

Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Tuesday December 5, 2017

PAC Business and Minutes

Jacki Bacharach motioned to approve minutes, Mark Christoffels seconded, and the minutes were approved. The March PAC meeting is scheduled for the first Tuesday of March and will be moved to SCAG Headquarters if available. Otherwise, it will be held on the second Tuesday of March in the Metro Boardroom. All other meetings are to remain as scheduled.

Measure M Administrative Guidelines

Ms. McMillan noted that the package given to the PAC presented a variety of major topics including the public participation guidelines and the performance metrics, as well as more technical elements such as the funding agreement structure. She also noted that the PAC would soon begin working to provide feedback on the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

In response to a question asked by Ms. Meaney over email, Ms. Honish stated that the 0.5% applies to both program and project development. She noted that the funds would be useful for the COGs in developing a program of projects, but that there would still need to be funding for the project sponsors down the road. She emphasized that the costs billed to the 0.5% be reflected in the project scope for a funding agreement before funds were allocated.

Ms. Honish also conveyed that Metro would give COGs in the near future financial planning tools so as to avoid missteps and to allow COGs to begin programming development funds. She hoped that this would allow COGs to begin planning funds early and to involve Metro often as necessary. To support this effort, Metro will also provide an internal contact list so that PAC Members can reach out to the appropriate staff for various questions or concerns.

Mr. Dipple commented that items should be discussed in a group setting at the monthly PAC meetings, and members should be given at least 2 days to read the materials before the meeting. He added that soliciting comments outside of the meeting might not garner the most robust responses, and therefore did not fulfill the goals of the PAC. Ms. Honish responded that time would be allowed for discussion at the meeting, and that in the future, materials would be distributed in a timelier manner.

Ms. Bacharach added that the most important part of PAC was discussion. Ms. Meaney asked whether the December deadline for comments could be extended. Ms. Honish responded that there was a Board-assigned deadline of 6 months from July 2017.

Mr. Diaz noted that because there were few changes, the PAC could discuss the most significant changes during the meeting. Ms. Lindblad said that Section 3 of Measure M Performance Metrics seemed to have been “dialed back.” Ms. Honish said she would look into this and respond after the meeting. Ms. Dodds requested that PAC receive red-lined drafts in order easily identify and review updates.

Ms. Bacharach requested an annual schedule for showing both deadlines for sub-regions *and* for feedback from Metro in order to keep all parties on track and abreast of pertinent information. She added that the schedule should also include an opportunity for dialogue, especially for items that were presently left “up to Metro’s discretion.” Her next comment was on Step 5 Item 4 of the MSP Administrative Guidelines. She expressed support for a 5-year rolling program with an added year at the end of every year.

Ms. Bacharach’s next comment was about an item on page 6 in Section 2. Regarding the Letter of No Prejudice, she asked for clarification on the difference between the 0.5% Program and the MSP. Ms. Honish clarified that the 0.5% Program referred to expenditures for the planning for a project, while the MSP referred expenditures for the actual project. Regarding lapsing rules, Ms. Bacharach noted that the Guidelines indicate funds will lapse after 3 years for a 5 year program. She expressed that this created an unrealistic timeline for projects. Furthermore, she noted that the policy regarding redistribution of funds was not fair because the funds were collected by and for each individual sub-region, and therefore the sub-regions should decide how funds are distributed as long as they stay within the designated parameters. Ms. Honish replied that this was to encourage project readiness, and that COGs would not lose the funds. The funds might become temporarily unavailable if sub-region’s project was not ready, and another project was. Ms. Bacharach asked that the guidelines be written in a way that better conveyed this idea. Mr. Lantz suggested that redistribution take place only with concurrence of the COG rather than independent of the COG. Ms. Honish responded that language could be added to say that debt-service would be specific to the MSP.

Ms. Bacharach asked a question about public participation, she found contradictory language in sections B and C. Ms. Honish would look into it. Ms. Bacharach then expressed that letters of support did not seem necessary, and asked why they were required in the planning process. Her final comment was on the chart titled “Project Financial Plan.” It seemed that it was missing columns for year and amount. Ms. Honish replied that the chart was meant to be an aggregate but that Metro can provide dates.

