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 upon which LAP funds can be applied towards a new project through the regular call for projects process. 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 with using available narratives and references as described that would be less 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