

**Amendment to the SFV/SGV High Capacity Transit Corridor Motion**

**By Directors O'Connor, Dubois and Knabe**

The motion before us today clearly makes the case for the need to address the growing Orange Line ridership. The lifting of the ban on at-grade light rail in this corridor makes it only logical that Metro should seek to undertake a feasibility study for the conversion of the Orange Line BRT to a light rail project at some point in time. The fact remains, however, that feasibility studies will not provide funding commitments until the project is included in an updated LRTP. The question then becomes: (a) under what process should feasibility studies such as those described in the Motion be conducted, and (b) where do they belong in the existing queue of Metro Long Range Transportation Plan budgeted and approved transit project studies?

Meanwhile, Metro staff is bringing before us this month updates of the Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP), staff is undertaking the Board directed subregional Mobility Matrix Studies, and concurrently proceeding with Ballot Initiative "outreach" efforts with the TAC Working Group and establishing an Executive Committee with the COGS, Caltrans and Metrolink as part of an effort to draft a potential new Transportation sales tax Ballot Initiative that could possibly go before the voters as early as 2016.

Within that context, this Motion brings into focus questions as to the efficacy of undertaking the preparation of any new sales tax Ballot Initiative outside the Long Range Transportation Plan *Update* planning process.

It is questionable how a new Ballot Initiative can balance the need to complete the regional investments approved in Measure R, bring forward the projects identified in the **2009 LRTP Strategic Plan** in Tiers 1 and 2, manage to incorporate "new" projects seeking feasibility study-funding without running the risk of becoming a de facto subregional-centric "shopping cart" of projects that fails to reflect Metro's commitment to developing sustainable mobility programs such as the **Active Transportation Agenda** and **Complete Streets** that address local and subregional congestion issues, and integrating State mandated sustainability strategies?

The challenges listed above coupled with those of developing new funding sources and re-balancing transportation priorities and funding need to be developed through a transparent, inclusive and innovative Long Range Plan planning process from which a new sales tax Ballot Initiative should emerge.

All of these issues described above need to be weighed in the context of the shortcomings of Measure R; primarily that the need for its counter-part, Measure J, lay in the fact that, for all its leadership and ambition, Measure R substantially underfunded and underestimated the costs of the transit and highway Expenditure Plan projects. This

## The LRTP Update vs. Ballot Initiative Dilemma

July 16, 2014

ambitious Motion reinforces the imperative that any new sales tax Ballot Initiative must contain projects whose costs are carefully estimated and fully funded if we are to garner the support of the subregions, cities and voting public.

**WE, THEREFORE, MOVE** to amend the *High Capacity Corridor* Motion to instruct the CEO to return in September, 2014 with a report back to the Board on

- A. A plan to update the 2009 LRTP which would add future projects in the strategic unfunded plan tiers 1 and 2;
  1. including the feasibility of complying with the instructions outlined in the Motion and similar advanced planning or other feasibility studies for the Strategic Plan or new initiatives;
- B. That Metro staff return with recommendations to re-focus current Ballot Initiative energies and resources towards the update of the 2009 LRTP,
  1. including a plan to incorporate subregional priorities developed through the subregional mobility matrix studies, using the joint work program to better link SCAG's 2016 RTP process with a Metro LRTP update; and
- C. A timeframe under which the updated LRTP could be completed.