

## Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Tuesday, June 11, 2019, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

---

### Attendance

Jasneet Bains

John Bwarie

Kerry Cartwright

Mark Christoffels

Martha D’Andrea

Terry Dipple

Randy Johnson

Bryn Lindblad

Juan López-Rios

Hilary Norton

Romel Pascual

Nancy Pfeffer

Stephanie Ramirez

Karen Reside

Mary Reyes

Paul Albert Marquez

Arthur Sohikian

Joss Tillard-Gates

Ann Wilson

### PAC Business and Minutes

The meeting started at 1:37 pm with roll-call. Jessica Meaney, stepping in for Chair Cecilia Estolano, asked if PAC member had changes to the minutes. Mr. Terry Dipple spoke on behalf of Jacki Bacharach and stated there needed to be more background regarding Mr. Steve Lantz’s funding question. Mark Yamarone agreed that more context could be added and PAC would approve minutes at a later date once changes were made.

### Congestion Pricing Feasibility Study Update

Ms. Tham Nguyen updated PAC on the Congestion Pricing Feasibility Study by stating that Metro is currently in the blackout period of the solicitation process. Ms. Nguyen also stated that Metro intends to leverage PAC in various aspects of the feasibility study; it will be one of two advisory panels, the other comprised of pricing and equity experts. Ms. Meaney then thanked Ms. Nguyen and Metro for including the PAC as part of the Congestion Pricing advisory council. Ms. Bryn Lindblad then asked about a timeline for this process, to which Ms. Nguyen answered that the study would kick off in late Summer 2019 and would take approximately 24 months to complete.

### NextGen Bus Study Update

Mr. Conan Cheung discussed the NextGen Bus Study [[slideshow](#)]. The first question asked of Mr. Cheung was whether the service change roll outs would focus on certain areas, to which Mr. Cheung agreed that it would most likely be phased and with significant outreach. Ms. Lindblad asked what kind of transit priority would be considered. Mr. Cheung replied that Metro is looking at “more immediate term implementation” but also identifying and then providing solutions for hot spots along approximately seven pilot corridors. A member of PAC asked if this was based on the 7 million service hours, to which Mr. Cheung responded that this would be a starting point but then look at plans that would add 10 percent, based on working group feedback; the key is to re-baseline the system and then add to what is working well. Ms. Meaney then mentioned that the Flower Street pop up bus lane has been very successful and that the Investing in Place video on it has gotten lots of views, further illustrating its

success. Mr. Cheung added to that saying that, anecdotally, operators report a 5 min improvement in travel time as well as reliability increase; it has been a big success.

### **Metro Active Transportation (MAT) Program**

Mr. Jacob Lieb discussed the Measure M Active Transportation 2% program [[slideshow](#) w/ attachments]. After wrapping the presentation, Mr. John Bwarie asked how the proposed funding would work, namely if only the top ranked projects from the attached list would be selected. Mr. Lieb clarified and stated that Metro would take a broader range of projects in order to be able to whittle down to the number of recipients outlined in the slideshow, especially with First-Last Mile projects as selecting from a variety of jurisdictions is ideal. Ms. Meaney then asked Jacob to summarize the PAC's role in MAT program and Mr. Lieb clarified to say staff will seek approval from Board in September for program with consideration for further vetting (via PAC or the MAT working group, depending on PAC's preference) and authorization to release solicitation; then come back to Board in late 2019/early 2020 for approval of selected projects.

Mr. Kerry Cartwright stated that the Port of LA is pushing some active transportation projects so this discussion is important to their agency. Mr. Cartwright then asked how these projects relate to Metro's Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) and where the safety element for non-commute trips is represented. Mr. Lieb stated that the MSP projects are largely shaped by the subregions whereas the MAT projects are based on policy objectives shaped by the working group, equity, etc. As to the safety issue, Mr. Lieb stressed that all projects must abide by Measure M's focus on safety. Mr. Cartwright then replied that his agency's bike bridge project was rejected despite its safety element and Mr. Lieb stated that they could talk later about this but with the understanding that the need for project funding outstrips supply.

Mr. Terry Dipple asked whether the criteria for MAT would affect active transportation projects submitted under the MSP to which Mr. Lieb replied that these are separate pots of money with separate criteria.

Ms. Nancy Pfeffer asked if the high needs areas mentioned in the slideshow are the Cycle One Screening and Prioritization Methodology, specifically the Disadvantaged Community Scores, Healthy Places Index, and Communities of Concern. Mr. Lieb confirmed it is. Ms. Pfeffer then asked if the use of "active transportation corridors" is the same as the Gateway Cities COG's "complete streets"; Metro versus city roles [56'] Ms. Pfeffer wrapped up her comments by asking if COGs are able to apply. Mr. Lieb responded that an offline conversation may be required but that the rules state a COG project must be sponsored by a jurisdiction with authority over right-of-way.

