Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Tuesday September 12, 2017

Meeting called to order at 1:33pm

After PAC Member and audience introductions, there was a call for approval of the July meeting minutes. Jacki Bacharach motioned, Mark Christoffels seconded, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

Therese McMillan began by introducing the work plan for the PAC over the course of the next 12 months. She explained that the PAC’s work would generally be split between the administrative procedures of Measure M and the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Ms. McMillan reminded members that the LRTP was modular, making it easy to focus on different subject-specific elements of the Plan for purposes of discussion within the group. Manjeet Ranu then detailed the work plan, referring to the “Proposed PAC Work Plan Schedule” attachment. The Schedule laid out likely discussion topics on a monthly basis aligned with milestones set by the Metro Board. Manjeet requested that the PAC determine which topics were worthy of a “deep-dive” discussion, as well as which topics needed additional background information. He mentioned that there were placeholders built into the schedule should PAC members desire to discuss additional topics not listed.

Jessica Meaney called for the PAC to provide comments to the Schedule in advance of the October PAC meeting so that it could be adopted on the day of that meeting. She noted that several of the Consumer representatives could use this opportunity to raise issues that they felt were not previously addressed.

Ms. McMillan clarified that all items in the work plan would be addressed. She noted that there would be items connected directly to elements of the LRTP, and others that would be discussed separately, such as the TOC Policy being presented to the Board.

Ms. Bacharach asked whether there is a part of the LRTP that discusses neighborhood-oriented traffic and slow-speed vehicles. Mr. Ranu responded that one of the modules, Baseline Understanding, focused on meeting with community residents and stakeholders to learn what they identified as priorities in their area. Another module, Values Framework, would translate those lessons from the community to goals and policies going forward.

KeAndra Dodds asked about the process leading up to policy paper development. Ms. McMillan responded that the PAC was to decide which of the items of those listed on the Schedule were most significant and would require the most attention. This would allow Metro staff to work backwards and
create working groups focused on the issues determined most necessary of further discussion by the PAC.

Monique Lopez expressed her appreciation for Metro staff’s diligence in providing the policy papers. She suggested the Transportation Equity should not just be one policy paper, but a section included in all of the policy papers. Ms. McMillan clarified that there are four themes that will be present in everything in the LRTP: equity, fiscal responsibility, innovation, and environmental justice. The policy paper on equity then, would highlight how equity would be present throughout the Plan.

Bryn Lindblad asked whether the working groups were exclusive to PAC Members. Ms. McMillan responded that the working groups are a prime example of when members can reach out to colleagues in the fields they represent to participate. She cautioned, however, that if too many people joined the working groups, it would be difficult to encompass everyone’s point of view. She expressed that there would need to be some innovative methods in order to comprehensively capture all opinions of the PAC.

Ms. Meaney encouraged PAC Members to find those items that were not already highlighted by Metro staff. She predicted that future PAC meetings would be dynamic, with not only presentations by Metro staff, but with discussions incorporating the full membership of the PAC.

Mary Gallagher suggested that one topic for further discussion could promoting use of the U-Pass program and getting students acclimated to taking public transportation.

Cecilia Estolano asked for clarification about the September 21 deadline listed on the work plan. Mr. Ranu confirmed that the deadline was for comments on the Multi-Year Subregional Program Administrative Guidelines. General topics not related to the MSP Admin Guidelines could be brought in as late as the October PAC Meeting.

Terry Dipple was concerned that there was not enough time focused on the Measure M Guidelines and Procedures in the near future, and perhaps too much time allocated to the LRTP. Ms. Dodds noted that there was a bit of overlap between the Measure M Guidelines and LRTP topics.

Roderick Diaz, in response to the interest survey that was distributed to PAC Members in July, said that PAC officers along with Metro staff had decided to have anyone interested in any topic as a part of that subgroup. As a result, topics like MSP would have very large associated constituencies, while other topics may have smaller constituencies.

Thomas Yee noted that there was heavy focus on the MSP’s and not other parts of the administrative guidelines. He wanted to clarify that there would not be discussion about other aspects until February. Kalieh Honish noted that the PAC schedule had indeed been set up that way in order to best serve the apparent interest of the PAC, as well as to allow for the holiday break in December. Ms. McMillan added that many of the modules in the LRTP were considered by the Metro Board to be just as important as the MSP guidelines. She noted that PAC members would need to use time outside of the General PAC Meetings in order to stay on schedule.
Multi-Year Subregional Programs

Ms. McMillan and Metro staff proceeded to present a PowerPoint based on the MSP handout. She noted that it was a draft of the overall guiding administrative procedures. She discussed the two distinct phases of developing the procedures. The first included the necessity for planning/programming efforts to be made in order to effectively implement the programs. By the October PAC meeting, Ms. McMillan aimed to have ready for the PAC the 5-year estimates of funding available for planning purposes for each MSP. Those numbers would be used to calculate the 0.5% that will be used to support the planning/programming of projects anticipated to use MSP funding.

The second included the time after the program is established, at which point there need to be procedures to move projects in said program to implementation. This would be decided through a funding agreement with Metro. The terms, cashflow, and assumptions would be spelled out on a project-by-project basis. All the specifics would need to be ready to be included in the funding agreement.

Jerard Wright from BizFed asked a question regarding whether Measure R and M administrative funds could be combined. Ms. McMillan responded that there is only one administrative provision in Measure M which is a takedown from the MSP programs. She clarified that there are no general administrative funds available in Measure M.

Ms. Meaney asked a question about where to find information on how MSP funds fit into existing Metro policies such as the Complete Streets Policy. Ms. McMillan responded that this kind of information would mostly be present in the performance metrics.

The PAC and audience members split into the 3 groups:

- Public Participation
- Performance Metrics
- Mobility Matrices

After 30 minutes of discussion, a representative each breakout session presented a summary of what was discussed in their group.

Performance Metrics (presented by Michael Behen):

Mr. Behen reported that the group focused mainly on how the value terms would look. They prioritized consistency across the subregions, with flexibility to allow for different program specifications unique to each area. They discussed two types of metrics: region-wide and program-specific, and how to synthesize between the two. The group would like for it to be determined what the standard, overarching metrics are, as there are baselines provided by SB1, Metro, and jurisdictions.

Ms. Estolano added that these metrics needed a lot more work, and that at the present, they were much too conceptual. Ms. Meaney noted that her group discussed metrics briefly, and considered each
COG having its own unique performance standards in addition to regional standards in order to account for the differences between the areas.

Mobility Matrices (presented by KeAndra Dodds):

Ms. Dodds reported that her group discussed the flexibility for the use of the funding. The conclusion was that subregions can swap funds in order to accelerate one project as long as both have available funds. The group also discussed community engagement and which party is tasked with conducting it. Generally, the community should be engaged on a regional level for programs, and at a local or regional level for individual projects depending on the scope and scale of the project.

Community Engagement (presented by John Bwarie):

Mr. Bwarie reported that their group discussed the roles of each of the groups in outreach: the COGs, the cities, the stakeholders, etc. They considered how to engage the primary users of Metro, many of whom tend to be underrepresented in stakeholder meetings. He emphasized that conscientious outreach to those stakeholders is vital, and that there be compensation for those community-based professionals in order to recognize their expertise.

Stephanie Ramirez added that there was discussion around different models of engagement, noting that education is a big part of effective outreach.

Next Steps:

Ms. McMillan expressed that the next steps vary by breakout session. She encouraged the working groups to meet before the October meeting to discuss their concerns further, and then draft language that would be incorporated into the final Administrative Guidelines.

Ms. Meaney called for the Community Engagement and Performance Metrics working groups to present at the October meeting to ensure that all were on the same page.

Ms. Estolano, along with Ms. Hankamer, talked about the difficulty of rapidly finding consensus amongst cities in the Westside COG regarding the performance metrics. Ms. Estolano said she felt uncomfortable taking steps forward without giving cities time to really understand what the performance metrics meant for them.

Ms. Honish clarified that Metro was looking only for draft language by the October meeting, and that the discussion would continue for some time after that date. The overall goal, Ms. Honish emphasized, was to finish the Guidelines by December.

Ms. Meaney summarized the next steps, restating that nothing would be adopted at the October meeting. She stated that there will be two conference calls that all members are invited to: one to discuss performance metrics, and one to discuss community engagement.

Ms. Estolano emphasized that the process to the adoption of various guidelines would be challenging, and that if PAC Members stated their positions in a rational manner and with well thought-out
examples, positive progress could be made. Ms. McMillan reminded PAC members that the MSP accounted for about 50% of Measure M funds, highlighting the significance of the PAC’s endeavor.

Ms. Meaney adjourned the meeting at 3:21.