

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

**South Bay Cities Council of Governments
Infrastructure Working Group (IWG) - May 14, 2025**

Attendees: Erik Zandvliet (Chair, Manhattan Beach); Andy Winje (Vice-chair, Redondo Beach); Shin Furukawa, Caleb Cho (Torrance); DJ Torado (Hawthorne); Cheryl Ebert (El Segundo); Gilbert Marquez (Carson); Kevin Kwak (Gardena); Rachel Junken (LA City); Pat Smith, Elizabeth Garcia, Marty Amundson (LACPW); Steven Anderson (Kimley Horn); Fong-Ping Lee (FPL and Associates); Lindsey Van Parys, Marco Anderson (GHD); De Mai, Brian Chandler (DKS Associates); Andrew Nickerson (PSOMAS); Aaron Edwards, Janna McKhann (NexTech Systems); Gene Kim (HDR); David Leger, Aaron Baum, Anne Tsai (SBCCOG)

- I. **April 9, 2025 IWG Meeting Notes and April 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 moving to a new office location on 357 Van Ness Way in July 2025.
 - REAP 2.0 Commercial to Redevelopment: SBCCOG recommended a consultant selection to the Steering Committee on May 12.
 - Cool Roofs Feasibility Study: The SBCCOG was awarded funding that will study the feasibility of cool roof treatments on representative public buildings. The consultant selection was recommended to the Steering Committee on May 12.
 - Carson to the Sea: A contract was awarded to a consultant team to conduct an LTN gap analysis between Carson, Lomita, and San Pedro.

- 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/2025/05/14113316/HANDOUT_LA-County_TSSP_May_2025.pdf

Mr. Smith reported that grants have expired for seven projects in procurement and extensions have been requested. Mr. Zandvliet suggested that the 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.
- d) Metro TAC – Mr. Leger shared that Metro reported decreased local returns revenue compared to the previous year.
- e) Streets and Freeways Subcommittee: Mr. Zandvliet reported that the subcommittee did not meet last month but will meet tomorrow to receive an update on the Olympics Mobility Concept Plan. Mr. Zandvliet also reported that SS4A applications are due on June 27.
- f) Caltrans South Bay Projects Update: The next Caltrans South Bay project update report will be published in June.

Mr. Zandvliet shared that a recent fatal accident on Sepulveda Blvd near the Manhattan/Hermosa Beach border has become a high priority issue in the Manhattan Beach community. The accident is the third fatal collision on the segment of Sepulveda Blvd from Manhattan Beach Blvd to Artesia Blvd within five months. Manhattan Beach staff may be reaching out to neighboring beach cities to collaborate on a corridor study.

III. **Presentation: Roundabouts**

Ms. Van Parys presented an overview of roundabouts as an effective piece of infrastructure to improve safety for all roadway users. The full presentation is available here: https://cdn.southbaycities.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/04093923/PRESENTATION_Roundabouts_GHD.pdf

Mr. Baum asked if bicycle accommodations at roundabouts are designed for cyclists to walk their bikes or to share an enhanced sidewalk with pedestrians. Ms. Van Parys responded that typically they are shared-use paths. Municipalities that have ordinances prohibiting shared-use paths will install signage directing cyclists to walk their bikes.

Mr. Baum asked if it is best practice to implement street calming measures in advance of roundabouts to slow down motorized vehicles. Ms. Van Parys responded that traffic calming measures are context sensitive and may be implemented on higher speed approaches to alert drivers to a changing roadway context.

Mr. Winje noted that the South Bay is built out and faces tight space constraints for building roundabouts and asked about oval or oblong-shaped roundabouts. Ms. Van Parys shared that non-circular shaped roundabouts (teardrop, bean, figure eight) work very well.

Mr. Baum asked why there are not more roundabouts. Ms. Van Parys theorized that roundabouts often experience political and community pushback and suggested that agencies conduct community outreach on roundabouts in general before revealing plans for specific intersections.

