

# South Bay Cities Council of Governments

## Transportation Committee Meeting

Monday, May 11, 2026 @ 10:30 a.m.

**In Person at 357 Van Ness Way, #90, Torrance, CA 90501 &  
Virtually via Zoom**

***SBCCOG Board Members: pursuant to the end of the State's COVID-19 emergency declaration, your attendance is required to be in-person or follow the provisions of SB 707 available [here](#).***

### **ACCESSING THE MEETING:**

For the public and guests, to receive Zoom meeting credentials in advance of the meeting, register by using the following link:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/meeting/register/tZYpdOyvqzstHdxcNhUBqDIFEZxtJ-UBdOcl>

**OR** to access the Zoom meeting, visit <https://zoom.us/join> or call (346) 248-7799 and use Meeting ID: 824 3575 0778; Passcode: 722264

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

The Public Comment portion of the meeting is the Public's opportunity to provide comments on non-agenda items within the jurisdiction of the SBCCOG/cities and each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes. Comments on agenda items may be made following the staff report on the item and each speaker is limited to three (3) minutes per item. Time allotments may be reduced due to time constraints at the discretion of the Chair. When called on, please state: Your name and residence and the organization you represent, if appropriate. To address the SBCCOG Transportation Committee on any item or a matter within the Transportation Committee's purview in writing, please provide written comments by 9 a.m. on the day of the meeting via email to [davidl@southbaycities.org](mailto:davidl@southbaycities.org). All written comments submitted will become part of the official record.

### **AGENDA**

- 10:30 a.m. Welcome / Self-Introductions**
- 10:31 a.m. Confirm Posting of the Agenda**
- 10:32 a.m. Public Comment**
- 10:35 a.m. Consent Calendar**
  - a. April 13, 2026 Transportation Committee Minutes (Attachment A) – Approve**
  - b. Transportation Report covering April 2026 (Attachment B) – Receive and File**
- 10:38 a.m. SBCCOG Transportation Working Group Updates**
  - a. Infrastructure Working Group – Chair Eric Zandvliet, Manhattan Beach**
  - b. Transit Operators Working Group – Chair Dana Pynn, GTrans**
  - c. Metro Service Council – Chair Don Szerlip, Metro South Bay Service Council**
- 10:50 a.m. Caltrans District 7 – Agency Updates – Sergio Carvajal, Caltrans**
- 10:55 a.m. Metro FY26-27 Proposed Budget – Matthew Bresolin, Metro**
- 11:20 a.m. Metro Board Composition Ad Hoc Committee Update - SBCCOG Staff**
- 11:40 a.m. Three Month Look Ahead (Attachment C) – Receive and File**
- 11:43 a.m. Announcements**
- 11:45 a.m. Adjournment**

**Next Transportation Committee meeting – Monday, June 8, 2026, 10:30 a.m.**

**To propose an item for the agenda, e-mail to: [DavidL@southbaycities.org](mailto:DavidL@southbaycities.org)**

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

# 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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*



# MONTHLY SBCCOG TRANSPORTATION REPORT

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

COVERING APRIL 2026

Edited by Aaron Ruiz, CivicSpark Fellow

## Federal

### **U.S. Department of Transportation Launches Initiative to Eliminate Traffic Bottlenecks**

U.S. Transportation Secretary Sean Duffy announced a new federal initiative aimed at reducing traffic congestion by targeting the nation's most persistent highway bottlenecks. The effort directs the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to work with state departments of transportation to identify and prioritize high-impact congestion points for improvement.

Under the initiative, FHWA will coordinate with states to catalog bottleneck locations, evaluate potential solutions, and streamline project delivery. With the U.S. being home to 10 of the 25 most congested cities in the world, including Los Angeles, the focus is on segments of the highway system where recurring delays impose significant costs on commuters, freight movement, and the broader economy. Officials emphasized that addressing these chokepoints can yield measurable benefits in travel time, fuel consumption, and emissions without necessarily requiring large-scale construction.

The announcement reflects a broader federal push to maximize the efficiency of existing infrastructure. By concentrating resources on targeted improvements, such as interchange reconfigurations, auxiliary lanes, and signal optimization, the initiative seeks to deliver congestion relief more quickly than traditional capacity expansion projects.

Source: [Trump's Transportation Secretary Sean P. Duffy Launches Initiative to Eliminate Traffic Bottlenecks Across America | FHWA](#)

## State

### **California Invests Nearly \$900 Million in Transit Technology, Freight, and Multimodal Options**

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) allocated \$848 million to advance mass transit systems, expand pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and improve freight movement. The investments align with Governor Gavin Newsom's "Build More, Faster – For All" infrastructure agenda and draw from multiple funding sources, including \$47 million from the federal Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and \$405 million from Senate Bill 1, California's Road Repair and Accountability Act.

Among the largest allocations is \$273 million for rail technology upgrades in the Bay Area and Southern California. A \$100 million portion will support construction of a 5-mile tunnel for BART's Silicon Valley Phase II extension between downtown San Jose and Santa Clara, funding a tunnel launch structure and supports that mark the project's transition from planning to sustained construction.