Regarding the LONP, Mr. Cartwright asked whether planning was considered pre-PS&E or pre-PAED. Ms. Honish replied that staff determined it to be pre-PAED. Mr. Cartwright asked for more clarifying language on what planning activities qualify. Mr. Yamarone noted that the chart showing performance metrics was the most up-to-date. Ms. Lindblad noted that she thought more specific metrics would be the most helpful. Ms. Honish previewed that in the coming months, Administrative Procedures for Metro grant funds would be discussed with more in depth performance metrics. For the ATP competitive and transit connectivity funds specifically, discussion around ongoing requirements would take place.

Mr. Dipple likened the funding redistribution issue to the Measure R option where twice a year, sub-regions could adjust funds. He supported the idea that if a project is delayed, the COG should have the first opportunity to attempt to repurpose the funds within the sub-region. Mr. Dipple also noted that he believed the performance metrics agreed upon were specific enough, and not vague. Ms. Honish commented that funds would lapse and be redistributed only in a situation where funds in a particular fiscal year are no longer necessary. Ms. Meaney expressed that lapsing policy seemed in line with previous information presented by Metro's Chief Executive Officer and Chief Planning Officer.

Mr. Christoffels asked why representation was necessary for the funding agreement in Step 2 section 2 of the MSP Administrative Guidelines. Ms. Honish stated that the funding agreement required COG consensus, and that the representation would be attached as part of the submission to Metro. Mr. Christoffels also referenced language stating that after the initial 5 year plan, COGs would submit 1-year updates. Ms. Honish encouraged sub-regions to stick to the 5-year plans, but noted that if necessary, there was a way for COGs to supplement them on a yearly basis.

Ms. Meaney asked whether PAC could have an extra 30 days to read and analyze all materials. Ms. Bacharach proposed that the Chair of PAC write letter to Board. Mr. Diaz asked whether would be feasible for Metro to meet deadline and then update guidelines later.

Luke Klipp (Board Deputy, Mayor Robert Garcia) expressed that there is precedent in place for extending deadlines set by the Metro Board. Ms. Bacharach asked that the PAC Officers contact Metro CEO Phil Washington asking that he support a request to extend the deadline for comments to the next meeting. Mr. Dipple said that his COG already had a LONP subject to what's approved by admin procedures and wanted to get started sooner rather than later. Was in favor of not extending the deadline, but wanted to have a healthy discussion before approval.

Ms. Dodds said that there was a lot of questions regarding clarity rather than disagreement. She leaned toward the time extension. A representative from Mayor James Butts' office encouraged Metro staff to submit Board Box. Ms. Meaney resolved to send a letter to Metro's CEO to consider a time extension.

Regarding Visionary Seed Funding, the comments from the PAC were acknowledged, and the Office of Extraordinary Innovation was working to fix consistency between revisions. Ms. Bacharach asked for clarification as to which agency the "embedded fellow" belonged. She also noted that without ability to select a consultant and with a 20% match requirement, the Program's usefulness is questionable.

Regarding 3% local contribution for major transit projects, Ms. Honish discussed the administrative procedures meant to outline Metro's responsibilities as related to the guidelines adopted. The Guidelines outline timelines for related milestones, and Ms. Honish noted that staff felt it was appropriate for Metro to take a Board action at the 30% final design period (standard for federalized projects). Ms. Bacharach asked if city over-matches, whether the additional amount be given to another city. Ms. Honish said that the 3% can be redistributed, and that COGs would do reporting. Ms. Bacharach then asked whether investments prior to the EIR could count for the 3% contribution.. Honish said that if cost is in scope at 30% design, it is eligible as contribution. Mr. Lantz asked whether if a city builds what is perceived to be an element of a project before the EIR is completed, is it possible to come to an

agreement that the expended money is eligible for the 3% contribution. Ms. Honish responded that the Ordinance is clear about how the calculable contribution is defined. Mr. Ranu determined that staff would examine this matter further.

Mr. Christoffels asked how Metro grant funds could be incorporated as 3%. Ms. Honish responded that COGs should determine and report to Metro what kind of contribution they want to make (e.g. First/Last Mile). The COG could also decide to simply contribute the funds. Mr. Klipp asked for clarifications for “all jurisdictions” as related to the contribution. Ms. Norton asked whether public-private partnerships could be included as 3% for the ATP grants specifically. Ms. Honish said that if the project was included in the scope at 30% design, it was eligible.

