportation Committee, and Board of Directors. If any changes are suggested, they will be made to the IWG, who will then make a formal recommendation to the Transportation Committee.

Matching Funds to MSP Competitive Applications:

- LAP allocations can be used as a local match to Measure M MSP or Measure R competitive program project applications.
- MSP competitive funds shall not be used for cost overruns/unanticipated expenses of LAP projects. The lead agency must either use additional LAP or other outside funding.

Pooling of LAP Funds:

- Cities may pool LAP funds to obtain maximum return on investments. Documentation should be submitted to the SBCCOG by each participating city agreeing to pool their funds. One lead agency should be identified on the application.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Updated 7/02/25

July 2025	August 2025	September 2025	October 2025
3. Transit Operators Working Group – DARK 9. Infrastructure Working Group • **Metro Urban Greening Grant Program** 14. SBCCOG Transportation Committee • **Measure M MSP Local Allocation Program Policies – consider recommendation to Board** • **Objective Measures for Measure M MSP Project Selection Criteria – consider recommendation to Board** 11. Metro South Bay Service Council 14. SBCCOG Steering Committee 24. Metro Board 24. SBCCOG Board • **Measure M MSP Local Allocation Program Policies – tentative recommendation for approval by Transportation Committee** • **Objective Measures for Measure M MSP Project Selection Criteria – tentative recommendation by Transportation Committee**	7. Transit Operators Working Group 8. Metro South Bay Service Council 11. SBCCOG Transportation Committee 11. SBCCOG Steering Committee 13. Infrastructure Working Group – DARK? 28. Metro Board 28. SBCCOG Board	4. Transit Operators Working Group 8. SBCCOG Transportation Committee • **SCAG Presentation on Mobility Hubs** 8. SBCCOG Steering Committee 10. Infrastructure Working Group • **Metro Board VMT Policy** 12. Metro South Bay Service Council 25. Metro Board • **South Bay Measure R Transit and Measure M MSP Annual Program Update approval** 25. SBCCOG Board	2. Transit Operators Working Group 8. Infrastructure Working Group • **Olympics Games Mobility Plan** • **Citian CRASH Platform Demonstration** 13. SBCCOG Transportation Committee 13. SBCCOG Steering Committee 10. Metro South Bay Service Council 23. Metro Board 23. SBCCOG Board

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK