

## Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Tuesday, April 9, 2019, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

---

### Attendance

Jasneet Bains	Karen Heit (for Nancy Pfeffer)	Linda Silva (for Paul Albert)
Colin Bogart (for Eli Kaufman)	Richard Hernandez	Marquez)
John Bwarie	Randy Johnson	Arthur Sohikian
Mark Christoffels	Steve Lantz	Cynde Soto
Martha D’Andrea (for Seleta Reynolds)	Bryn Lindblad	Joss Tillard-Gates
Roderick Diaz	Megan McClaire	Ann Wilson
Cecilia Estolano	Hilary Norton	Thomas Yee
David Feinberg	Stephanie Ramirez	
	Mary Reyes	

### PAC Business and Minutes

The meeting started with roll-call. Chair Cecilia Estolano introduced new PAC members, including Karen Reside, Cynde Soto, Megan McClaire, Jasneet Bains, and Eli Kaufman. Ms. Estolano then moved to approve minutes from December 2018 and February 2019 which was seconded by Mr. Christoffels; minutes were approved.

### The Re-Imagining of LA County

Ms. Estolano thanked the PAC for all their hard work in contributing to the letter that was sent to the Metro Board regarding the Re-Imagining of LA County. Ms. Estolano underlined how much can be done if the three sides work together as they did with the letter. She then introduced Metro’s Kalieh Honish to recap, and discuss recommended actions and next steps.

Ms. Honish also thanked the PAC for their efforts as it was exactly the role for which PAC was created. Ms. Honish then gave a high level summary of the Re-Imagining of LA County and the [recommendations](#) to begin a feasibility study as well as to look at a fee on transportation network companies (TNCs). She also stated that equity would still play a key role in any studies and that the Re-Imagining of LA County will be separate and apart from the Twenty-Eight by ’28 discussion. In July, it is anticipated that Metro staff will come back to the Board with a funding plan. Also, in April the scope of work (SOW) for the congestion pricing feasibility study will go to the Board, with award in June.

Steve Lantz (alternate for Ms. Jacki Bacharach) then asked whether the funding needs and cost estimates for the Twenty-Eight by ’28 projects considering the most recent Board decision to decouple Twenty-Eight by ’28 from congestion pricing and will the aforementioned project list be shortened based on potential funding constraints. Ms. Honish responded that the financial forecast is updated annual and typically in July so these questions will be answered at that time.

Roderick Diaz asked what it would mean considering that Metro is no longer pursuing the Re-Imagining of LA County. Ms. Honish replied that Twenty-Eight by '28 and congestion pricing are still going forward, just that they are no longer linked. Future considerations will look at the benefit to all of LA County.

### **LRTP Update**

Ms. Honish introduced the [LRTP Update](#) and noted that the “modules” are now being referred to as “chapters” to illustrate a more familiar approach to the LRTP.

Ms. Honish went on to discuss the current status of public engagement by explaining the current ranking tool and how it will feed into the scenario testing. Ms. Honish then asked PAC members to share the ranking tool with their constituents and mentioned that they would be receiving an email to share soon; a late May deadline to share and rank was set. Ms. Stephanie Ramirez kicked off the comments for this item by asking if the Our Next LA\* and related ranking tool are available in Spanish to which Ms. Honish stated that it would be ready in two weeks.

Ms. Bryn Lindblad then asked if the scenario testing was unconstrained, to which Ms. Honish confirmed that it was unconstrained since it is difficult to move the needle in regards to Los Angeles County congestion but also to highlight the good and bad impacts. This will involve outreach as well and is anticipated to take place in August 2019.

Mr. Joss Tillard-Gates asked if Metro was tracking the demographics of those participating in the survey. Ms. Honish stated that demographics were tracked in round 1 but the current tool does not ask for demographics nor were they popular during the first round. Forthcoming Facebook ads will target certain demographics according to ZIP codes to ensure a broad base. Mr. Tillard-Gates then followed up by asking if there is available demographic data for the first round, to which Ms. Honish confirmed it was available and embedded in a Board Report which could be forwarded to Mr. Tillard-Gates.

Mr. Steve Lantz asked where “the trip not taken” was represented in the Long Range Plan since this can contribute to overall congestion relief. Ms. Honish referred to the performance measures discussion that would happen later in the meeting, specifically those measures related to the mode shift.

Mr. Colin Bogart of LACBC (substitute for Mr. Eli Kaufman) asked why Metro does not use “bike/pedestrian infrastructure” instead of “complete streets” since many may not understand what defines a complete street. Ms. Honish replied that the scenario testing will encompass safer and complete streets in addition to more robust bike/pedestrian infrastructure; not just more lanes but better lanes. “Complete streets” captures the most of what the public stated was important to them in the first round of outreach. Chair Estolano then commented that the stress testing seemed a little bit of an odd exercise since some of the combined tests would net a better result, specifically mentioning that better transit and congestion pricing would complement each other. Ms. Honish stated that Metro is looking at these possibilities and that the results are expected in July.

## Equity

Ms. Honish preface the discussion by stating that the equity portion of the LRTP will identify the communities most in need, and examine the impact on planned investments with respect to equity and the communities' access to opportunity. However, the LRTP will not reevaluate commitments already made, nor will it define equity itself. Mr. Jonathan Overman of Cambridge Systematics then went over the [slideshow](#).

Mr. Lantz started discussion on the topic by asking what will be done with the resulting work especially as it relates to the entire county as this seems like an unanswered question. Ms. Honish replied that these data will be used in an overarching look at investments throughout the county but reiterated that she could not speak to the investments tied to it. Ms. Ann Wilson echoed Mr. Lantz's concerns.

Interim Chief Planning Officer, Laurie Lombardi, arrived and discussed that Metro would be taking an item to the Board to discuss the planning process. Metro is also taking a look at capital investments, New Starts in particular. With respect to Equity, CEO Phil Washington is looking to hire an Equity officer to oversee the platform and its implementation in the agency, and recently Metro met with GERE to discuss ideas on racial equity and items on which to focus. To Mr. Lantz's and Ms. Wilson's question, Ms. Lombardi could not answer definitively on how the Equity Platform would affect current investments.

Mr. Andres Ramirez asked how communities are being identified for the purposes of equity and what will be done with the ongoing studies. Ms. Honish stated that this study creates data for decision making; it is a place to start.

Ms. Megan McClaire had similar questions and wondered what Metro was attempting to change specifically. In that respect, the Equity officer needs to have a clear charge and/or budget. Ms. McClaire then raised a concern about the term "risk factors" since it can have a loaded meaning when it comes to race. Ms. Honish replied that this was a truncated term for what the working group saw as risks involved in accessing opportunities, though she agreed that the term may come across as negative. Ms. McClaire suggested adding the aforementioned context to help in understanding the term.

Mr. Thomas Yee, stepping in for Ms. Jessica Meaney, noted the participants in the equity working group and that the work presented here is a big step in recognizing the decisions made. Further, this work has been less about reevaluating and reallocating investments than about knowing how decisions will impact various communities; this is a start to a very important process and not just an LRTP exercise. Mr. Yee then asked if Metro would like to hear comments about applicability of the data, and if Metro could provide an EFC map with subregions/COGs overlaid to see how communities are impacted. Ms. Honish stated that once the performance metrics are honed PAC can revisit the applicability of data, and that Metro would provide subregions/COGs overlay.

Ms. Ramirez asked how the new Equity officer position would look in terms of hierarchy. Ms. Lombardi stated that this new position would report to the Office of the CEO with some staff as support.

## Performance Measures

Mr. Michael Snavelly of Cambridge Systematics presented on [performance measures](#). Mr. Snavelly spent some time discussing performance measure 5 since it focuses on EFCs. Ms. Lindblad then asked if it was possible to add travel time to goal 3, to which Mr. Snavelly agreed. Mr. Bogart asked if Metro would consider expanding the radius for walk modes, which Mr. Snavelly stated that he thought this was a recommendation based on Vision 2028 but would be happy to look at accommodate this. Mr. Lantz commented that the measures mention bikes and pedestrian but that having a broader range of mode options like scooters and carts would be better. Mr. Snavelly suggested talking about it so that such verbiage could be included.

Mr. Tillard-Gates thanked staff and PAC for their efforts thus far but the definition of equity seems to be a foregone conclusion since the factors that make up equity have already been determined. Mr. Tillard-Gates then went on to say that defining equity and how to address inequity would best be served by visiting the communities affected; the definition of equity is key. Ms. Honish agreed that a definition of equity is needed but as part of this work Metro is trying to simply measure the impacts.

