

Meeting Minutes – Draft

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 11, 2018; 1:30PM-3:30PM

PAC Business and Minutes

Andres Ramirez, Bryn Linbald, Cecilia Estolano, Cesar Hernandez, David Freiburg, Dalila Sotelo, Jacky Bacharach, Jessica Meaney, John Bwarie, Mark Christoffels, Mary Reyes, Nancy Pfeffer, Paul Allen Marquez, Randy Jackson, Roderick Diaz, Seleta Reynolds, Stephanie Ramirez, Terry Dipple, Tommas Yee attended in person. Marianne Kim and Darin Chidsey phoned into the meeting. Mr. Bwarie motioned to approve the minutes and Mr. Hernandez seconded the motion. The PAC approved the minutes.

Ms. Estolano discussed the introduction of new members and Ms. Kalieh Honish, Metro staff, elaborated, stating new members and representation will be added to each category during the December PAC meeting. The Arroyo Verdugo COG (JPA) will join and the senior group and formerly called disabled group will now have their own representation. Each consumer-based group will select their alternate and the provider group will now have a public health seat to set an equal rendition to each group. Ms. Estolano thanked Ms. Meaney for her excellent job in chairing the group during the past sessions and the meeting proceeded.

PAC Officer Election

The PAC is comprised of transit providers, consumers, and jurisdictions. Chairs for each group were selected by drawing of straws – those who pulled the shorter straw chaired the group. This time, however, the PAC designated 10 minutes to caucus to determine who will be the new chair for each respective group. Chairs will rotate; whoever is the chair of the jurisdiction group will become the chair of the overall PAC, followed by the provider group, and then consumer group. Every year, each group will get to decide who their chair is and will rotate within the PAC chair accordingly.

After 10 minutes of deliberation, Ms. Estolano was elected to continue to chair the jurisdiction group, Mr. Roderick Diaz the provider group, and Ms. Jessica Meaney the consumer group. Ms. Estolano will continue to chair followed by a representative from the provider group.

Ms. Bryn Lindbald asked if Metro staff could reach out to determine who attended the PAC meetings consistently and to verify if some members still want their seat. Ms. Honish explained Metro has already reached out to members but will do so again. Ms. Meaney noted some members are not present because they no longer are in their respective positions. Ms. Ramirez then asked what the process for alternates looked like, the timeline, and so forth. Ms. Honish responded that Ms. Ramirez and Mr. Richard Hernandez are free to select their own alternates but should confirm in writing Metro of the changes. Mr. Ramirez followed-up and shared that the process is different from their original procedures and was telling her constituents that the

nomination process would be the same as how it was initially done. Ms. Ramirez shared she wanted to be clear so that her message is consistent going forward. Ms. Honish stated she understood the sensitivity of the matter and would form a “more thorough answer” by the end of the month.

Ms. Estolano suggested that in addition to selecting and electing, a call out to the audience notifying them of the available seat should be available. The idea is that participants who want to participate will bring more enthusiasm and attend meetings more consistently. Finally, Ms. Honish agreed to verify via email who still wants their seat in the PAC and who will attend the next meeting in December.

SB1

Mr. Michael Turner presented on SB1, focusing on state funds that offer \$5 billion per year in transportation funding. Three-fifths (3/5) of the monies will not go to Metro. Half of the money will go to CalTrans for projects and the other half for local street repair through discretionary accounts. Metro, like other agencies, must compete for the funds in the discretionary accounts. Transit capital categories do extend money to the South Bay which will include freight capacity, funding for congestion corridors that seek to improve them, and dedicated commuter services. An SB1 explanatory workshop is currently scheduled for September 19th from 9:00AM-11:00AM.

PAC WORKING GROUP STATUS REPORT

Equity Performance Measures

Mr. John Overman, Cambridge Systematics, updated the PAC on equity performance. Metro subcontracted Cambridge to measure and address equity in the LRTP and empirically analyze what constitutes an underserved community. Cambridge is analyzing data through an opportunity and risk matrix to determine who is left out or included in projects. Opportunity includes outcomes of factors such as age, group, gender, birthplace, and more. Risk views the factors that lead a population to more difficult lifestyles. Mr. Overman also shared they define overcrowding through the industry standard of 1.5 or more occupants per room. They will complete their analysis next week to present at the subcommittee on Tuesday, September 25th at 2:00PM on the 3rd floor conference room and propose a working definition for historically underserved communities.

Ms. Honish shared the presentation was shared to keep everyone informed. Ms. Therese McMillan added that data collection allows making better informed decisions on programs and business for both short and long term goals. In other words, the purpose of data collection is to identify where gaps for opportunity exist and what Metro and investments could do with the information to close the gaps. Ms. Dalila Sotelo asked how exactly the data is collected. Mr. Overman responded that risk factors are assessed through Census block or tract data and opportunity range through Census and geographic information system (GIS) data with Metro’s travel demand models. Ms. Estolano commented that the term “historically underserved

communities” is “interesting” because although the term includes historic, the data used only measures current factors and does not take a historical approach.

Ms. Nancy Pfeffer added that her staff is currently researching terms such as community concern, overcrowded, and more through the CalEnviroScreen and once reports are ready, she is willing to share with the PAC if needed. Finally, Ms. Meaney suggested a timeline for the working group to be able to identify when items are discussed, defined, and operationalized. Ms. McMillan agreed the suggestion was a good idea and reinforced a copy of Mr. Overman’s presentation will be made available shortly.

L RTP Outreach

The Long Range Plan is launching a survey via a website to obtain feedback on the plan. Ms. Honish politely asked the PAC to share the website with their networks. A town hall is scheduled for Thursday, September 13, 2018 at 6:30PM to obtain feedback for the Long Range Plan.

TOC Policy Update

Ms. Jenna Hornstock briefly shared the TOC Policy was a success – it was adopted by the Board in June. The TOC group is now focused on drafting the framework paper as required by the L RTP. AECOM is supporting the paper and the hope is that metrics will lead to the TOC implementation plan. They will continue to have meetings to develop their report that is due to the board in 18 months. The next TOC working group meeting is scheduled on Monday, September 24th and consecutive meetings will follow to develop the report. Once the report is finished, the team will create annual reports to update the Metro board.

Measure M ATP 2% Admin Procedures Update

Ms. McMillan updated the PAC on the Measure M ATP 2% Admin Procedures, noting 2.4 million dollars for active transportation projects is derived from three categories. 22% of funds come from Metro Active Transport First/Last Mile Programs multi-sub regional funds, 29% from the LA River Waterway Bike Project Expenditure Plan for major projects, and 49% from the balance discretion fund category. The Metro ordinance specified where monies came from and Metro is analyzing definitions to establish what can compete for monies under the discretionary program. Ms. Pfeffer asked if e-scooters could be funded through program and Ms. McMillan responded yes since its part of the active transportation first-last mile initiative.

The PAC is concerned Metro is developing expenditure procedures without being transparent about where monies are coming from. The PAC noted budgeting is unclear and there is no information that explicitly describes how funds are spent and if funds are being transferred from Measure A to C and so forth. Ms. Meaney stated that although the money for active transportation projects is small, it carries a lot of significance and requested a document that lists where all the funds are being expended and where monies are remain for the next PAC meeting.

Ms. Sotelo asked if funds not spent in the previous year roll over to the next years. Ms. McMillan responded that MSP's are given a five year cash flow and regional projects are eligible for the 2% pot of funds and those 30 million dollars were assigned by other people. Ms. Meaney asked why those monies cannot be used for capital and operating expenditures. Ms. McMillan responded that all MSP program funds are coming from highway and active transportation and therefore is limited to capital. And that the law also prohibits movement of funds as stated in the conversation. Ms. Bacharach stated fund listings alter between 15 million and 17 million dollars and that the sales tax is not included as it becomes available. Ms. Bacharach also requested a report on the sales tax that indicates where funds came from and where they will be going. Ms. Ramirez was also concerned with the lack of transparency for the budget and felt there were no augmentation of the funds and rather a swap of funds. She too encouraged Metro to be more transparent about budget financing and requested a budget update on each quarterly PAC meeting.

