

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Transportation Committee

April 13, 2026

Meeting Minutes

(Held at 357 Van Ness Way Suite 90, Torrance, CA 90501)

COMMITTEE CHAIR PIMENTEL CALLED THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 10:34 AM.

I. Welcome / Self-Introductions

In attendance were the following voting SBCCOG Board Members:

Christopher Pimentel (Chair, El Segundo)
Rodney Tanaka (Gardena)
Alex Monteiro (Hawthorne)
Anne Yoon (LA County SD2)
Bubba Fish (LA County SD4)
Bill Uphoff (Lomita)
Nina Tarnay (Manhattan Beach)
Jon Kaji (Torrance)

Non-voting member:

Donald Szerlip (Metro South Bay Service Council)

Also in attendance:

Mike Bohlke (Metro Deputy to Mayor Butts)
Andy Sywak (Metro)
Sergio Carvajal (Caltrans)
Constance Turner (SCE)
Kevin Kane (SCAG)
Elias Sassoon (El Segundo)
Dana Pynn (GTrans)
DJ Torado (Hawthorne)
Selena Acuna (Hawthorne)
Deanna Fraley (Lomita)
Jenn Howell (Lomita)

Elizabeth Garcia (LA County)
Erik Zandvliet (Manhattan Beach)
Dina Aryan-Zahlan (POLA)
Meg Wynne (POLA)
Paige Meyer (Redondo Beach)
Shin Furukawa (Torrance)
David Leger (SBCCOG)
Jacki Bacharach (SBCCOG)
Jake Romoff (SBCCOG)
Anne Tsai (SBCCOG)
Aaron Ruiz (SBCCOG)

II. Public Comment

Dina Aryan-Zahlan made a public comment in support of the Avalon Pedestrian Bridge and Gateway project on the Measure M MSP item.

III. Consent Calendar

- A. March 9, 2026 Transportation Committee Minutes (Attachment A)
- B. Transportation Report covering March 2026 (Attachment B)

MOTION by Committee Member Tanaka, seconded by Committee Member Uphoff, to **APPROVE** the consent calendar. Approved without objections.

IV. SBCCOG Transportation Working Group Updates

- A. **Infrastructure Working Group** – Mr. Zandvliet reported that the IWG met to discuss the Measure M Subregional Program funding. The group recommended approval of 8 existing projects, 10 new projects, with reprogramming for 2 additional projects, and referenced the report in the agenda.

B. **Transit Operators Working Group** – Ms. Pynn shared that the group received and approved the Measure R South Bay Transit Investment Program which was forwarded to the committee.

C. **Metro Service Council** - Mr. Szerlip shared that the council met and heard from the Ad Hoc Committee evaluating the structure of the Metro Board. Most of the public's comments were more interested in seeing transit advocates, riders, and construction experts on the board, over public officials. Mr. Szerlip also explained that they received an update on the budget with a presentation on infrastructure improvements. Mr. Szerlip noted the Service Council will be dark in July and August.

V. **Caltrans District 7 - Agency Updates** – Mr. Carvajal reported that there were no major updates.

VI. **SCAG Local Data Exchange (LDX)**

Mr. Kane introduced the Connect SoCal 2050, a Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy which is a federal and state required plan to show how the region will develop over the next 20+ years. Mr. Kane explained that the LDX aims to meet and exchange local information for regional purposes with all jurisdictions in Southern California, with SCAG preparing jurisdiction-specific GIS data, maps, and a survey. Meetings began in April 2026, with input/review from local jurisdictions due to the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) work by November 20, 2026. Mr. Kane noted that the program is early in the development cycle, and that there is currently a RTP/SCS Policy Committee focusing on the local data development process. Mr. Kane identified six categories of data/maps that local jurisdictions may correct for any discrepancies that fall within their local purview. This is intended to be rooted in local planning policies, be aligned with state policy, and steered by a regional vision. Mr. Kane also demonstrated overlaps in goals between the Connect SoCal 2050 program and the 7th Cycle RHNA Allocation, including jobs and housing balance, infill development, land conservation, and regional emission targets.

Ms. Bacharach asked if there are deadlines for 2037 and 2050. Mr. Kane clarified that the RTP/SCS is moving forward with 2050 as the sole horizon year, with intermediate points set to demonstrate state compliance.

Mr. Pimentel asked for further explanation on the Green Region Resource Area (GRRRA). Mr. Kane explained that this is intended to reflect SB 375 requirements, which highlight where future growth may be less feasible due to sensitivities to climate hazards, habitat areas, agricultural areas, and areas legally protected from growth to a varying degree.

Mr. Szerlip questioned if the program considers future developments from a long-range transportation planning standpoint, such as the locally preferred alternative (LPA) through the Sepulveda Pass or the K-Line extension into Torrance. Mr. Kane stated that the program is designed to set the groundwork for data and a regional consensus on a long-term plan for 2050. For transportation-specific projects, Metro's long-range plan would be the source of this data to be added to the regional goals and plans.

Ms. Bacharach asked for clarification on the accuracy of SCAG's planning for 2050 referencing a previous forecast from SCAG, considering any potential obstacles that may hinder a jurisdiction's ability to predict the local economy, land use development, etc. Mr. Kane commented that the RTP is required to be completed every four years, while a 20+ year outlook remains necessary. The forecast recognized that while population growth rates have decreased, state policy and priorities remain the same and SCAG aims to refine data sets for local understandings and RHNA development.

Mr. Pimentel questioned the necessity of the plan and if it serves simply as a compliance exercise. Mr. Kane answered that it does ensure compliance for the region, along with gathering data to make informed decisions and guide development principles. Mr. Pimentel followed up regarding school data and if it is included. Mr. Kane commented that school enrollment rates are included as part of travel demand modeling, but not as a separate dataset.

VII. FY26-27 Measure R Transit Program Funding Recommendation

Ms. Tsai provided updates on the FY 26-27 Measure R South Bay Transit Investment Program. In March 2026, SBCCOG received one funding request from City of Carson, in collaboration with CSUDH, for \$4 million for the Victoria Transit Center. Ms. Tsai noted that SBCCOG files have previously labeled it as the “Fashion Outlet Transit Center,” which is no longer applicable as the location is on the campus of California State University, Dominguez Hills. The City of Carson and CSUDH have been working collaboratively on the university’s mobility hub, of which the Victoria Transit Center is a component. The funds will add mobility hub elements to the scope of this project, to prepare for the 2028 Olympics. With the additional \$4 million, the City of Carson’s total Measure R transit funding would amount to \$15.477 million. If this request is approved, \$19.2 million will be in the remaining funds. Mr. Leger clarified that Measure R funding will no longer increase and will end in 2039.

MOTION by Committee Member Monteiro, seconded by Committee Member Uphoff, to **APPROVE** the Measure R Transit Program Funding Recommendation. Approved without objections.

VIII. FY26-27 Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program Funding Recommendation

Ms. Tsai reported that In September 2025, the Metro Board of Directors approved the South Bay’s FY25-26 MM MSP annual program. Following that action, approximately \$230.78 million remained available in unprogrammed funding through FY29-30. In January 2026, SBCCOG received funding augmentation requests for 8 existing projects, 11 new projects, and 2 reprogramming requests for a total of \$158.78 million in MSP funding requested. Due to the high volume in funding requests this year, a competitive scoring process was initiated as outlined and approved by the board in July 2025. The Measure M Reviewing Subcommittee was formed and comprised of SBCCOG staff and volunteers from the Infrastructure Working Group (IWG). Projects were ranked and scored, with the highest-ranking projects receiving priority for funding. The Measure M Reviewing Subcommittee recommended \$82.26 million in additional funding for existing projects and \$26.52 million in new projects for a total of \$108.78 million. This would include 10 out of 11 new project requests. In addition to this, opportunities were identified for integration with the South Bay Fiber Network (SBFN) for those projects with a broadband nexus. Because of this, the IWG is recommending that all Measure M broadband projects that plan to install fiber communication conduit be required to allocate fiber capacity for SBFN communication with access rights, and that all future projects that plan to open up the right-of-way for fiber optic communications be required to install additional conduit for the SBFN with access rights. The IWG also recommended a discussion regarding revenue sharing for projects funded by Measure R and Measure M that generate revenue.