On measure 8, Chair Estolano pointed out that there was a measure for greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) and air quality pollutants but not nested within EFCs, which she felt was important. Mr. Snavelly agreed and would look into including. Ms. McClaire asked how Metro defines “activity centers” to which Mr. Snavelly stated that it was essentially “any place that people go to”. Chair Estolano mentioned the inclusion of economic zones were important as well and Ms. Hilary Norton echoed this comment by saying that anywhere Metro can “double down” on these areas with transit would be welcomed. Mr. Snavelly highlighted that these are systemwide performance, as is the REMI model, so it is hard to parse them into specific zones.

Ms. Karen Heit, stepping in for Nancy Pfeffer, commented on the need for goods movement measures and Mr. Snavelly responded by saying Metro is doing a separate goods movement study.

When discussing goal 4 of the performance measures, Mr. Lantz suggested that this is where the trip not taken can be input. Chair Estolano and Mr. Snavelly concurred. Mr. Snavelly elaborated that travel demand management strategies that reduce the number of driving trips taken will be captured in this outcome; however, currently no data available for teleworking or trips not taken. Mr. Roderick Diaz, also discussing goal 4, suggested a measure related to linked trips. Mr. Snavelly commented that this may be an upcoming measure, especially considering the NextGen Bus Study. Mr. Diaz wrapped up his comments by stating that State of Good Repair should take into account Metro-assisted assets such as some Metrolink assets. Mr. Snavelly followed up by suggesting that Mr. Diaz give input on how this could be accomplished.

Mr. Bogart, in reference to measure 11, asked why increasing bike and pedestrian modes is not included. Mr. Snavelly stated that since there is no data for these modes they cannot include it but would love to do so if Metro moved forward on a bike and pedestrian count.

## **BRT Vision and Principles**

Ms. Lauren Cencic discussed the general idea of BRT Vision and Principles and gave a status report of the work to date. [\[link\]](#)

Ms. Norton asked how this study would prioritize access versus speed and used the North Hollywood to Pasadena BRT project as an example. Ms. Cencic replied to say that the study does not have the full answer yet but this study would take a look at questions like that but it comes down to the right balance of access versus speed. Ms. Cencic also summarized Ms. Norton's comment to mean that Ms. Norton preferred erring on the side of more access over speed, to which Mr. Norton agreed.

Ms. Martha D'Andrea, stepping in for Seleta Reynolds, asked if this study would go back and look at the Metro Rapid program as a reference point. Ms. Cencic confirmed Ms. D'Andrea's thoughts on using the Rapid program, as well as other studies, as a reference point to see what potential it may offer.

Mr. Lantz asked if PAC would see milestone reports and be able to provide input as to potential corridors. Ms. Cencic stated that she would welcome input from PAC in any capacity. Mr. Lantz suggested that milestone drafts and comments before going to the Board would be a good starting point. Chair Estolano generally agreed that the COGs are interested in hearing more. Mr. Yee commented that the PAC generally thinks this is something on which it would have some oversight.

Ms. Wilson asked if this would have an influence on the current four BRT projects in Measure M regarding financials. Ms. Cencic stated that, as related to these four BRT projects, it is not something with which this study is tasked; this study is mostly concerned with building consensus and design criteria.

## **NextGen Bus Study Update**

Mr. Conan Cheung presented on the NextGen Bus Study and its status [\[link\]](#), including an announcement on the following week's working group specifically related to equity.

Ms. D'Andrea asked how affordability of transit factors into the study and Mr. Cheung responded that affordability is not a factor in this study though there were comments at workshops related to fares.

## **Congestion Pricing**

Mr. Joshua Schank, of the Office of Extraordinary Innovation, introduced Ms. Tham Nguyen who would be presenting on the congestion pricing topic. [\[link\]](#)

Chair Estolano commented that the Westside Cities COG is very interested in participating in this feasibility study.

Mr. Lantz asked how this would be coordinated with local initiatives throughout this process. Ms. Nguyen responded that staff would like to engage the municipalities during this phase and that this is part of the fact finding of this study.

Ms. Linda Silva, stepping in for Paul Albert Marquez, asked why there is nothing in the various studies discussing the construction aspect, namely how workers get to construction sites.

Ms. Lindblad commented that the NextGen Bus Study and the Congestion Pricing study need to mesh in some way.

**PAC Announcements**

Ms. Honish offered Our Next LA\* magnetic clips to all PAC members as a way of saying thank you.

The meeting adjourned at 4:03p.