Mr. Baum asked if quick-build projects can help communities experience the infrastructure. Ms. Van Parys stated that it depends on if the quick-build is done correctly. Mr. Zandvliet added that if quick-builds or pilots are not designed successfully, they are less likely to be built on a permanent basis. Mr. Winje noted that the City of Redondo Beach had an ambition to install one roundabout in every council district. The city piloted a few temporary roundabouts, which were met with strong opposition because the infrastructure was not aesthetically pleasing and did not address pedestrian crossings. Then, the city tested three roundabouts in a row to address traffic issues, and they worked successfully, but the community did not like them. Mr. Winje recommended that agencies go all-in rather than implementing a test. Mr. Zandvliet noted that decision makers may be hesitant about the high cost of a roundabout project in comparison to a traffic signal. However, in the long term, roundabout maintenance costs will be much less than traffic signal maintenance costs. Ms. Van Parys provided a cautionary example of a city that built a roundabout without hiring a roundabout geometrician, which has resulted in several collisions.

Mr. Baum asked about best practices for community engagement. Ms. Van Parys shared an example in City of La Quinta to address concerns about safe crossings for children. GHD generated a cartoon character, video, and comic book to teach school-aged children how to walk and bike to school safely. GHD has also generated video renderings of approaching a roundabout from cyclist and driver perspectives. In addition, GHD has hosted community walkthroughs of roundabout models using small rubber modules as well as drive throughs in empty parking lots to familiarize roadway users. Ms. Van Parys emphasized that experiential engagement is much more effective than showing community members plan images.

IV. **Measure M Updates**

1) **MSP Selection Criteria Follow-Up from Board of Directors** (Attachment C)

Mr. Leger reminded the group that the Board approved the revised project selection criteria but has asked the IWG to identify ways to objectively measure the criteria. Ms. Tsai sent out a survey to solicit ideas from the group. Mr. Leger said that the SBCCOG does not intend to overly burden agencies but is interested in reasonable ways to measure some of the criteria. Alternatively, the IWG may determine that a diverse selection committee would address the Board's concerns as projects are scored. Mr. Zandvliet added that including these measures would be supplementary to a baseline funding application.

Mr. Winje suggested developing a qualitative spectrum of points to assess the subjective criteria. On the lower end, an agency might address a criterion in the application narrative; in the middle, an agency could submit an LOS study; on the higher end, an agency might submit a modeling exercise.

The group held a brainstorm session and pitched ideas for each selection criterion. The group agreed to assess the ideas again at a future meeting with the goal of making a recommendation to the Transportation Committee by September.

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

Mr. Leger reported that the Transportation Committee recommended that the SBCCOG not become the fiscally responsible agency for the I-405 Artesia/I-105 auxiliary lane project at the May meeting. The Transportation Committee also recommended approval of a scope of work modification for the Inglewood Transit Connector project.

VI. **Announcements/Adjournment:**

Ms. Tsai announced that the SBCCOG released an RFQ to provide technical services to agencies implementing the Local Travel Network.

Ms. Tsai reminded agencies that submitted funding and programming requests to the FY25-26 Measure M MSP program update to submit their financial plan forms by tomorrow.

Mr. Zandvliet adjourned the meeting at 1:39 p.m. Next meeting June 11th in-person and online at the 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 MAY 2025

Edited by Anne Tsai

Federal

EPA Hails Congressional Disapproval of Biden EPA's California EV Mandate Rule

On May 22, 2025, the U.S. Senate passed three Congressional Review Act (CRA) resolutions disapproving California's vehicle emission waivers that will now move to President Trump's desk for signature. In February, EPA Administrator Zeldin announced alongside President Trump and the newly created National Energy Dominance Council, that the EPA would transmit to Congress three waiver rules granted by the Biden Administration – California's Advanced Clean Cars II, Advanced Clean Trucks, and Heavy-Duty Engine Omnibus NOx.

Similarly, in March, Administrator Zeldin announced the agency will reconsider the Model Year 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles regulation and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards for Heavy-Duty Vehicles that were put in place during the Biden Administration.

U.S. Department of Transportation Secretary Sean P. Duffy Announces Federal Funding to Get America Building Again with Expansion of Bus Manufacturing, Strips DEI Requirements

On May 15, 2025, the U.S. Department of Transportation announced the availability of approximately \$1.5 billion in competitive grant funding for projects that expand bus manufacturing. This new federal funding from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will help create jobs within the industry by building and renovating bus facilities and expanding accessibility for American families utilizing commuter transit.

This year's Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) strips DEI requirements related to climate change, sustainability, environmental justice, and diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI) applied under the Biden Administration.