Mr. Mark Christoffels asked about large scale projects, knowing that these projects often times are rejiggered owing to funding and jurisdictional constraints, and their ability to be partially funded through the MAT program should they be repackaged. Mr. Lieb responded saying that, if these large projects are broken up into smaller pieces, they would be re-scored and re-ranked. Mr. Christoffels then asked about the disparity between Metro asking projects to limit parking at new stations and the inability for first-last mile projects at stations to compete in the MAT program; could this be rethought?

Mr. Lieb stated that it is a possibility to rethink this process but that Metro has been heavily involved in including first-last mile options when it comes to station design; there will be other opportunities for the projects with which Mr. Christoffels is concerned.

Ms. Meaney felt that the funding sources and data underlying Active Transportation 2% was still not very clear to her or the PAC and large, therefore, she floated a motion to receive 10-Year Financial Forecasts. This motion was seconded by Mr. Dipple. Ms. Martha D'Andrea amended the motion to include these financial forecasts for the next 40 years. Ms. Laurie Lombardi agreed to this request. Ms. Meaney then suggested a 3 p.m., July 8, 2019 meeting to discuss the forthcoming financial forecasts.

### **BRT Vision & Principles Study Update**

Ms. Lauren Cencic gave an update on the BRT Vision & Principles Study [[slideshow](#)]. Ms. Stephanie Ramirez asked how this effort is connected to the NextGen Bus Study, to which Ms. Cencic stated that they are sharing data as well as coordinating study approaches, identifying corridors, and sharing of outreach. However, beyond that they are separate studies in that NextGen is looking at the system as a whole while this study focuses on BRT only.

### **L RTP Update**

Mr. Mark Yamarone gave an update on the L RTP Update [[slideshow](#)]. Ms. Pfeffer asked about how the L RTP performance metrics might overlap with SCAG's RTP performance metrics as there may be common ground. Mr. Yamarone stated that Metro coordinates closely with SCAG as he chairs the technical advisory committee for SCAG's RTP Update.

Ms. Ramirez asked the reasoning behind capturing the over-65 population when Metro's senior passes allow for 62+ years old. She also stated that, in regards to slide 4, the over-65 population is at 18% (versus 12% in the slide) by way of City and County of LA studies. Mr. Yamarone stated that the over-65 data is from the census and from earlier years which may explain both discrepancies.

Mr. Cartwright stated that performance measure 12 (re: goods movement) does not align with goal 4 (transform LA County through regional collaboration and national leadership). Mr. Yamarone stated that he did not disagree but after discussions with the goods movement team this is where they felt it best as compared to the other goals.

Ms. Jasneet Bains asked how activity centers are defined (performance measure 9) and Mr. Yamarone stated that these are destinations such as parks, hospitals, schools, etc., not so much commercial centers.

Ms. Meaney asked a clarifying question about whether the performance measures would be adopted at the upcoming Planning & Programming Committee. Mr. Yamarone stated that if there are no comments by the public or committee members, these performance measures would be incorporated into the L RTP Update, slated to be made public by June 2020.

Mr. Cartwright asked where Metro is in terms of the tasks of the LRTP and Mr. Yamarone replied that Metro is currently in the scenario testing phase with outreach forthcoming at the end of summer 2019; a hybridized recommended plan based on this outreach would be incorporated into the LRTP Update.

Ms. Meaney expressed concern about how the LRTP works in relation to the other funding mechanisms such as the MAT and MSP programs. Ms. Lindblad stated that Metro has already submitted an investment list to SCAG for their RTP and Mr. Yamarone confirmed.

### **PAC Announcements**

Ms. Meaney introduced the Draft PAC Attendance Policy and that PAC memberships end in September, after a two year term. A draft attendance policy was created in order to add meaning to the PAC and its meetings. Ms. Meaney then opened the floor up for discussion.

Concerns with the policy included the thought that one absence is too restrictive to the idea that there needs to be clarification on whether both primary and alternate need to attend in order for attendance for a group to count. Much of the PAC wanted to address the members that frequently miss meetings instead of pushing out rules that may not affect them (i.e., COGs cannot lose their representation). However, Ms. Meaney, while understanding that attendance affects each of the 3 groups differently, stressed that she felt it important that an attendance policy that everyone could agree on is important for the sake of the PAC. Mr. Yamarone added that this policy is simply a mechanism to nudge affected groups with a policy to reference; working groups would not be counted toward absences. Ms. Meaney wrapped up the subject by asking for comments to the attendance policy with follow up in August.

The meeting adjourned at 3:31 p.m.