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**Purpose of Meeting:**

As a follow-up to the 9/12/17 Pac Meeting, a conference call was requested to discuss MSP Performance Measure. Metro prepared a background memo on MSP Performance Measures and a list of questions discussed at the PAC break-out session.

There were many common and recurring themes discussed during the conference call highlighted below.

**Common themes:**

- Transparency
- Countywide Measures for Network Improvements Across Boundaries
- Subregional Flexibility for Context Specific Measures
- Consistency among Similar MSP Programs
- Keeping Measure M Promise of Congestion Reduction
- Project Consistency with MSP Goals

**Performance Measures discussions:**

Cecilia Estolano opened the discussions on performance measures and highlighted the information Metro provided. She believed that the use of Metro adopted performance measures for Measure M could be a good starting point to establish a framework for the admin guidelines. She suggested using the Measure M Performance Measures as a framework for countywide goals, noting that subsequent subregional measures may also be needed or adopted. She asked call participants for their thoughts on this approach.
Steve Lantz noted that he wanted to establish his own performance criteria. But if the Measure M measures are adopted, it should only apply for the first five years of the MSP programs and be revised as necessary as the programs mature. He also noted that he wanted program performance measures, not project level performance measures. He wanted to see the methodology for Measure M to share with his subregion.

Naomi believed that all the MSPs should have countywide regional performance measures. Countywide measures she would like to see applied are quality of life, safety, accessibility.

Hilary added that when voters approved Measure M, they were told that traffic was a big issue and that our Highways would be fixed and congestion in our communities would be eased. Voters and the business community want the gridlock in LA County to be addressed and mitigated. We should focus MSP investments on corridors which span subregional boundaries and carry the most people. Streets do not start and stop in cities; they are part of a network that needs to be addressed. Congestion and vehicle hours of delay are very real problems in mind of voters. Many hours are spent on the road in traffic.

Rodrick Diaz was interested in first last mile connections and the development of those performance measures. They would like to see how they can work with cities to improve connections to and from Metrolink.

Thomas Yee believes that the Metro adopted Measure M Performance Measures are a good starting point. However, he believes that we need to track how the MSP projects are implemented and the outcomes achieved to improve mobility.

David Somers noted that there is an overlap between LADOT and Metro’s Performance Measures. Some of their focus now is on equity, affordability, improved public outcomes. He also noted that he agrees with transparency, we voted to tax ourselves to make transportation and mobility improvements.

Kalieh Honish noted that the memo provided was done so to start discussions on performance measures based on the last PAC meeting. The Measure M performance measures have been presented only to solicit input.

Terry Dipple believes that in his subregion they may be ok with general performance measures for their subregion, but is opposed to regional performance metrics because their subregion is not like other parts of the county. Every city has their own priorities and transportation equity may not be one for all parts of LA County.

Steve Lantz reiterated that regional consistency may be possible, but it could be a pick list of items included in the performance measures. Does it or doesn’t it accomplish
what ever measures are adopted. He wanted to know how the performance measures would be calculate and under what methodology.

Hillary noted that there should be consistency on networks regardless of subregional boundaries. The projects taken together should sum up to regional improvements that can be identified.

Cecilia noted that safety might be one consistent performance measure throughout the county and that regional performance measures could be adopted with some flexibility in the subregion.

Naomi agreed with safety as one of the core performance measures and that other countywide measures should be established.

Terry objected to tightly defining metrics for projects such as Vision Zero. This might inhibit the flexibility needed for the different MSP categories identified in the ordinance, highway, arterial, etc.

Angela added that consistency should be established between similar programs because some jurisdictions are part of multiple COGS.

David Somers noted that Metro staff should participate in further performance measure refinements to ensure county consistency.

Abdollah added that in the Measure M guidelines definition, safety was included for the highway categories.

Metro staff agreed to provide additional information on the Board adopted performance measures.