Next Steps from Metro to PAC:

- Responses to comments
- Redlined version of updates
- Matrix of received comments by PAC
- Time extension request to Metro CEO
- Clear channel of communication

L RTP Policy Papers

Mark Yamarone presented on policy papers. Presentation includes introduction including definition, discussion of actions Metro has taken in regard, discussion of best practices/research, and identification of up to 3 questions on topic that could be addressed in LRTP Update. Metro staff would set up conference calls

The goal of the policy papers is to provide a primer for a conversation on the various topics. The paper would provide a definition, a summary of what Metro has done to date, and best practices already in use outside of Metro. Mr. Yamarone noted that the process would be similar to the process used to discuss the MSP Guidelines. Conference calls would be set up so that any interested PAC member could outline and discuss the various topics in more detail. The three questions below help frame the topics as they relate to Metro’s long range planning process:

1. How should Metro view sustainability in regards to both agency goals and countywide goals?
2. What investment decisions should Metro adopt to achieve greatest sustainability outcomes?
3. How can Metro adapt to shifts in tech to lead way toward sustainable future?

Ms. Bacharach asked where “e-bikes” were accounted for in the policy papers. Mr. Yamarone responded that several topics, specifically those involving emerging technology, would fall under several policy paper categories. Mr. Cartwright commented that he would like incorporation of what ports are doing. Additionally, he requested that Metro stay up to date on State matters that might be consistent with Metro’s goals. Stephanie Ramirez asked if conference calls would open to the public. Mr. Ranu said that

they would be open to PAC members only. Ms. Honish added that PAC meetings are public and discussion is brought up. Ms. Lindblad commented that urban heat and storm-water runoff should be addressed. She also requested that timeline on drafts be made available so as to allow for outside experts' views to be contributed. Ms. Meaney noted that Board committee meetings were a good place to activate stakeholders. Mr. Ranu added that the public is also welcome to PAC meetings, and would be engaged during the robust public participation process. Mr. Yamarone responded to Ms. Lindblad saying that Metro is always looking for best practices, and open to receiving research papers, articles, etc. Ms. Dodds asked for a clear definition of sustainability be included in the policy paper.

Ms. Ramirez commented that active transportation did not necessarily address issues to those with limited mobility and in wheelchairs. Moises Cisneros added that he would like to see the human and small business aspect of sustainability taken into consideration in the policy paper. Kerry Cartwright asked whether any could be condensed. Ms. Honish said that at this juncture, staff were simply trying to frame the conversation in order to shape the discussion going forward. Mr. Cartwright asked for information about "Transportation History." Mr. Ranu explained that Metro could learn from the positive and negative effects of various transportation infrastructure projects over the last century.

Mr. Lantz proposed a category addition to the Transportation Demand Management policy paper: the "trip not taken" as a result of tele-commuting and working from home. Mr. Yamarone agreed to examine that aspect. Ms. Honish also noted that e-commerce in the Goods Movement policy paper.

Twenty-Eight by '28

Mr. Ranu presented that there would be a focus on Los Angeles due to the incoming Olympic Games. In order to take advantage of the momentum, Metro plans to proceed with accelerated efforts and to achieve the aspirational schedules. Ms. Bacharach, referring to South Bay Curve, asked what the steps going forward would entail. Mr. Ranu responded that there would be outreach and additional discussion in the near future.

Work Plan

Ms. Honish noted that the next 6 months would be focused on competitive grants including ATP and system connectivity-transit. In addition, the streetcar aspect would be discussed at the next meeting. In addition to the four policy papers discussed at this meeting, the TOC paper would be available in January. An Equity envisioning process would also commence in January. A Short Range Transit Plan item would be available in the next six months as well.

Ms. Meaney pointed out that all money is programmed out until 2040, with little flexibility. She noted that in order for a project to be accelerated, another would have to be decelerated.

Ms. Honish also noted that the Strategic Plan would come to the PAC in February. Additional initiatives can be found on in the PAC Work Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55pm.