Mr. Uphoff questioned if there are expectations regarding timelines for projects. Mr. Leger replied that each jurisdiction with projects is expected to provide updates during each annual meeting with SBCCOG, but no policy currently stands approved by the board to revoke funds if a schedule is not met. A city must voluntarily update SBCCOG about a project no longer being pursued, and then the project will be de-obligated from the program.

Mr. Pimentel discussed possible policy direction for timelines on projects. Ms. Bacharach emphasized the importance of this discussion and mentioned the necessity of a policy for cost overruns and project delays. Mr. Leger noted that previous prioritization by the board was to ensure existing projects are completed and suggested the IWG discuss this and return to the Transportation Committee with a recommendation.

Ms. Yoon followed up and referenced that Metro funds phases of a project with a 5-year expectation of completion of a project, questioning where this expectation comes from. Mr. Leger answered that it comes from the terms of the funding agreements with Metro, which enables each year of funding to remain available for 3 years. An administrative amendment is necessary to extend the timeline of funding that is programmed, but there is not a true deadline for a phase or project completion.

Mr. Monteiro requested reconsideration of funding for the Hawthorne Mobility Hub Project and asked for a recommendation from the committee to support this. Mr. Szerlip questioned how the project will help reduce congestion within Hawthorne. Mr. Monteiro explained that the parking garages will serve as a mobility hub that

is easily accessible to cyclists and transit riders and mentioned the 2028 Olympics contributing to more congestion. Mr. Zandvliet informed the committee that the Measure M Reviewing Subcommittee reviewed the project closely and it was the lowest-ranking project based on the rubric that included supporting documents to justify the need for the project. Mr. Zandvliet recommended that no single project be revisited without all projects receiving a second look to avoid any preferential treatment for specific projects. Proposals offered by IWG included were for Hawthorne to use their local allocation funding to begin the design phase of the project, and then they could reapplying for construction costs in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Obagi noted that there have been no discussions about traffic management in the South Bay considering future large-scale events, and how to assist local cities with this. Mr. Obagi then recommended that it be a joint effort to assist neighboring cities, considering the venues in Inglewood.

Mr. Monteiro mentioned that Metro's LA28 plan does not include any projects in Hawthorne despite having 3 Metro Rail stations and presented the idea that all cities be held accountable for their projects and consider the effects to surrounding cities.

Ms. Bacharach suggested that the working groups can create an Olympic committee to discuss traffic impacts, but recommended that Hawthorne proposal remain with the design phase only.

MOTION by Committee Chair Pimentel, seconded by Committee Member Tanaka, to **recommend** a policy that limits the amount of additional funding a lead agency can seek for each phase of a project following the initial allocation by the SBCCOG. Committee Member Fish abstained. Approved without objections.

Ms. Yoon asked Mr. Monteiro to clarify what portion of the project is the \$1.8 million in design funding going towards. Mr. Monteiro explained that the funds will be to design the El Segundo Blvd/Doty Ave parking structure to complete the project by the Olympics.

MOTION by Committee Member Monteiro, seconded by Committee Member Obagi, to **APPROVE** the Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program Funding Recommendation and include Hawthorne for \$1.8 million from an advance to Hawthorne's local allocation funds for the of the Hawthorne Mobility Hub Project. Committee Chair Pimentel voted against.

IX. Three Month Look-Ahead – Received and filed

X. Announcements – No announcements were shared.

XI. Adjournment: Committee Chair Pimentel adjourned the meeting at 12:02 p.m. to May 11 at 10:30 a.m.

Prepared by Aaron Ruiz, CivicSpark Fellow and Anne Tsai, Transportation Project Coordinator