FTA's Grants for Buses and Bus Facilities Program supports transit agencies in buying and rehabilitating buses and vans and building bus facilities. FTA's Low or No Emission Program helps transit agencies buy or lease buses made in America, purchase equipment, and maintain facilities. The twin programs are announced together, although each has different requirements and funding amounts. In Fiscal Year 2025, approximately \$400 million is authorized for the Buses and Bus Facilities Program and \$1.1 billion is authorized for the Low or No Emission Program.

The Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) focuses on strengthening U.S. bus manufacturing, which can stabilize the cost of new buses and accelerate delivery to the transit agencies that need them. Transit agencies competing for funds are encouraged to consider strategies to

avoid customization, as procuring more standardized bus models will shorten manufacturing timelines and result in more American-built buses getting on the road faster.

State

California Invests Nearly \$1.7 Billion to Improve Safety, Increase Mobility and Bolster Resiliency on the State Highway System

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has allocated nearly \$1.7 billion to help improve safety, increase mobility for all users and strengthen the state highway system. In addition to these proactive, long-range efforts, the CTC allocated \$86.5 million to repair vital roadways and other transportation infrastructure damaged during recent wildfires and storms in Southern California.

Among the many projects funded by the commission are \$55.1 million in response to the devastating January wildfires in Los Angeles County and the strong Pacific storms that followed, battering charred hillsides and unleashing massive debris flows. Those include:

- \$30.6 million to replace a retaining wall and rebuild a slope drapery protection system near Big Rock Drive in Malibu and reconstruct hillsides above Pacific Coast Highway/State Route 1 (PCH/SR-1) near Mulholland Drive, all of which were impacted by the Palisades Fire and rainstorms.
- \$16.9 million to repair damaged state assets on PCH in the cities of Los Angeles, Santa Monica and Malibu, including slopes, drainage systems, signs, retaining walls and guardrail; and additional measures to prevent debris flows and mudslides on PCH from Entrada Drive to Sweetwater Canyon Drive following the rainstorms.
- \$4.8 million to provide traffic control within the cities of Los Angeles, Santa Monica and Malibu, where residents were forced to evacuate from the Palisades Fire.
- \$2.8 million to make repairs caused by the Franklin and Palisades fires near South Topanga Canyon, including new traffic signals, roadside signs, drainage systems and erosion control.

Of the total statewide allocation this month, nearly \$651 million came via Senate Bill (SB) 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 and approximately \$536 million from the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act of 2021 (IIJA).

In District 7, that includes \$150.9 million in SB 1 funds for 30 projects and \$196.6 million in IIJA funds for six projects in Los Angeles and Ventura counties.

Region

LA Metro Opens Rail to Rail Active Transportation Corridor, Connects Communities in Inglewood, South Los Angeles

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) hosted a “rolling dedication” and community fair on May 17 to celebrate the grand opening of the Rail to Rail Active Transportation Corridor, a 5.5-mile multi-modal path and public green space in Inglewood and South L.A. The path, a first-of-its-kind project for Metro, removed unused and blighted railroad tracks to connect the communities serviced by the Metro K Line Fairview Heights Station, the Metro J Line Slauson Station and the Metro A Line Slauson Station via biking and walking paths.

Approved by voters with the passage of Measure M and Measure R, this \$166-million investment represents a significant improvement to the communities in and around South L.A. while positively impacting quality of life and public health. It is the seventh of twenty-eight projects Metro will complete by the ‘28 Olympic and Paralympic Games (28 X ‘28), the Rail to Rail Active Transportation Corridor will serve the communities near the Intuit Dome and SoFi Stadium, two key venues for the Games.

The Rail to Rail Active Transportation Corridor improves community connectivity and encourages active transportation, which can help reduce transportation costs, support the local economy, enhance quality of life, promote public health and decrease greenhouse gas emissions and traffic congestion. Beginning at the intersection of 67th Street and 11th Avenue near the Fairview Heights Metro K Line Station, the path moves east to its current terminus at Slauson Station on the Metro A Line. A total of 17 Metro bus lines, three DASH bus lines and five Metro Bike Share stations provide service along the alignment. It offers rest areas with benches and new shade trees and is located within walking distance of several neighborhood schools, parks and other community amenities.

The project includes improvements that help protect the safety of cyclists and pedestrians moving along and across the Slauson corridor.

Construction of the project included planting 472 new trees, all indigenous species, which will improve air quality, increase the tree canopy and reduce heat absorption. New sustainable landscaping features, such as a new bio-swale, bioretention planters and bio-infiltration planters, manage stormwater and filter pollutants.

Metro is piloting the deployment of community interventional specialists (CIS) along the alignment between 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. CIS provide a friendly and familiar presence on the path and are specifically trained to diffuse and de-escalate issues. Core to the CIS program concept is a local hire initiative, resulting in the positions being filled by members of the community personally invested in its success.

A total of 52 security cameras are strategically placed along the alignment and continuously monitored at the Metro Security Operation Center. Additionally, there are nine emergency telephones installed along the alignment.

Phase two of the project, currently referred to as Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor, will extend the path from the A Line Slauson Station approximately four miles east along Randolph Street through the cities of Bell, Maywood, Huntington Park and the unincorporated Florence Firestone community, terminating at the Los Angeles River. It is expected to open in 2027.

Trends

Low-stress roads and bike lanes improve safety, not just comfort

Low stress roads make biking more comfortable, especially for people who are more risk-averse. But do they make biking safer? A new study suggests they do, countering concerns from some transportation officials that these facilities might encourage unsafe riding.

The level of traffic stress (LTS) is used to rate how comfortable streets are for biking. It categorizes roads from LTS 1 (low stress) to LTS 4 (high stress), which are often associated with four types of cyclists, ranging from “no way no how” to “strong and fearless.” Since more than half of people fall into the “interested but concerned” group, the second out of the four categories, low-stress networks are often designed with them in mind.

Comfort and safety don’t always go hand in hand, though. People often drive safer on roads perceived as complex or dangerous. That could explain why some officials worry that adding bike lanes might lure people into unsafe conditions. U.S. Secretary of Transportation Sean Duffy recently voiced that concern, saying at the Work Economy Summit: “If you drive in a congested area where there are bike lanes, it seems to be really dangerous for bikers.”

Fortunately, the evidence points in the opposite direction. A new study of eight metropolitan areas in Arizona from 2015 to 2021 found that lower-stress roads had fewer bike crashes, and when crashes did occur, they were less severe if there was a bike lane.

In that study, the safest roads were those rated LTS 1, which have two lanes or fewer, 25 mph speed limits or lower, and traffic volumes under 750 vehicles per day. The researchers explain, “a cyclist is at an increased risk of being struck by a motorist on roadways in Arizona’s metro regions as the road segment’s perceived stress rises.”

The study also found that each contributing factor—more lanes, higher traffic volumes, and higher speed limits—added to the risk.

Interestingly, although roads classified as LTS 2 also have fewer crashes, the ones that occurred were often more severe, with severity increasing further on LTS 3 and LTS 4 roads. Conventional bike lanes significantly reduce that risk.

Regarding the concerns echoed by Secretary Duffy about bike lanes, the researchers noted: “While the selection of an appropriate design should be made with additional corridor-level considerations, the provision of separated bike facilities on high-speed roads with increased

motor vehicle volumes or further improvements to critical links in the regional bike network that lower LTS may hold promise in unlocking a latent demand for utilitarian cycling that has been suppressed amongst individuals with higher aversions to traffic safety and comfort risks when cycling.”

In plain terms: better bike infrastructure can make biking safer and more comfortable, creating more opportunities for people to ride, while reducing the risk of serious crashes.

The SBCCOG’s Local Travel Network prioritizes low-stress roads and may serve as a preferred route for lower-risk riders.

Local Allocation Program Policies

Local Allocation Program 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 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 all public roadways that intersect with the municipality or are maintained by the agency. Private roads and alleys are excluded. State highways are included. Walk streets, multi-use trails, or any public pathways that are not traditional automobile rights-of-way but are eligible for Measure M funding are also included.
 - 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 Local Allocation Program, 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.
 - Centerline road mile data was determined through a comparison exercise between city self-reported data and GIS analysis generated by SBCCOG. SBCCOG staff used existing GIS layers and publicly available pavement management data to produce a uniform analysis. SBCCOG-generated numbers within 5% of agency self-reported numbers were accepted as-is. 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 further information to agree on a final number in one of the following ways:
 - SBCCOG staff held a meeting with agency staff to visually iterate the SBCCOG's GIS layer and reach a consensus.
 - Agency staff provided GIS layers containing city boundaries and PMS/PMP data that was reconciled against the SBCCOG's GIS layer.