The CTC also approved two major long-term investment plans, with the 2026 State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) committing \$17.9 billion over four years for highway safety improvements, pavement and bridge repairs, and expanded access for bicyclists and pedestrians. The second being the 2026 State Transportation Improvement Program which allocates \$2.7 billion to priority projects statewide, with over 60 percent of new funding directed toward biking, walking, rail, and transit.

For the South Bay and Los Angeles region, the allocations include \$35 million to complete design and construction of rail power stations in Los Angeles and \$33 million to expand rail freight operations at the Port of Long Beach. Additional highway repair funding includes \$1.2 million for drainage and sinkhole repairs on the I-405 near Hawthorne, addressing damage from heavy runoff.

Source: [California Investing Nearly 900 Million for Cutting-Edge Mass Transit Technology, Freight Movement and Transportation Options | Caltrans](#)

## Region

### **LA Metro Launches Public Safety Hub and Data Dashboard**

LA Metro has launched a new Public Safety Hub, a centralized online platform that consolidates safety resources, information, and data for riders and the public. The hub is designed to improve transparency around safety conditions on the transit system and make it easier for riders to access relevant information in one location.

A centerpiece of the initiative is a real-time Public Safety Dashboard that displays up-to-date statistics on safety incidents, response times, and enforcement activity across Metro's bus and rail network. The dashboard draws data from Metro's security personnel and law enforcement partners, allowing the agency to share performance metrics publicly for the first time in this format. Riders can view trends over time and see how safety conditions vary across different lines and stations.

The launch responds to persistent rider concerns about safety, which have remained a significant barrier to ridership recovery since the pandemic. Surveys have consistently ranked safety among the top issues for current and potential Metro users. By making this data publicly accessible, Metro aims to demonstrate accountability and rebuild confidence in the system.

Metro officials emphasized that the hub is part of a broader effort to improve rider experiences, alongside increased security staffing and expanded outreach programs. The agency plans to update the dashboard regularly and refine the platform based on user feedback.

For South Bay residents who use Metro services, Silver Line, K Line, and regional bus routes, the hub offers a direct way to monitor safety conditions on the lines they travel. The initiative also aligns with regional goals to encourage transit use by addressing quality-of-life concerns that influence travel choices.

Source(s): [Metro Launches New Public Safety Hub and Dashboard | The Source](#)

[Metro Safety & Support - LA Metro](#)

[New Metro Dashboard Shares Safety Data on L.A. Buses, Trains](#)

## Trends

### **San Francisco Speed Cameras Offer Preview for Los Angeles and California**

San Francisco's automated speed enforcement program has shown early signs of effectiveness in reducing dangerous driving, offering a potential preview of what Los Angeles and other California cities may see as they prepare to launch their own camera programs.

San Francisco was among the first California cities to implement speed cameras after the state authorized pilot programs in 2024. Data from the city's program indicates that speeding violations have declined at camera-equipped locations, and officials report fewer high-severity collisions on corridors where enforcement is active. The cameras operate in designated safety zones, including areas near schools and senior centers, and issue citations to vehicles exceeding the speed limit by a set threshold.

The program has not been without controversy. Critics have raised concerns about privacy, equity, and whether citations disproportionately affect lower-income drivers. San Francisco has implemented a tiered fine structure and offers payment plans to address affordability concerns, and the city directs revenue toward traffic safety improvements rather than general funds.

Los Angeles is preparing to launch its own speed camera program, with installation of 125 cameras expected by the end of July. The city has identified high-injury corridors where speeding contributes to serious and fatal crashes, and cameras will be deployed in phases starting with the most dangerous locations. City officials have pointed to San Francisco's experience as a model for implementation and public outreach, informing future discussions about automated enforcement as a tool for improving street safety.

Source: [Speed cameras worked in San Francisco. Now they are coming to L.A. -- with hefty fines - Los Angeles Times](#)

Updated 4/20/26

May 2026	June 2026	July 2026	August 2026
4. Metro South Bay Service Council	1. Metro South Bay Service Council	Transit Operators Working Group - DARK	6. Transit Operators Working Group
7. Transit Operators Working Group	4. Transit Operators Working Group	Metro South Bay Service Council - DARK	10. SBCCOG Transportation Committee
11. SBCCOG Transportation Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro Annual Budget</li> <li>• Metro Board Composition Ad Hoc Committee Update (Tentative)</li> </ul>	8. SBCCOG Transportation Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I-105 ExpressLanes Update</li> </ul>	8. Infrastructure Working Group	10. SBCCOG Steering Committee
11. SBCCOG Steering Committee	8. SBCCOG Steering Committee	13. SBCCOG Transportation Committee	12. Infrastructure Working Group
13. Infrastructure Working Group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metro Measure R MyGrants Portal</li> </ul>	10. Infrastructure Working Group	13. SBCCOG Steering Committee	Metro Board - DARK
28. Metro Board	25. SBCCOG Board	23. Metro Board	27. SBCCOG Board
28. SBCCOG Board	Metro Board - DARK	23. SBCCOG Board	31. Metro South Bay Service Council (September Meeting)

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK