Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Wednesday April 5, 2017

Meeting called to order at 1:05

Introductions

Metro CEO Phil Washington started the meeting with a brief introductory speech, and introduced Therese McMillan. Ms. McMillan introduced staff members and called for self-introduction of PAC members.

--

Roles and Responsibilities (Therese McMillan, Metro)

Ms. McMillan began by thanking members for joining the PAC. She detailed the two main differences between the PAC and other advisory committees or councils at Metro:

1. Members are here not representing their own agency. They are instead representing the constituency of that seat. The main role of the PAC is to assist in outreach to the constituents that each seat represents. Ms. McMillan used the example of the “Airport” representative representing all air passenger/freight issues, as opposed to just representing Burbank Airport.

2. Metro will not be taking votes; the Advisory Council’s role is to bring together the diverse viewpoints of each constituency on any particular issue. Constituent consensus on any particular issue is good. It is just as important, though for the Board to be aware of different viewpoints or areas of disagreement among constituents that Metro may still need to work through.

Ms. McMillan reiterated that Metro’s Board of Directors will be making all policy decisions, and that the hope is for the PAC to advise them in a way that informs their decisions in a much more inclusive, comprehensive way. Ms. McMillan mentioned that the Tax Oversight Committee, tasked with overseeing everything that Metro does, will use the Guidelines as a base to guide their review.

Ms. McMillan advised that Metro staff is here to provide support to PAC members, but that it will be the responsibility of the PAC to coordinate outreach (as discussed in the nominations and selection process). Members were selected in part because they have a significant networks and means by which to connect with that network. She noted that one of the ways that Metro can be of service is through use of Metro’s meeting rooms.
Ms. McMillan explained that PAC Members are to select their own officers including Chair, Vice Chair, and 2
nd Vice Chair. One officer will be selected from each category (Providers, Jurisdictions, Consumers), and the positions will rotate every year. Officers are responsible for running the PAC
meetings, presenting to the Metro Board and coordinating with Metro staff on meeting materials,
agendas, etc. The officers are to be selected by each category by June 2017.

Steve Lantz (South Bay Cities COG) asked whether there is a timeline in place for the PAC.

Ms. McMillan responded that this is meant to be a new committee serving the Metro Board henceforth. There will always be policy issues to be discussed and communicated. The PAC was
created recognizing that Measure M passed by over 71% in the County because of the diverse group of stakeholders in the region. Therefore, implementation must involve the same level of diverse
representation.

---

**Overview of Measure M Ordinance (Kalieh Honish, Metro)**

Ms. Honish explained that projects were brought forward in a collaborative process through the
COGs. Each sub-region brought projects forward, and Metro used performance measures to select
which projects would be included in the Measure M Expenditure Plan. The performance metrics were
used included mobility, accessibility, safety, economic benefits, and sustainability.

Ms. Honish relayed that the purpose of the ordinance is to create 4 sub-funds, continuing work
Measure R, consisting of local return, regional rail, local match, oversight entailing comprehensive
assessment and periodic review including a 10 year evaluation. Ms. Honish referenced a pie-chart on
the screen that showed a breakdown of how the money is distributed between each of the sub-funds.
The sub-funds are to be carefully monitored and proportionally grown based on their own capacity.
Funds cannot be transferred from one sub-fund to another. The one exception to that rule is in the
“capital” area. At the 10-year mark, there is a one-time allowance for funds to be added to the capital
sub-funds with a 2/3-majority vote by the Board of Directors.

Ms. Honish went into detail about how the money is broken down in each type of construction project.
Under transit construction, a portion is earmarked while the other portion is competitive and can be
applied for by cities. Under highway construction, most projects a bit of local match for cities to
compete.

---

**Measure M Guidelines (Therese McMillan, Metro)**

Ms. McMillan started by expressing how different Measure M is from Measure R, calling it much more
comprehensive and complex. Measure M has no sunset, and goes on in perpetuity until the Board of
Directors elects to end it. Measure M also has very deliberate and prescriptive oversight and
evaluation mechanisms in comparison to Measure R.

Ms. McMillan emphasized that managing the (20 billion dollars) of Measure M money in a
transparent, responsible way must be the first order of business. Metro wanted create a
comprehensive set of guidelines as well. Language in the ordinance calls for guidelines for certain aspects, but Staff wanted to go above and beyond to create a guiding framework for the entirety of the Measure. Ms. McMillan expressed that some contents in the Guidelines served as responses to lessons learned from mistakes in Measure R.

Ms. McMillan emphasized that Metro’s overall goal is to manage projects and programs, and that Metro aims to manage Measure M’s resources in a way that leads to improvements for the public. These goals should be the foundation of how Metro develops the Guidelines.

Ms. McMillan named and went into detail about the three core principles of the Measure M Guidelines:

- **Timely use of funds**: Metro wants to make sure that partners are ready to go before the funds are locked down. This is due in part to the fact that Measure M funds are accumulated over a long period of time. As such, there is also a lapsing policy in place to make sure that if there are project delays, money can be repurposed (within the aforementioned parameters).

- **Cash flow**: Metro continues to support the notion of shovel-ready projects. Ms. McMillan explained that if there is potential to accelerate projects to be completed faster without compromising other projects, Metro would like to be able to take advantage of the opportunity. Cost containment is another important aspect of managing cash flow. Ms. McMillan expressed that projects in the Measure M ordinance were assigned a certain dollar value, and must find other sources of funding should their funding needs exceed that value.

- **Multi-year funds**: There is a very comprehensive assessment and amendment process involved with changing project funding schedule. Amendments require a 2/3 majority Board vote (at least). Ms. McMillan also advised that there is a comprehensive assessment every 10 years, at which point Staff can decide whether changes are necessary.

Ms. McMillan referenced the 3% local return requirements, stating that they have been refined from Measure R, and are clearer regarding requirements and expectations.

Ms. McMillan then spoke about sub-regional programs, an important part of management. The third page of Attachment A in the Ordinance contains a list of programs funded by Measure M where specific projects have not been identified. These programs are typically oriented toward a specific region of the County (e.g. Active Transportation Program for the San Gabriel Valley). The Guidelines address how Metro is to select specific projects for these programs using definitive terms of eligibility.

Ms. McMillan concluded by talking about competitive county-wide structure for accessing funds in three categories: Active Transportation, Highway, and Transit. Staff is still determining exactly how the competitive process will work.

---

**Measure M Guidelines Developed by Finance Team (Kelly Hines, Metro)**

Ms. Hines spoke about the sections of the guidelines developed by the Local Programming team, which used Measure R as a baseline and added new eligible uses as provided in Measure M while
incorporating new reporting requirements for proper oversight purposes. These sections included local return, ADA/para-transit, and subsidies for students and seniors.

Ms. Hines explained that the main concerns regarding local return included the method used to distribute funds throughout the cities. The Ordinance calls for allocation based on population; there is discussion on whether night time population should be used, as it is for Propositions A and C and Measure R, or whether day time population (employment) should be used instead. In addition, Staff are considering the adding a minimum allocation amount for smaller cities.

Ms. Hines then relayed that the ADA/para-transit riders would receive a 75% discount, while students and seniors would receive no less than a 25% discount. Unused funds would be pooled to create a unified subsidy program for low-income riders. Ms. Hines also informed that regional rail funds would be used for performance measures, and that ongoing discussion with Metrolink is taking place.

Before opening up for questions, Therese noted that all public comments should be directed to theplan@metro.net. Comments should be submitted here to avoid misinterpretation and to make sure all are accounted for. Information on Measure M is available to the public at theplan.metro.net.

Questions/Open Discussion Period (Metro PAC)

Steve Lantz (South Bay Cities COG) asked a question regarding whether Metro is going to reply to comments sent to email address. Ms. McMillan responded that as there is a short window for all of this; Metro will be reviewing them in preparation and anticipation of the Board meeting in June. Metro plans to consolidate all comments before going in front of the Board.

Jacki Bacharach (South Bay Cities COG) asked a question regarding whether Metro will ask for guidance and advice on specific changes. Ms. McMillan replied that PAC members should go out and bring their people’s opinions to Metro. There will not be solicitation of advice from the PAC.

Jessica Meany (Social Justice) asked who writes report with PAC recommendations. Will PAC members be in charge of producing a report? Ms. McMillan answered that the expectation is that staff does not interpret report to the Board. Officers selected by the PAC would represent the PAC in front of the Board.

Ms. Meaney asked how the PAC submits feedback on Guidelines. Ms. McMillan responds that the PAC can give a statement at the Planning Committee. At the June Board meeting, the PAC can submit their feedback. Ms. McMillan emphasized that there will most likely not be a full consensus amongst PAC members and that all viewpoints must be acknowledged and reported in the presentation to the Board. She suggested that the PAC could present 5 key issues, and the different PAC perspectives on those issues.