Eligibility and Project Review:

- Projects must meet Measure M MSP eligibility requirements. Applications for LAP funded projects must still be reviewed and approved by both the SBCCOG and Metro Board of Directors as part of the annual program update process.

Awarding Subcommittee Formation and Role:

- An Awarding Subcommittee shall be formed composed of three IWG members and SBCCOG staff responsible for:
 - Evaluating projects under both the LAP and competitive programs.
 - Monitoring the timely use of allocated funds.
 - Making funding 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. A city in jeopardy of losing unused funds will be notified as part of the annual Fall one-on-one meetings.

Transfer of Funds Between Jurisdictions:

- Cities are allowed to transfer LAP funds to another member agency either as a gift or loan, subject to SBCCOG staff approval. Such transfers must be accompanied by documentation (facilitated by the SBCCOG) detailing the purpose and terms of the transfer to maintain accountability.

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.

Performance Metrics and Reporting:

- SBCCOG Board will adopt performance metrics (e.g., time from allocation to project commitment, percentage of funds used within the five-year period) which will be developed and shall require annual reporting by each city on LAP fund usage to the SBCCOG as part of the annual Fall one-on-one meetings.

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. SBCCOG staff will make the assessment 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 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 LA or other outside funding.

Pooling of LAP Funds:

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

DRAFT

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Measure M MSP Project Selection Criteria Brainstorm

Description: The following is a list of suggested metrics for SBCCOG member agencies to include to write stronger competitive applications. Metrics are organized according to criteria pulled from the updated Measure M MSP project selection criteria approved by the SBCCOG Board in February 2025.

Good*	Better*	Best*
Description in application narrative	References to evidence-based studies in application narrative	Analyses, studies, or modeling specific to the project in the application

**This is a potential qualitative spectrum suggested during the May 2025 IWG meeting.*

Criteria: Mobility/Accessibility Improvement for Users

HEOI Measures:

1. Relieves congestion

Metrics:

- a. LOS/ICU calculation for street segments and intersections
- b. References to other studies

2. Improves effectiveness and reliability for street, highway, and freeway users

Metrics:

- a. Travel time analysis
- b. Delay study
- c. Incident recovery
- d. Grade separation project
- e. References to other studies

3. Improves travel times

Metrics:

- a. LOS/ICU calculation for street segments and intersections
- b. Travel time analysis
- c. Delay study
- d. Incident recovery
- e. Grade separation project
- f. Simulation study (Synchro, O-D study, bus headways)
- g. References to other studies

4. Eliminates trips

- a. Reduction in total daily vehicle trips
- b. Reduction in number of transfers or mode changes

TSMIP Measures:

1. Increases travel by transit, paratransit, bicycle, micromobility, and pedestrian modes

Metrics:

- a. Mode shift percentages from baseline
- b. Increases transit frequency
- c. Supports specific multimodal local or regional goals
- d. Project scope includes a mobility hub or transit lines

Criteria: Project Need & Benefit to Transportation System

1. Regional or subregional mobility benefits
 - a. Number of travel modes served
 - b. Populations served (residential, commercial)
 - c. Removes barriers to access
 - d. Demonstrates benefits to populations outside of primary applicant's jurisdiction
 - e. Project is multi-jurisdictional
2. Integrates with goods movement
 - a. Overlap and/or coordination with truck routes
 - b. References to other studies
3. Reduces safety incidents/improves safety
 - a. Near-miss analysis
 - b. Reduction in KSI crashes
 - c. Includes one or more traffic safety countermeasures
 - d. PDO collision history

Criteria: Environmental Compatibility, Sustainability, and Quality of Life

1. Reduces VMT/GHG emissions
 - a. GHG emissions calculations
 - b. VMT analysis
2. Improves environmental quality, public health, quality of life
 - a. Applies Envision sustainability framework (Institute for Sustainable Infrastructure)
 - b. Supports a local or regional environmental goal or plan
 - c. Reduces cut through traffic in neighborhoods
3. Reduces household transportation costs
 - a. Project is located in a Metro Equity Focused Community/CalEnviroScreen Disadvantaged Community
 - b. Reduces travel time

- c. Reduces residential trips
- d. Promotes transportation alternative to single-occupancy vehicles

