

Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL
Tuesday January 9, 2018

PAC Business and Minutes

Roll call.

Mark Christoffels moved, Jacki Bacharach seconded *with change*.

Measure M Admin Guidelines

Ms. Honish began by introducing the amended Measure M Admin Guidelines and detailed some of the specific changes with which the PAC expressed concern. Some of the changes include better clarity of Metro's role, response times, specific delineation of what are eligible uses for the half-percent planning funds versus capital expenditures (i.e. capital lines begin at project environmental phase; half percent funds are applied prior to that), and the inclusion of the new Public Participation form .

Visionary Seed Funding now has a 40% match requirement per the amended Guidelines.

Terry Dipple asked for clarification on an item found on Page 3 of Therese McMillan's memo. He received a Letter of No Prejudice and wanted clarity whether additional information is necessary for funds to be reimbursed in the future. Ms. Honish noted that there is now an MSP email box where questions may be submitted (MMGuidelines@metro.net). In response to Mr. Dipple's question, she explained the finalized guidelines would be published soon and will contain information relevant to the related procedure.

Ms. Estolano, referring to the second paragraph of page 3 starting with "compensating," stated COGs do not yet know what projects will be planned using funds. Ms. Honish clarified that if cash flow is available within 5 years, projects may commence. Mr. Christoffels followed-up with a clarifying question and Ms. Honish answered accordingly.

Mr. Dipple referred to page 2 of the memo, noting that language is unclear on whether or not an additional analysis is necessary if already included in original matrices. Both Ms. Honish and Ms. Wiggins answered no. Mr. Lantz then asked if an analysis on removing a project was required. Similarly, Ms. Wiggins answered no.

Ms. Lindblad asked about the addition of an appendix for documents but Ms. Meaney said it could be put in the Appendix as is. There was opposition to that and the MSP will stay the same. Overall, structure is still the same but there is more clarity and there is an appendix that includes forms that guides viewers through each step.

Ms. Bacharach said that there are clarity issues in how to secure the funding. She requested a draft funding agreement from Metro staff as soon as possible. She also asked whether each MSP has a separate funding agreement. Ms. Honish replied yes, and Ms. Bacharach noted that one of them, Subregional Equity does not have available cash flow. Ms. Honish noted that they would have to wait to do a funding agreement for that MSP, but not for any of the other 3. Ms. Bacharach asked who qualifies as a project sponsor and Ms. Honish responded a project sponsor can be determined, but that COGs should involve Metro early and often. Steve Lantz asked for difference between project sponsor and lead agency. Ms. Honish said she would look into it. Ms. Bacharach asked for recourse if Metro does not meet deadlines specified in guidelines. Ms. Honish said there would be recourse. Mr. Lantz pointed out vagueness in lapsing policy regarding administrative agreements. For instance, all agreement state they will lapse in three years. The uncertainty of the language, however, will be cleared by Ms. Honish – she believes the agreements states lapsing years plus 3.

Mr. Christoffels asked that Metro provide response to submitted PAC comments. He said there are questions that would presuppose CEQA, which is illegal. Ms. Honish said that the final version of the memo will include language that states “subject to availability.”

New Draft Admin Procedures (June 2018 Completion)

PAC will next be reviewing 2% Transit System Connectivity, Street Car/Circulator and Active Transportation ATP.

Jacob Lieb introduced and presented 2% ATP, the first active transportation program at Metro that exists with other funding opportunities. Some of the programs under ATP are already identified; however, there is still potential for additional and future priorities that will be established on a rolling 5-year basis. The local return is the most flexible funding source with two other funding sources including first-last mile. The state ATP program will be augmented annually.

Ms. Meaney laid out next steps and asked when cash flow would be available and Ms. Honish said June. Ms. Lantz asked whether there is order to priorities as listed on the documents provided and Mr. Lieb answered no. The Board would determine priorities for the first time this year and then every 5 years.

L RTP Policy Paper Outlines Introductions

Mark Yamarone introduced the next 4 policy paper outlines which include:

- Public Private Partnership
- Goods Movement
- TDM/Shared Mobility
- Transit Oriented Communities

PAC proceeded to breakout into smaller groups that allowed each group to provide insight as needed. Mr. Yamarone provided an introduction to the policy papers that included questions for each:

- Public Private Partnership
 - How should Metro prioritize projects for P3 developments?
 - What risk/cost is Metro willing to accept?
 - What role does equity play for Metro's approach to a P3?
- Goods Movement
 - What are the appropriate policy directions for LA County's goods movement system?
- TDM/Shared Mobility
 - How can Metro support TDM efforts throughout the County?
- Transit Oriented Communities
 - What TOC activities can be considered a "Transportation Purpose?"

Jenna Hornstock presented on TOC. There will be a new TOC policy decided on by the Metro Board and a policy paper that seeks to alter the current approaches to TOC. She also presented documents that will define and seek Board approval regarding:

- Metro's TOC goals and objectives
- What is considered a "Transportation Purpose" (required for spending Measure M fund)

For TOC Policy, staff will form a PAC working group with target representation from each constituent group with bi-monthly meetings between January and May 2018. Metro staff would prepare materials and agendas. A draft of the policy will be presented to the Board in April; a final recommendation will be made to the Board in June 2018.

Drafts for the policy paper will begin in the spring with the onboarding consultants and a completed draft will be available in the fall. Questions for Paper will include definitions of TOC, goals, objectives of Metro's approach to helping these processes, and what TOC activities considered transportation purpose.

Ms. Dodds asked what the difference between the policy and policy paper is. Ms. Hornstock and Wiggins followed up, stating the policy informs the paper. Ms. Dodds then asked how Policy will interact with the LRTP policy paper. Ms. Hornstock replied that the paper will draw from the policy and Ms. Honish confirmed.

Public Comment Period

Asiyahola Sankara from ACT LA discussed that higher income households are replacing lower income households and impacts of transit use. Mr. Sankara stated the policy and policy paper could be the catalyst that impacts the lives of communities of color. He also noted that small businesses are especially vulnerable to displacement from transit improvement projects.

Fanny Ortiz, ELACC representative as part of ACT LA, also discussed the implications transit corridors have on displacement. She noted she was displaced because of transit and urged the PAC to see TOC's

as vital for communities of color. Ms. Sotelo thanked everyone for their time and public session concluded.

Breakout Session Report-Backs

Ms. Honish presented the P3 break out session.

Mr. Yamarone presented the Goods Movement breakout session. There was emphasis on land use side related to adjacent housing and Metro's role commenting on state rail plan. Mr. Yamarone shared the use of corridor planning is also critically important to communities and environmental justice. He then shared that the group discussed the intersection between goods movement and complete streets, such as the local delivery issues that are increasingly facing difficulties and the need for parking and biking facilities. He then shared that his group discussed the role of truck-only lanes.

Dolores presented TDM and focused on the trip not taken and telecommuting. For example, flexible work hours are impacting transit. She also discussed the shared vehicle implications and that employer pass programs should look at neighborhoods rather than just employers. She then discussed the need to differentiate between carpooling and ride-hailing and that incentive programs need to be stronger to coerce ridesharing and parking benefits. Finally, Dolores shared about the connectivity between major hubs, education and placeholders, and how we must look at working spaces like We Work that help with telecommuting.

Ms. Hornstock presented on TOC. They had a robust conversation and highlighted what is accessible for whom, the affordability of types of households that need be considered, and how does TOC tie in with equity. Ms. Hornstock also shared how do TOC tie with equity and the roles that Metro can take to incentivize other municipalities to achieve goals, such as parking. TOC also discussed the connection between local use regulations and displacement and that Metro needs to look at small businesses and not just businesses when thinking about TOC. There will be a follow-up conversation regarding TOC in the upcoming weeks. The first meeting is scheduled on Monday, January 22nd.

Ms. Honish made a comment regarding the new program Low Income Fare is Easy. The program was made possible by the support of the Board.

Michael Cano informed PAC of SB-1 workshop, where they discuss the new programs funded by the California legislature bill passed in April. The workshop will focus on the strategies provided by the funding bill.

Finally, everyone was thanked for their time and the meeting adjourned at 3:33.