Ms. Meaney suggested that at the next PAC meeting, Representatives could set an agenda involving discussion of the major issues.

Dalila Soleto (Metro CAC) commented that the CAC develops a work program that envelopes the issues raised, and presents to the Planning Committee on quarterly basis. In contrast, the PAC should
be mainly self-driven. Ms. Soleto suggested that the meeting focus on separating guidelines in major categories. As homework, PAC members would get feedback regarding each of the major categories in order to report back for May meeting. Ms. Soleto also called for Staff to share email comments with PAC members.

Ms. McMillan agreed with Ms. Soleto and emphasized that PAC members should focus on how to best outreach. Results of outside stakeholder meetings should be reported at PAC meetings, whereas specific comments should be directed to the comment email address. Ms. McMillan added that Staff will produce a summary of those submitted comments.

Tamika Butler (Bike/Pedestrian) commented that there is not much incentive for PAC members to direct people to comment email address without access to the submissions. Additionally, she asks how to engage underprivileged stakeholders without internet access. Ms. McMillan replied that it is most important for PAC members to bring back the feedback from their outreach efforts. The comments received via the email address serve as an additional way for people to express their concerns, but does not negate the necessity and importance of the PAC.

Seleta Reynolds (Los Angeles Department of Transportation) commented that solely reading comment letters written by stakeholders does not necessarily take advantage of the “brains” in the room. She would prefer to have a discussion based on the significant issues. Ms. Reynolds called for working groups facilitated by neutral parties or officers to discuss the viewpoints of each stakeholder group.

Cecilia Estolano (Westside Cities COG) suggested 10 minute break to discuss officers for each subgroup.

Terry Dipple (Las Virgenes/Malibu COG) asked if Metro staff would accept a recommendation brought forward by the PAC if a consensus were developed regarding a certain part of Guidelines.

KeAndra Dodds (Low-Income Communities) asked if there will be an opportunity to be shared with staff so that PAC recommendation can be incorporated into draft Guidelines presented to the Board.

Ms. McMillan acknowledged that these were good points, and that staff would review and revisit. She noted that the PAC’s feedback in May would factor into the recommendation in June. Ms. McMillan also noted that Metro is collecting feedback from many different groups in addition to the PAC.

Ms. Bacharach asked why we need to get these done by July 1st. Ms. McMillan replied that this was that date when tax collection began per the Ordinance.

Ms. Soleto noted that the members of the PAC are respected enough to make their own recommendations to the Board.

Joanna Hankamer (Westside Cities COG): asked whether PAC members could discuss key issues to gather constituent input on for the next meeting? Ms. McMillan replied that she wanted to leave outreach open to whatever each representative or constituent group feels is significant.

---10 Minute Break to Discuss Heads of Categories---
Meeting reconvened at 2:45pm

Ms. McMillan reiterated that Staff would provide, on a monthly basis, a running inventory in the form of a report summarizing the comments that Metro has received. If Staff has initial response to any of those things, those will also be shared with officers.

PAC Officers

Providers: Roderick Diaz, Metrolink

Jurisdictions: Cecilia Estolano, Westside Cities COG

Consumers: Jessica Meaney, Social Justice

Ms. Estolano proposed that prior to the May 2nd Meeting, PAC representatives find the top five issues that the PAC has 100% consensus on to report to the Board. Ms. Soleto pointed out that due to the diverse nature of the group, consensus will most likely be difficult to achieve, and that points of disagreement should instead be communicated to the Board. Ms. Reynolds suggested that areas of both agreement and disagreement be produced and presented at the next meeting.

Ms. Meaney requested that meetings going forward reserve time for PAC members to talk as a group. Ms. McMillan said that this would be fine, and noted that PAC Officers should inform Vivian Rescalvo (Metro) ahead of time in order to work out the logistics.

Ms. Dodds expressed that she strongly supports coming up with some sort of consensus in May instead of June so that the Board has time to consider and incorporate PAC feedback into the Final Guidelines. Ms. McMillan noted that the PAC could present to the Planning Committee and Executive Management Committee at the May 17th and 18th meetings (respectively).

Ms. McMillan noted that the duties of the PAC regarding the Long Range Transportation Plan would be a bit more relaxed, citing the June deadline as the reason for the time crunch.

Ms. Rescalvo reminded PAC Members to submit a member contact form to Marquis Williams (Metro) if they had not done so already.

Ms. McMillan adjourned the meeting at 3:00pm.