Ms. Seleta Reynolds asked if a competitive program was coming out of the 49% discretionary funds. Ms. McMillan responded that 857 million dollars are allocated over the next 40 years. She added that funds could be investments into items that fit under the ordinance definition of active transportation. Ms. Reynolds asked there is a cash flow and was informed there will be one. Ms. Estolano commented that Metro already took the funds and hence the money is allocated to projects as Metro deems fit. Mr. Bwarie stated his area does not have an MSP and asked where his funds will be coming from. Ms. McMillan responded they are coming from highway funds because there are active transportation funds in the funding.

Ms. Reynolds asked how roles between the PAC and the Metro board differ in determination for funds. She added that it would be helpful for the PAC to make a policy call to address how fund expenditures are determined. Ms. Reynolds added that does not want to start programming the money but wants a reed for the policy direction to make a change. Ms. Estolano strongly recommended forming an off cycle, single-item meeting in October or early November to give the budget working group some time to develop budget recommendations. Ms. Sotelo agreed and advocated for another meeting in November. Ms. Reynolds added that there is no need to have a meeting to change the determination of fund distribution and suggests funds should be used for an additive program. She also added that she would like to see a document that lists where all pots of money are and where funds are coming from. Ms. Bacharach agreed with Ms. Reynolds and suggested they could go to the board with ideas should they meeting in November to address what was discussed. Ms. McMillan shared that the system is losing ridership and the way the budget is organized is meant to mitigate those issues. She noted that it is not an explanation of why the budget is structured as is but does provide insight on the type of problems Metro needs to solve with their budgets.

Ms. Sotelo stated she would like the PAC to establish policy procedures for how the 49% of the 2.4 billion dollars is spent. The working group could advise on (1) why there was a void (2) provide real advice to implement a procedure to ensure money is not allocated without transparency in the future and (3) provide recommendations on what will happen with those funds in the next 5 years. Ms. Bacharach added they definitely need to know what been taken

from Measures A, C, and R because there are some funds that people do not know where they are going. The system is losing ridership, fair box recovery is at 17%, and she is afraid that new projects created to help solve the issues will be heavily subsidized by Measure M dollars. Ms. Estolano stated that the current argument is that the first-last mile improvements will solve the issues but is unsure if that is where the pot of funds should be focused on.

Ms. Estolano added she would like the conversation on the budget to occur and then have a phone meeting to summarize the occurrences. Ms. Ramirez stated she is willing to share updates with the consumer group. Finally, Ms. Meaney added that that 2% ATP is arbitrary because it is not explicit where and when funds are coming and going from. She concluded that she would want to have at least a three week advance notice for the upcoming PAC in December.

The next working group meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 17 at 1:30PM in the 3rd floor Gateway Plaza Group.

PAC Announcements

Next Gen Bus Study

The NextGen Busy study is approaching a November deadline but the date is not set in stone. Ms. Honish requested anyone with feedback to follow-up so as to coordinate responses as needed. Ms. Ramirez stated templates make information sharing easier because it facilitates the process.

Ms. Bacharach is concerned the NextGen report is operating in silo. The report did not account the South Bay municipal operators or rail impacts. Similarly, EIR documents from the report were unavailable. Ms. Honish responded that the BRT study is being procured and will share information with the NextGen study as it becomes available. Ms. Meaney asked why it was a separate study and Ms. Honish responded that it is not a service plan but criteria for the development process. Ms. Estolano shared her concern with the approach.

December Meeting

The next PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, December 11 although it may be moved so participants may attend. A list of potential dates for the subsequent meetings will be provided. Materials for the meeting will hopefully also be provided earlier.

The PAC meeting adjourned at 3:30PM.