Meeting Minutes
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Tuesday May 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2017

Meeting called to order at 10:06am

Ms. McMillan called the meeting to order and welcomed members to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Policy Advisory Council Meeting. She emphasized that the majority of the meeting would be led by the three PAC Officers (Roderick Diaz, Cecilia Estolano, and Jessica Meaney), and that it would be a working meeting. She then called for introduction of present PAC Members and Metro staff.

--Introductions--

Ms. McMillan then went over the materials provided to each PAC Member. Those included:

- Meeting Minutes from the April Meeting
- Table detailing which sections of the Guidelines involve further detailed discussion and adjustment post-Board approval
- Summary of public comments collected through Metro’s website (Ms. McMillan reiterated that all comments should be submitted to the Metro website so as to maintain one comprehensive list of public comments)
- Results of survey distributed by PAC Officers and taken by PAC Members highlighting the main areas of concern

Ms. McMillan advised that the PAC Members should plan to have a report ready to present to the Executive Committee and the Planning Committee meetings at the end of May (this has since been changed to a presentation directly to the Board) so that Staff could incorporate PAC & Committee comments into the final Guidelines submitted to the Board in June.

Jacki Bacharach commented that there should be an agenda item to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. She also noted that there was an incomplete sentence in the April minutes that needed to be corrected. Cecilia Estolano proposed that PAC Members read over the minutes, bring forward any revisions, and approve the minutes, at the June meeting.

Ms. Bacharach also noted that, although she appreciated and encouraged prompt, efficient work, from a legislative standpoint, it is not necessary to complete the Guidelines by June.
Ms. McMillan then turned the meeting over to the PAC Officers. Jessica Meaney started by thanking PAC Members for completing the survey, and emphasizing that the meeting would be centered around breakout groups based on the survey results. She summarized the comments received by the Consumers category. Although many of the sub-groups were still working on engaging their constituency, a few of the issues that came forward included green streets/complete streets, safety, multi-year sub-regional funds, the 3% local contribution, and local return.

Ms. Estolano informed the PAC that the Jurisdictions had held a conference call as a follow-up to the PAC conference call in April. During this follow-up, Jurisdictions representatives discussed the key issues concerning their group while trying to understand the views of the Providers and Consumers in order to allow meaningful, active participation in discussions. They also discussed the importance of being well-represented in breakout sessions, giving them the ability to drive as much discussion as possible. Ms. Estolano expressed that the Jurisdictions group was looking forward to effectively communicating their point of view, while actively listening to others’, with the goal of sharing a few points of consensus with the Board in June.

Roderick Diaz summarized the comments received from the Providers group. There was general support for many of the different guidelines as written. Mr. Diaz noted that there was significant interest in expanding the requirements for eligibility in certain categories, specifically bus-rapid transit. There were also comments related to the mechanics of fund administration (i.e. borrowing funds; transferring funds between fund types).

Mr. Diaz then went over the comprehensive survey results and introduced the corresponding breakout sessions. Two handouts with survey results were made available to PAC Representatives, one largely in black and white and the other in color. Mr. Diaz explained that all of the comments were listed on the black and white sheet with the right-most column attempting to summarize the comment in one sentence. The second sheet contained the comments categorized using different colors by which of the following issues they regarded:

- ADA/Para-Transit/Transit for Seniors/Student Discount Programs (Green)
- Local Return (Pink)
- Multi Year Sub-regional Programs (Orange)
- 3% Local Contribution (Blue)
- Shovel Readiness/Project Readiness (Purple)
- General/Specific Program Eligibility (Light Blue)

Mr. Diaz called for Representatives to provide a bit of an explanation of their comments. Ms. Estolano noted that the Program Eligibility category had been combined with the Shovel Readiness/Project Readiness category for the purpose of the breakout sessions. Ms. Meaney added that members’ explanations in the general meeting regarding their survey comments would help guide the discussion in the breakout sessions.
Yvette Kirrin commented that if whole PAC felt the same way about a particular topic, that a breakout session may not be necessary. She suggested a vote to determine the level of PAC consensus. Mr. Diaz suggested PAC representatives have a similar discussion within the breakout sessions.

Steve Lantz suggested that because there were topics on which consensus would not be reached, it might be possible for PAC to agree to disagree and move on. He noted that this would make it easier for the PAC to find areas of agreement to present to the Board. Ms. Estolano agreed that the PAC should look to find areas of consensus, but added that the PAC should also serve as a forum to surface significant issues, even without consensus. Ms. Meaney wanted to ensure that the Board is aware of the range of opinions surrounding the guidelines.

Mr. Diaz next invited PAC members to ask any clarifying questions regarding the presented topics.

3% Local Contribution:

Bryn Lindblad verified that this topic included eligibility for the contribution, and clarified that the “Program Eligibility” topic covered other programs that did not fit into one of the specific topic categories.

ADA/Paratransit & Students:

Hilary Norton asked how the allocation ratio (up to 75% for ADA/Paratransit & up to 25% for Students) came about. Mr. Diaz responded that the comments received had to do with clarifying how the ratio was determined, and going into more specific detail about it. He noted that there were also comments that requested improved efficiency and delivery of the programs that fall under that category.

Stephanie Ramirez commented that, according to consumers, the allocation system is not working, and should not be funded further without revision. She mentioned that she would like to see performance metrics so that there is accountability. Ms. Ramirez noted that there are many people who need/want to use transit, but that there are barriers that require more mitigation than just a discount.

Andre Colaiace shared that the funding allocated for this category is federally mandated, and continued federal funding relies on compliance with the mandate. Mr. Diaz concluded that this would serve as a good discussion item for the breakout session.

There were no questions about the Local Return or Shovel Readiness/Project Readiness topics.

Multi-Year Subregional Programs:

Jacki Bacharach expressed concern that there seemed to be no role for COGs in the Guidelines, despite their efforts in shaping Ordinance’s project and program lists. She pointed to a table that showed a list of ways that the COGs could play a role in the future. Ms. Bacharach mentioned that under the Guidelines, subregional projects will be funded after other projects are funded, raising a question of whether subregional programs were weighted equally. Ms. Bacharach also commented that there was
no mention of local match for subregional programs in the Ordinance, and should therefore be no local match requirement in the Guidelines.

Mark Christoffels added onto Ms. Bacharach’s statement, asserting that the development of Measure M was a bottoms-up process, and that the COGs did a lot of community outreach and discussion to gauge the future needs of the neighborhoods. They developed “high-level” documents with plans for the communities, and would now like to create a more detailed plan and recommendation with the allocated funds available.

Ms. Estolano agreed that allowing for that planning process is critical, and that flexibility is also important so as to consider what may happen in the future. She would like to see a level of flexibility available to the COGs as they continue their planning efforts.

Ms. Kirrin noted that the Gateway Cities COG did create a high level document, and is now asking local jurisdictions to pick the top three projects from that document in order to create a cash flow timeline. Ms. Kirrin called for Metro to provide a clear picture as to which projects are eligible.

Ms. Meaney commented that unlike specific subregional projects, subregional programs are very broad in scope, with terms yet to be determined. She called for active community engagement, accountability, and transparency throughout the development and lifespan of Measure M. Terry Dipple said that COGs and cities are welcoming of community participation and that they provide public notice for all of their Council meetings, but that while many issues can be addressed, not all can be completely solved.

Keandra Dodds commented that every COG is different in terms of how they interact with and engage their community. That being said, she suggested a minimum standard of community engagement, that considers the unique styles of each COG.

William Osgood stated that critical effect on business needs to be at the center of discussion. He claimed that small business’ involvement in the utilization of Measure M funds can have an upward effect on local economy. He warned that the role of small business may be being neglected. Ms. Estolano asked Mr. Osgood and the Small Business group to provide specific comments representative of related concerns for the June meeting.

--Attendees headed to different meeting rooms for breakout sessions--

Mr. Diaz called the meeting back to order at 11:43am. He called for each group leader to present the main discussion points and findings from their respective breakout session.

3% Local Contribution – Mark Christoffels

Mr. Christoffels expressed the need for clarification as to whether the 3% local contribution applies to communities along Bus Rapid Transit corridors. The group also discussed whether the 3% should be collected by jurisdiction, or if instead a corridor approach was acceptable. Mr. Christoffels used the example of a city securing grant funding to pay for a grade separation, a significant cost that would count for the 3% contribution. With a corridor approach, other cities would not have to find additional
monies to contribute. He noted that this would be beneficial to both the cities and the COGs. Mr. Christoffels relayed that Metro was open to the corridor approach idea.

There was also an issue raised unique to Los Angeles County regarding unincorporated territories: does a light-rail system running through District 5 need local contribution from Districts 1, 2, 3, & 4, or will Metro use supervisorial districts similar to how they do with cities?

**ADA/Paratransit – Andre Colaiace**

Mr. Colaiace stated that the breakout group had reached consensus that 2% not enough of an allocation for this category. There was also consensus that Metro should encourage jurisdictions to use some of their local return to benefit seniors and people with disabilities with improvements including expansion of dial-a-rides and taxi voucher programs. Mr. Colaiace added that his group agreed the region could do a better job educating seniors and people with disabilities about the different mobility options available to them. He said that seniors would like to see some concrete achievements that justify their votes in favor of the Measure.

Stephanie Ramirez reiterated that there are senior riders excited by the new transportation opportunities presented by Measure M. She warned that Metro, and the region as a whole, could miss out on a major opportunity if advocates and staff are not able to better educate seniors on how to get around on the improved system.

Ms. Estolano asked for information regarding students’ interests. Mary Gallagher relayed that there are transit-related pilot program in place at a community college and a State university that should distribute surveys to users in order to test effectiveness. She said that these surveys should be incorporated into the Metro comments website so that the student perspective is included. Ms. Gallagher added that there would be study to see whether the program should be extended to high school students.

**Local Return: Cecilia Estolano**

Ms. Estolano relayed that the Local Return breakout discussion had covered 5 main issues. The first regarded removing the $100,000 minimum payment from the local return requirements. Ms. Estolano noted that there was no strong opposition to eliminating the floor, and that removing it might be a point of consensus amongst the PAC. The next issue was how to calculate city population for local return. Ms. Estolano reported that there was strong support of using daytime employment numbers derived from EDD data collected by SCAG (2 years behind, but still fairly current). Ms. Dodds noted that drive-through cities may be unequally represented with this calculation method because their roads get wear and tear without the employment numbers to back it up. Information about this measurement system will be distributed at the May Board meeting, and Ms. Estolano reiterated that there was not yet consensus on this approach.

Ms. Estolano next talked about requirements surrounding transit-oriented communities, which she described as vaguely worded in the Guidelines. She says that PAC Representatives agree that the
problem could be worked out perhaps by more clearly referencing some of the programs that Metro currently has, including the MATCH Program and the TOC Guidelines. Ms. Estolano called for consumers, business, and jurisdictions to form a small sub-group in order to come up with some language to be suggested to Metro before the June meeting.

The fourth issue regarding taxi coupons had been resolved prior to the PAC meeting according to Metro staff. The final issue was about whether there should be a disadvantaged veterans/minority owned business program in the local return portion of the Measure. Ms. Estolano noted that the first step in answering this question would be a meeting between small business advocates and COGs to discuss how this could be a positive for local governments.

**Shovel Readiness/Project Readiness/Eligibility: Yvette Kirrin**

Ms. Kirrin reported that Ms. McMillan and Abdollah Ansari (Senior Executive Officer, Construction & Engineering, Metro) were able to clarify some of the questions raised on eligibility. Ms. Kirrin called for the Guidelines to reflect a clearer definition for eligibility while expanding it to apply to all funding phases (environmental, PS&E, and construction). She clarified that “project readiness” is determined by phase, which differs from “shovel readiness.” Ms. Kirrin also noted that programs that have many projects as part of them should also be eligible for funding.

In regards to the Countywide BRT, Ms. Kirrin expressed that Metro should not be the only operator eligible to use those allocated funds. She added that there should be a Metro-led effort to expand the list of eligible BRT projects.

Finally, Ms. Kirrin detailed a discussion about how to expand the project list to include community driven projects. She clarified that there was no intent to remove projects from the list, but that perhaps by using the 5- and 10-year program assessment processes, additional projects could be added to the list.

Bryn Linblad added that there was also discussion regarding adjusting the definition of “urban greening” to include more than just stormwater, and mentioned cooling with shade as a response to urban heat islands as an example. She also mentioned discussion about including pre-construction costs in eligibility calculations.

**Multi-Year Subregional Programs - Seleta Reynolds**

Ms. Reynolds primarily reported the three main issues that the breakout group discussed. She said that there should be clarity around the role of the COGs, adding that the COGs should be able to provide a stronger check in terms of moving funds between subregions and substituting one type of funding for another. Ms. Reynolds also expressed a desire for the Guidelines to instruct COGs and cities to create a 5 year list in order to make for a clearer planning process. In addition, she requested that money be allocated to fund that type of planning process. Finally, Ms. Reynolds relayed that pre-development costs should be eligible uses of perhaps no more than 10% of the amount funded by the program.
Ms. Bacharach added that the role of the COGs should not be bound by the mobility matrices, and that more flexibility with the matrices would be beneficial. Mr. Diaz noted that the issue of borrowing against different funds had been raised, and that further discussion should be facilitated.

Ms. Reynolds also added that stronger criteria regarding flexibility with the mobility matrices was necessary to ensure that projects are not put forward in one category that clearly violate policies in another category. She noted that consensus not reached on that issue.

Mr. Diaz called for each group leader to create a summary of the conclusions reached by each committee. These comments have since been sent to PAC Members and are available.

Ms. McMillan closed the meeting by expressing how valuable the response from the PAC had been so far. The next meeting will be held on June 6, 2017.