Scoring Rubric

Scoring Level	Characteristics
Clearly and convincingly demonstrates	Applicant references modeling, analyses, and/or studies specific to the project
Sufficiently demonstrates	Applicant references other study/studies relevant to the project
Somewhat demonstrates	Applicant describes how the project meets criteria in the application narrative

HEOI-only example:

Mobility/Accessibility Improvement for Users (30 points max)

The proposed project clearly and convincingly demonstrates that it relieves congestion; reduces travel times; improves effectiveness and reliability for street/highway/freeway users; and/or eliminates trips.	21-30 points
The proposed project sufficiently demonstrates that it relieves congestion; reduces travel times; improves effectiveness and reliability for street/highway/freeway users; and/or eliminates trips.	11-20 points
The proposed project somewhat demonstrates that it relieves congestion; reduces travel times; improves effectiveness and reliability for street/highway/freeway users; and/or eliminates trips.	0-10 points

TSMIP-only example:

Project Need & Benefit to Transportation System (20 points max)

The proposed project clearly and convincingly demonstrates that it provides regional or subregional mobility benefits; reduces safety incidents/improves safety; improves transportation options; and/or improves first/last mile connections to transit.	14-20 points
The proposed project sufficiently demonstrates that it provides regional or subregional mobility benefits; reduces safety incidents/improves safety; improves transportation options; and/or improves first/last mile connections to transit.	7-13 points
The proposed project somewhat demonstrates that it provides regional or subregional mobility benefits; reduces safety incidents/improves safety; improves transportation options; and/or improves first/last mile connections to transit.	0-6 points

BOTH HEOI and TSMIP examples:

Project Readiness (20 points max)

<p>The proposed project clearly and convincingly demonstrates a clear definition of scope, phasing, total budget and proposed funding sources, and Measure M reimbursement schedule; Caltrans Project Development documents; project study report (or similar); readiness 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>	<p>14-20 points</p>
<p>The proposed project sufficiently demonstrates a clear definition of scope, phasing, total budget and proposed funding sources, and Measure M reimbursement schedule; Caltrans Project Development documents; project study report (or similar); readiness 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>	<p>7-13 points</p>
<p>The proposed project somewhat demonstrates a clear definition of scope, phasing, total budget and proposed funding sources, and Measure M reimbursement schedule; Caltrans Project Development documents; project study report (or similar); readiness 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>	<p>0-6 points</p>

Environmental Compatibility, Sustainability, and Quality of Life (10 points max)

<p>The proposed project clearly and convincingly demonstrates that it 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</p>	<p>8-10 points</p>
<p>The proposed project sufficiently demonstrates that it 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</p>	<p>4-7 points</p>

The proposed project somewhat demonstrates that it 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	0-3 points
--	------------

SAMPLE

Updated 5/29/25

June 2024	July 2025	August 2025	September 2025
<p>5. Transit Operators Working Group</p> <p>9. SBCCOG Transportation Committee - DARK</p> <p>9. SBCCOG Steering Committee</p> <p>13. Metro South Bay Service Council</p> <p>11. Infrastructure Working Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective Measures for Measure M MSP Project Selection Criteria – consider recommendation to Transportation Committee Measure M MSP Local Allocation Program Policies – consider recommendation to Transportation Committee <p>22. Metro Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure R SBHP Annual Program Update Approval <p>26. SBCCOG Board</p>	<p>3. Transit Operators Working Group – DARK</p> <p>9. Infrastructure Working Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metro Board VMT Policy Discussion <p>14. SBCCOG Transportation Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measure M MSP Local Allocation Program Policies – consider recommendation to Board Objective Measures for Measure M MSP Project Selection Criteria – consider recommendation to Board <p>11. Metro South Bay Service Council</p> <p>14. SBCCOG Steering Committee</p> <p>24. Metro Board</p> <p>24. SBCCOG Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 	<p>7. Transit Operators Working Group</p> <p>8. Metro South Bay Service Council</p> <p>11. SBCCOG Transportation Committee</p> <p>11. SBCCOG Steering Committee</p> <p>13. Infrastructure Working Group – DARK?</p> <p>28. Metro Board</p> <p>28. SBCCOG Board</p>	<p>4. Transit Operators Working Group</p> <p>8. SBCCOG Transportation Committee</p> <p>8. SBCCOG Steering Committee</p> <p>10. Infrastructure Working Group</p> <p>12. Metro South Bay Service Council</p> <p>25. Metro Board</p> <p>25. SBCCOG Board</p>

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK