Agenda
Metro Policy Advisory Council
January 9, 2018 Meeting

Metro Headquarters
1 Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Board Room, 3rd Floor
Conference Call Number:
512-489-3100
Meeting number: 3653020#
Pin number: 007#

Due to issues with background noise, please make sure to keep phones muted when calling in.

The meeting will begin promptly at 1:30 PM

1. PAC Business and Minutes (5 min.)

2. Measure M Administrative Guidelines (30 min.)
   - Overall Status/Update
     o MSP Administration
     o Other
   - New Draft Administrative Procedures
     (June 2018 Completion)
     o 2% Transit System Connectivity
     o 2% ATP
     o Street Car/Circulator

3. LRTP Policy Paper Outlines Intro (10 min.)
   - Transit Oriented Communities (TOC)
   - Public Private Partnerships (P3)
   - Travel Demand Management (TDM) & Shared Mobility
   - Goods Movement

4. Public Comment (5 min.)

5. Break-out Sessions by Policy Topic (45 min.)
   - TOC
   - P3
   - TDM & Shared Mobility
   - Goods Movement

6. Break-out Session Reports (8 min.)

7. Low Income Fare is Easy (LIFE) Program (2 min.)

8. SB-1 Oral Status Report (5 min.)

9. Next Steps (5 min.)
Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL

Tuesday December 5, 2017

PAC Business and Minutes

Jacki Bacharach motioned to approve minutes, Mark Christoffels seconded, and the minutes were approved. The March PAC meeting is scheduled for the first Tuesday of March and will be moved to SCAG Headquarters if available. Otherwise, it will be held on the second Tuesday of March in the Metro Boardroom. All other meetings are to remain as scheduled.

Measure M Administrative Guidelines

Ms. McMillan noted that the package given to the PAC presented a variety of major topics including the public participation guidelines and the performance metrics, as well as more technical elements such as the funding agreement structure. She also noted that the PAC would soon begin working to provide feedback on the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

In response to a question asked by Ms. Meaney over email, Ms. Honish stated that the 0.5% applies to both program and project development. She noted that the funds would be useful for the COGs in developing a program of projects, but that there would still need to be funding for the project sponsors down the road. She emphasized that the costs billed to the 0.5% be reflected in the project scope for a funding agreement before funds were allocated.

Ms. Honish also conveyed that Metro would give COGs in the near future financial planning tools so as to avoid missteps and to allow COGs to begin programming development funds. She hoped that this would allow COGs to begin planning funds early and to involve Metro often as necessary. To support this effort, Metro will also provide an internal contact list so that PAC Members can reach out to the appropriate staff for various questions or concerns.

Mr. Dipple commented that items should be discussed in a group setting at the monthly PAC meetings, and members should be given at least 2 days to read the materials before the meeting. He added that soliciting comments outside of the meeting might not garner the most robust responses, and therefore did not fulfill the goals the PAC. Ms. Honish responded that time would be allowed for discussion at the meeting, and that in the future, materials would be distributed in a timelier manner.

Ms. Bacharach added that the most important part of PAC was discussion. Ms. Meaney asked whether the December deadline for comments could be extended. Ms. Honish responded that there was a Board-assigned deadline of 6 months from July 2017.
Mr. Diaz noted that because there were few changes, the PAC could discuss the most significant changes during the meeting. Ms. Lindblad said that Section 3 of Measure M Performance Metrics seemed to have been “dialed back.” Ms. Honish said she would look into this and respond after the meeting. Ms. Dodds requested that PAC receive red-lined drafts in order easily identify and review updates.

Ms. Bacharach requested an annual schedule for showing both deadlines for sub-regions and feedback form Metro in order to keep all parties on track and abreast of pertinent information. She added that the schedule should also include an opportunity for dialogue, especially for items that were presently left “up to Metro’s discretion.” Her next comment was on Step 5 Item 4 of the MSP Administrative Guidelines. She expressed support for a 5-year rolling program with an added year at the end of every year.

Ms. Bacharach’s next comment was about an item on page 6 in Section 2. Regarding the Letter of No Prejudice, she asked for clarification on the difference between the 0.5% Program and the MSP. Ms. Honish clarified that the 0.5% Program referred to expenditures for the planning for a project, while the MSP referred expenditures for the actual project. Regarding lapping rules, Ms. Bacharach noted that the Guidelines indicate funds will lapse after 3 years for a 5 year program. She expressed that this created an unrealistic timeline for projects. Furthermore, she noted that the policy regarding redistribution of funds was not fair because the funds were collected by and for each individual sub-region, and therefore the sub-regions should decide how funds are distributed as long as they stay within the designated parameters. Ms. Honish replied that this was to encourage project readiness, and that COGs would not lose the funds. The funds might become temporarily unavailable if sub-region’s project was not ready, and another project was. Ms. Bacharach asked that the guidelines be written in a way that better conveyed this idea. Mr. Lantz suggested that redistribution take place only with concurrence of the COG rather than independent of the COG. Ms. Honish responded that language could be added to say that debt-service would be specific to the MSP.

Ms. Bacharach asked a question about public participation, she found contradictory language in sections B and C. Ms. Honish would look into it. Ms. Bacharach then expressed that letters of support did not seem necessary, and asked why they were required in the planning process. Her final comment was on the chart titled “Project Financial Plan.” It seemed that it was missing columns for year and amount. Ms. Honish replied that the chart was meant to be an aggregate but that Metro can provide dates.

Regarding the LONP, Mr. Cartwright asked whether planning was considered pre-PS&E or pre-PAED. Ms. Honish replied that staff determined it to be pre-PAED. Mr. Cartwright asked for more clarifying language on what planning activities qualify. Mr. Yamarone noted that the chart showing performance metrics was the most up-to-date. Ms. Lindblad noted that she thought more specific metrics would be the most helpful. Ms. Honish previewed that in the coming months, Administrative Procedures for Metro grant funds would be discussed with more in depth performance metrics. For the ATP competitive and transit connectivity funds specifically, discussion around ongoing requirements would take place.
Mr. Dipple likened the funding redistribution issue to the Measure R option where twice a year, subregions could adjust funds. He supported the idea that if a project is delayed, the COG should have the first opportunity to attempt to repurpose the funds within the sub-region. Mr. Dipple also noted that he believed the performance metrics agreed upon were specific enough, and not vague. Ms. Honish commented that funds would lapse and be redistributed only in a situation where funds in a particular fiscal year are no longer necessary. Ms. Meaney expressed that lapping policy seemed in line with previous information presented by Metro’s Chief Executive Officer and Chief Planning Officer.

Mr. Christoffels asked why representation was necessary for the funding agreement in Step 2 section 2 of the MSP Administrative Guidelines. Ms. Honish stated that the funding agreement required COG consensus, and that the representation would be attached as part of the submission to Metro. Mr. Christoffels also referenced language stating that after the initial 5 year plan, COGs would submit 1-year updates. Ms. Honish encouraged sub-regions to stick to the 5-year plans, but noted that if necessary, there was a way for COGs to supplement them on a yearly basis.

Ms. Meaney asked whether PAC could have an extra 30 days to read and analyze all materials. Ms. Bacharach proposed that the Chair of PAC write letter to Board. Mr. Diaz asked whether would be feasible for Metro to meet deadline and then update guidelines later.

Luke Klipp (Board Deputy, Mayor Robert Garcia) expressed that there is precedent in place for extending deadlines set by the Metro Board. Ms. Bacharach asked that the PAC Officers contact Metro CEO Phil Washington asking that he support a request to extend the deadline for comments to the next meeting. Mr. Dipple said that his COG already had a LONF subject to what’s approved by admin procedures and wanted to get started sooner rather than later. Was in favor of not extending the deadline, but wanted to have a healthy discussion before approval.

Ms. Dodds said that there was a lot of questions regarding clarity rather than disagreement. She leaned toward the time extension. A representative from Mayor James Butts’ office encouraged Metro staff to submit Board Box. Ms. Meaney resolved to send a letter to Metro’s CEO to consider a time extension.

Regarding Visionary Seed Funding, the comments from the PAC were acknowledged, and the Office of Extraordinary Innovation was working to fix consistency between revisions. Ms. Bacharach asked for clarification as to which agency the “embedded fellow” belonged. She also noted that without ability to select a consultant and with a 20% match requirement, the Program’s usefulness is questionable.

Regarding 3% local contribution for major transit projects, Ms. Honish discussed the administrative procedures meant to outline Metro’s responsibilities as related to the guidelines adopted. The Guidelines outline timelines for related milestones, and Ms. Honish noted that staff felt it was appropriate for Metro to take a Board action at the 30% final design period (standard for federalized projects). Ms. Bacharach asked if city over-matches, whether the additional amount be given to another city. Ms. Honish said that the 3% can be redistributed, and that COGs would do reporting. Ms. Bacharach then asked whether investments prior to the EIR could count for the 3% contribution.. Honish said that if cost is in scope at 30% design, it is eligible as contribution. Mr. Lantz asked whether if a city builds what is perceived to be an element of a project before the EIR is completed, is it possible to come to an
agreement that the expended money is eligible for the 3% contribution. Ms. Honish responded that the Ordinance is clear about how the calculable contribution is defined. Mr. Ranu determined that staff would examine this matter further.

Mr. Christoffels asked how Metro grant funds could be incorporated as 3%. Ms. Honish responded that COGs should determine and report to Metro what kind of contribution they want to make (e.g. First/Last Mile). The COG could also decide to simply contribute the funds. Mr. Klipp asked for clarifications for “all jurisdictions” as related to the contribution. Ms. Norton asked whether public-private partnerships could be included as 3% for the ATP grants specifically. Ms. Honish said that if the project was included in the scope at 30% design, it was eligible.

Next Steps from Metro to PAC:

- Responses to comments
- Redlined version of updates
- Matrix of received comments by PAC
- Time extension request to Metro CEO
- Clear channel of communication

LRTP Policy Papers

Mark Yamarone presented on policy papers. Presentation includes introduction including definition, discussion of actions Metro has taken in regard, discussion of best practices/research, and identification of up to 3 questions on topic that could be addressed in LRTP Update. Metro staff would set up conference calls.

The goal of the policy papers is to provide a primer for a conversation on the various topics. The paper would provide a definition, a summary of what Metro has done to date, and best practices already in use outside of Metro. Mr. Yamarone noted that the process would be similar to the process used to discuss the MSP Guidelines. Conference calls would be set up so that any interested PAC member could outline and discuss the various topics in more detail. The three questions below help frame the topics as they relate to Metro’s long range planning process:

1. How should Metro view sustainability in regards to both agency goals and countywide goals?
2. What investment decisions should Metro adopt to achieve greatest sustainability outcomes?
3. How can Metro adapt to shifts in tech to lead way toward sustainable future?

Ms. Bacharach asked where “e-bikes” were accounted for in the policy papers. Mr. Yamarone responded that several topics, specifically those involving emerging technology, would fall under several policy paper categories. Mr. Cartwright commented that he would like incorporation of what ports are doing. Additionally, he requested that Metro stay up to date on State matters that might be consistent with Metro’s goals. Stephanie Ramirez asked if conference calls would open to the public. Mr. Ranu said that
they would be open to PAC members only. Ms. Honish added that PAC meetings are public and discussion is brought up. Ms. Lindblad commented that urban heat and storm-water runoff should be addressed. She also requested that timeline on drafts be made available so as to allow for outside experts’ views to be contributed. Ms. Meaney noted that Board committee meetings were a good place to activate stakeholders. Mr. Ranu added that the public is also welcome to PAC meetings, and would be engaged during the robust public participation process. Mr. Yamarone responded to Ms. Lindblad saying that Metro is always looking for best practices, and open to receiving research papers, articles, etc. Ms. Dodds asked for a clear definition of sustainability be included in the policy paper.

Ms. Ramirez commented that active transportation did not necessarily address issues to those with limited mobility and in wheelchairs. Moises Cisneros added that he would like to see the human and small business aspect of sustainability taken into consideration in the policy paper. Kerry Cartwright asked whether any could be condensed. Ms. Honish said that at this juncture, staff were simply trying to frame the conversation in order to shape the discussion going forward. Mr. Cartwright asked for information about “Transportation History.” Mr. Ranu explained that Metro could learn from the positive and negative effects of various transportation infrastructure projects over the last century.

Mr. Lantz proposed a category addition to the Transportation Demand Management policy paper: the “trip not taken” as a result of tele-commuting and working from home. Mr. Yamarone agreed to examine that aspect. Ms. Honish also noted that e-commerce in the Goods Movement policy paper.

Twenty-Eight by ’28

Mr. Ranu presented that there would be a focus on Los Angeles due to the incoming Olympic Games. In order to take advantage of the momentum, Metro plans to proceed with accelerated efforts and to achieve the aspirational schedules. Ms. Bacharach, referring to South Bay Curve, asked what the steps going forward would entail. Mr. Ranu responded that there would be outreach and additional discussion in the near future.

Work Plan

Ms. Honish noted that the next 6 months would be focused on competitive grants including ATP and system connectivity-transit. In addition, the streetcar aspect would be discussed at the next meeting. In addition to the four policy papers discussed at this meeting, the TOC paper would be available in January. An Equity envisioning process would also commence in January. A Short Range Transit Plan item would be available in the next six months as well.

Ms. Meaney pointed out that all money is programmed out until 2040, with little flexibility. She noted that in order for a project to be accelerated, another would have to be decelerated.

Ms. Honish also noted that the Strategic Plan would come to the PAC in February. Additional initiatives can be found on in the PAC Work Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55pm.
TO: POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL
FROM: THERESE McMILLAN CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER
SUBJECT: REVISIONS TO THE MEASURE M DRAFT ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

JANUARY 3, 2018

Happy New Year to all members of the Policy Advisory Council. We achieved significant milestones during 2017, including the development of key Measure M guidelines — the conclusion of which is the subject of this memorandum. Thank you especially for your dialogue, contributions and patience in developing the Administrative Procedures for the Multiyear Subregional programs. It is now time to put these into place so we can collectively move forward with delivering Measure M improvements to the public. I look forward to another year of collective efforts, foremost of which is Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan development.

ISSUE

At the December 5, 2017 meeting of the Policy Advisory Council (PAC), staff discussed the revised Multi-Year Subregional Programs (MSP) Administrative Procedures, as well as Visionary Project Seed Funding and 3% Local Contribution. At that meeting, PAC requested an extension to January for more time to review and comment. Those comments have been received, and staff has revised the Administrative Procedures, where clarifications were needed.

BACKGROUND

The PAC representatives requested a redline MSP Administrative Procedures version for review and comment at their December meeting. A highlighted version was provided on December 12, 2017, and the comment period deadline, was extended from December 11, 2017 to December 14th.

MSP Comments

In addition to the discussion at the PAC meeting, we received five detailed sets of comments. In response to the comments we received, we have attached a
newly revised redline version (Attachment A). It is important to note that all of the Appendix section is new, but only the headings are in red. Some clarifications and corrections were made for consistency and clarity. One clerical correction is the substitution of “subregional entity” for “COG” in the Public Outreach section to match the other MSP procedures.

**MSP Subject Clarifications**

Two concept areas that needed clarification were the distinctions between program and project phases. For this reason, there are two different funding forms to be completed as additional project information is developed. Initially, as part of Step 2, Metro only needs broad funding information from a subregional entity regarding its 5 year plan. A new corresponding form is located in the Appendix.

When a project sponsor is ready to enter a funding agreement, a detailed funding plan is needed, as well as readiness information. Both of these forms are unchanged from previous administrative procedure versions.

Another point of clarification was a request to specify which activities are eligible for the 0.5% program development funding. To clarify this eligibility, the MSP procedures now specifically state that the 0.5% pre-project MSP funding is eligible for any pre-environmental program development, and that conversely, the other 99.5% of the MSP funding can only be spent on capital expenditures for environmental clearance or subsequent phases of a project.

The purpose of this clarity and distinction is to maximize the Measure M funding to deliver projects. Metro encourages subregional entities and project sponsors to seek additional supplemental funding on their own if it is needed beyond the 0.5% amount for further project development to assist in advancing a project to the environmental phase.

Another request for clarification was regarding Metro’s role and timeline in approving 5 year plans, and related submissions. Additional detail regarding review time, and Metro staff role in development review was provided.

**3% Local Contribution & Visionary Project Seed Funding**

The other two draft Administrative Procedures presented to the PAC were 3% Local Contribution and the Visionary Project Seed Funding. The 3% Local Contribution draft is included as Attachment B, with one minor correction on page 5. The draft Visionary Project Seed Funding Administrative Procedures was revised to consistently refer to a 20% local match requirement, and is included as Attachment C.
NEXT STEPS

If these revised draft Administrative Procedure documents result in any additional comments, please forward them to MetroPAC@metro.net by Monday, January 8, 2017, close of business, or provide them at the PAC meeting on January 9th. The final drafts will be presented to CEO Phillip Washington for signature by January 16, 2018.

Attachment A – Draft MSP Administrative Procedures with Redline Revisions
Attachment B – Draft 3% Local Contribution Administrative Procedures
Attachment C – Draft Visionary Project Seed Funding
MEASURE M ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES:
MULTI-YEAR SUBREGIONAL PROGRAMS (MSP)
5-YEAR PLAN PROCESS
SECTION 1

SUBREGIONAL 5 YEAR PROGRAM PROCESS

Step 1 Five Year Forecast

Step 1: Metro provides a five-year Measure M programming funding forecast for each Multi-Year Subregional Program, based on the amounts provided in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.*

*Actual funds disbursement will be based on cashflow Policy in the Guidelines. Fund estimates may be adjusted annually by Metro for accuracy.

I. Metro will provide a five-year financial forecast in October of each year.
II. The financial forecast will define estimated amounts available for programming for each MSP.
III. The estimates of available funds will outline upcoming 5 year periods for each MSP, accounting for any prior programming amounts and lapping of funds.
IV. These amounts will be consistent with Attachment A groundbreaking dates included in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.
   - Coordination will be undertaken for swapping of MSPs funds among different MSP types within the subregion.
   - Subregional entities will explain the project benefits and readiness.
   - Metro must concur with any fund swap.
V. The 5 year estimates will need to conform to Cash Flow procedures Pg. 15 of the Measure M Guidelines and the related administrative procedures.
VI. Only Metro provided MSP funding estimates are valid.

Step 2 Preliminary List Of Projects & Five-Year Plan

Step 2: Subregional entities will develop a preliminary list of subregional projects for inclusion in five-year plan.** The plan development will include public participation and an analysis of the projects previously submitted in the Mobility Matrices as possible alternatives; parameters will be developed by Metro. The final list of projects will be included in the five-year programming plans.

** Coordination with Metro staff is required to ensure project eligibility in each category.

This is a program development stage for the MSP 5 year plan(s). Resources to support this are allowed in the Guidelines as follows.

Pursuant to the Measure M Guidelines, “Resources to support the steps listed in Table IX can be drawn from MSP, not to exceed 0.5% of the amounts for any single year determined in
Step 1 of Table IX. Any additional resources to support the steps in Table IX must be drawn from resources under the control of the subregion or its constituent cities.”

Note: “Any single year” refers to the basis for the calculation. An aggregate can be made available at any time during the five year period of up to 5 single year increments.

Terms of the amounts and timing of the 0.5% funding will be determined in a funding agreement between Metro and the subregional entity/project sponsor. To receive 0.5% Measure M funding for planning activities, the subregional entity must notify the designated Metro MSP contact in writing, identify the MSP program, and provide the proposed scope of work, amount requested, basis for estimated cost (including firms or persons that will be compensated), subregional capital projects that are subject of the planning activities, and a representation that the requestor has approval of all entities in the subregion that are eligible to receive MSP funding. If the request is accepted, Metro will move forward with the preparation of a funding agreement and notice to proceed. For questions, please contact MMGuidelines@metro.net.

I. 5 year plans based on project readiness will be developed utilizing existing information provided by the project sponsors, as provided by the subregions for each MSP type.

II. The subregional entity will develop a 5 year list of projects to include MSP requested funding amounts, project timing/schedules, and other actions anticipated to deliver a final project. Subregional entity will also provide project readiness information for each project included in the 5 year plan, as detailed in Section 5 of these procedures. Note: The funding agreement will require a representation from the subregional entity/project sponsor that all entities within the subregion eligible for MSP funding have agreed to been involved and consulted regarding the composition of projects in the plan, either directly, or through their participation in a council of governments or comparable subregional entity that represents the subregion.

III. In order to ensure Metro concurrence of any 5 year list of projects, subregional entities should seek Metro staff review for eligibility and program nexus during this development stage.

IV. Projects will be sequenced based on available funds and project schedule.

V. The 5 year plans should identify projects to be funded, including annual expenditures and funding by fiscal year (July to June). Complete the Step 2 Programming Form in the Appendix. All funding sources should be identified in detail in the Step 4, including all non-MSP funding, as well as other funds (see the financial expenses and funding sources tables in the “Project Financial Plan”). The annual funding amounts must be sufficient to fund the identified expenses for all projects.
If funds required are in excess of available funds, Metro may ask the subregional entity to prioritize or delay certain projects. The project sponsors are expected to submit reasonable expenditure estimates based on credible project readiness documentation. Metro will request that project expenditures are removed from the plan, and will not program funds for the project, if in Metro’s estimation, the estimates are not likely to be met. Project sponsors should submit expenditures to be funded by the MSP revenues based solely on the five-year forecast (as this is the amount that Metro will program).

VI. Nexus for each MSP project must be developed and align with the MSP program type, Board approved definitions and related Guidelines, as part of the plan.
   a. Projects submitted as part of the Mobility Matrix are eligible, but may be reconsidered by the lead agency
   b. Definition for each proposed project will be developed by the project sponsor in sufficient detail to establish a nexus with the MSP category. The nexus definition is required for each project and will assist in evaluating the project and its applicability to the MSP program which will potentially fund the proposed project. The project nexus should align with the approved guideline definition (set forth in Sections IX-XIII of Guidelines, and supplemented in additional administrative procedures).
   • Examples include:
      - Project will close the Class II gap on Arterial X. This project will allow for seamless connectivity from Point A to B on Arterial X. This project is an eligible Active Transportation project; or
      - Project will improve traffic flow on the corridor by synchronizing Arterial A, an eligible Highway efficiency and Operational Improvements project.
   • 0.5% support resource needs must also have nexus — which depends on MSP program type
   • 0.5% expenses are eligible for project development prior to the environmental clearance phase; conversely, project level environmental review is an eligible capital expense

VII. Public outreach will be conducted concurrently while developing that 5 year project funding plan. See Public Participation Section 4 for details about outreach requirements.

**Step 3 Subregional Entity Adoption**

*Step 3: For each Multi-year Subregional Program within their respective subregion, a subregional entity adopts a five-year project development and implementation plan for adoption by the Metro Board. The plan will identify specific projects and phasing; allocated* and anticipated funding amounts, and project timing, including final delivery commitments.*
I. Metro Staff and the subregional entity will review the proposed project(s) submitted. Proposed projects will be reviewed for nexus to program and funding eligibility consistent with the definition adopted by the Metro board in the Measure M guidelines.

II. The subregional entity will adopt the proposed 5-year program of projects.

III. The subregional entity will forward the adopted proposed list of projects to Metro.

IV. Metro staff will review the proposed 5-year program of projects for consistency with the Measure M Ordinance, Guidelines, and Administrative Procedures.

V. Metro staff will provide a response within 60 days of submission of the 5-year program of projects.

**Step 4 Metro Board Approval**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4: Upon approval by Metro Board, project sponsors may apply for funding consistent with the Guidelines and related procedures, based on adopted five-year subregional funding programming plans.* Funding agreements will be executed between Metro and project sponsor(s).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Metro staff will use the information from step 1-3 to prepare a recommendation to adopt a subregional program for Board approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Metro staff will provide concurrence of eligible projects and may request supplemental information to verify program nexus and funding eligibility prior to requesting Metro Board approval. <em>In order to provide concurrence, staff will require the following information:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Project readiness information (see “Project Readiness” form in the Appendix); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Detailed project fund plan information (see “Project Financial Plan” form in the Appendix).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Based on this consultation, staff will make a recommendation to the Metro Board regarding funding of the requested 5 year program amounts and the initiation of Funding Agreements for the projects identified in the approval request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Metro Board may accept the program of projects as recommended by staff or a subregional entity, or it may request submission of additional information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. After Metro Board approval, Metro staff will begin executing funding agreements with lead agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Project funding agreements will comprise project specific (as opposed to program-level) approvals. Funds requested for a project must not exceed available Measure M funds shown in the five-year forecast. If funds required are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in excess of available funds, Metro may ask the subregional entity to prioritize or delay certain projects. Project sponsors which seek MSP project funding — project sponsor is defined as the entity developing and delivering the capital project — will develop a scope of work which will detail the following:

a) Need for project development if using 0.5% program development funds option
b) Specific project location/physical limits
c) Detailed project description including MSP Program/Project Nexus
d) Detailed funding plan — what phases of the project will be funded and by what funds.
   • All funds must be committed.
   • Supplemental fund requirements will be triggered if the project sponsor cannot fully fund the project Pg. 25 Measure M guidelines.
e) Final Jurisdictional Support/Community or Council actions (e.g., resolution)
f) Schedule list of completed phases and phases funded by Measure M.

V. There will be reporting and audit requirements of the projects once an agreement is executed.

VI. Per the Measure M Master Guidelines, annual and semi-annual program reporting requirements will be developed through the Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (MMITOC), and project sponsors will submit any required reports to the MMITOC for approval.

**Step 5 Annual Update**

**Step 5:** Subregional agencies may update or amend their adopted five-year programming plans on an annual basis reflecting project modifications, deletions, or additions of new projects, subject to the process in Steps 1-3. All plans and plan modifications must be consistent with relevant administrative procedures, funding agreements, and Metro Board adopted policies.

I. Project sponsors seeking Measure M funds for new projects not included in the 5 year MSP plan approved in step 3 will follow all the steps outlined in Step 2.

II. Project sponsors seeking to amend the 1) scope, 2) request additional funding or 3) cease work on a project will provide a letter to Metro detailing the request and provide sufficient justification to review the proposed change. Project deletions are strongly discouraged where funds have been partially expended. Metro will require additional detailed information as to why a project cannot be completed prior to any substitutions.
Funding agreements may include reimbursements for project expenses, loss of 10% retention or other penalties.

III. Metro will provide concurrence of eligible new project and modifications to existing projects consistent with the project definitions or program nexus.

IV. The subregional entity will adopt the updated 5 year plan which will include the new projects and requested modifications from the new or revised projects.

V. Metro Board will approve the amended 5 year MSP plan.

VI. Metro staff will commence executing amendment or funding agreements for projects.

**Step 6 Communication**

| Step 6: Following Metro approval of projects, project sponsor(s) and Metro include the relevant subregional entity in all communications regarding project development and delivery. |

I. Metro and the project sponsor will communicate via the reporting requirements included in the funding agreement.

II. If the project sponsor would like to change their project scope, schedule or funding, the project sponsor will consult with both Metro and the subregional entity.

III. Must meet minimum audit requirements of those for Local Return

IV. All reports, expenditures, agreements and related project requirements are subject to audit and will require all appropriate documentation (such as contractor invoices, timesheets, receipts, etc).
SECTION 2.

FUNDING AGREEMENT & REQUIREMENTS

Supplemental Funds Requirement

I. Supplemental funds are funds other than MSP or Local Return funds that are needed to fully fund a project. Supplemental funds can include Metro in kind resources, such as additional technical support, Metro sponsorship or other Metro staff resources.

II. Metro will send notice to project sponsor(s) if required or requested supplemental funds will trigger additional policy implications.

III. The policies that will apply include, but are not limited to policies listed on p. 37-38 in the Guidelines (Secion XII), and may include policies adopted subsequent to this administrative procedures.

Letter of No Prejudice (LONP)

Metro may enter into a "letter of no prejudice" with a subregional entity, where Metro will agree to consider reimbursing a subregional entity with MSP funds for any local funds expended prior to the execution of a funding agreement. The reimbursement can apply to funding from either the 0.5% program or MSP project.

LONP procedures -- as applicable to 0.5% program

I. A scope of work must be developed by the subregional "entity" requesting funds for the 0.5% portion of the MSP program which will receive funding based on the Five Year Forecast. The scope of work will detail the following

- Identified task which are related specifically to the MSP (i.e., Active Transportation, Highways, Goods Movement, etc.)
  - Task will be directly attributed to work required to develop MSP related program.
  - Funds are not available for non-MSP administrative purposes
  - All tasks must be attributed to a capital program being funded by Measure M MSP.

- Total Resources estimated to complete the program tasks (staff/consultant services); not to exceed the 5 year estimate.
  - A staffing plan will be required, identifying staff required for the delivery of the capital project.

- Schedule for the length of the tasks to be performed to deliver the capital program.
II. Scope of work will be reviewed by Metro to ensure the proposed work aligns with the MSP and can be attributed directly to the capital development of a project.

III. Subregional entities are responsible for discrepancies generated for all contractual arrangements pursued under an LONP.

If the above steps are not performed prior to the execution of the LONP they will be performed prior to executing the funding agreement.

**LONP procedures -- as applicable to project funds**

LONP requests will be considered for project expenditures on a case by case basis.

**LONP Project Funding Agreement Provisions:**

I. A letter of no prejudice is only intended to be an interim arrangement between Metro and the subregional entity requesting funds for eligible uses.

II. For each LONP and the identified scope of work approved by Metro, a funding agreement will need to be executed in order that the subregional entity can be reimbursed for any costs. Additional, case specific provisions may be included.

III. The funding agreement will include reporting requirements.

IV. The funding agreement will be audited intermittently and at the end of the period of performance.

V. The subregional entity will be responsible for any charges found as ineligible. Metro determination of eligible expenditures shall be final.

**Lapsing Rules**

Pursuant to the Measure M Guidelines, the principles of “Timely Use of Funds” apply to MSP funds. Readiness is also required to be able to access funds. Because of these priorities, all MSP funding is subject to lapse if not expended in a timely fashion, pursuant to the signed funding agreement (see p. XX in the attached MOU template).

As indicated in the attached template (section #), the funds will lapse after 3 years. The lapsed funds will not be deducted from the MSP or subregional total, but the near term available funding will be redistributed at the discretion of Metro based on cashflow. The first consideration for distribution of the available funding will be any outstanding LONP requests, for eligible program or project expenditures. Metro must consider all demands on the MSP cashflow, including the need for debt service, to determine the best discretionary use of the lapsed funding.

**Payment**
Payment will be issued once an invoice is approved by Metro staff, to help ensure that the submitted expense is within the approved scope of work attached to the project funding agreement. As noted above, Metro shall determine which expenditures qualify as eligible for payment, and that determination shall be final.

Metro will approve or disapprove invoices within 30 days of submission. Once the invoice has been approved by Metro, the payment will be issued within 30 days.
SECTION 3.

SUBREGIONAL QUALITATIVE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Subregional entities will apply qualitative performance measures from the following list of performance measures. The subregional entities will articulate the benefits of the 5 Year Plans including a description of how the projects will achieve the thematic goals established by the Measure M MSP Administrative Procedures.

If a subregion wishes to adopt a quantitative metric, Metro will advise the subregion on best practices for metrics appropriate to their MSP. The Policy Advisory Council will periodically review the application of performance metrics in the evaluation of MSP projects and program outcomes.

Subregional Qualitative Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Provide responses to how the project achieves the following outcomes, if any:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>• Relieve congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase travel by transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve travel times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve effectiveness &amp; reliability for core riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>• Increase economic output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support job creation &amp; retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Support goods movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reduce household transportation costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extend useful life of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>• Improve transportation options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve service to transit dependent, low-income, and disadvantaged populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve first-last mile connections to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>• Reduce incidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve personal safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability &amp; Quality of Life</td>
<td>• Improve environmental quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improve quality of life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 4.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Each subregional entity will be responsible for developing a Public Participation Element that will cover how interest groups are addressed, identify the processes/procedures involved in the engagement effort and key components of the MSP plan. These are presented as questions that must be answered in advance of, and included within, the MSP 5-Year Plan “Public Participation Element.”

How these questions are addressed is not prescribed, recognizing the flexibility that may be pursued differently among subregions in developing their elements. For example, subregions may elect to utilize, or build upon, successful existing public participation processes that the subregion currently has in place to connect with its community. On the other hand, a subregion may elect to develop a brand new approach tailored to an MSP category generating keen public interest.

This Public Participation Element must be included in the MSP 5-Year Plan adopted by the subregional entity governing board and subsequently adopted by the Metro Board, per the MSP Administrative Procedures (see p. 4, Step 2, VII).

The MSP 5-Year Plan Public Participation Element needs to answer these questions.
1. Who has an interest in MSP development (by program)? Outline relevant and impacted interests. At a minimum, the public participation element must address the interests of:
   - Subregional Entities
   - Cities, County and other local jurisdictions
   - Communities (where projects are located or significantly influencing)
   - Stakeholders (may well vary by MSP focus, but could include advocacy organizations, non-profits representing community interests, business interests, potential service providers and/or funders for the MSP program or project, etc.)

2. What process/procedures will be followed to meaningfully involve these groups?
   A. Define who takes the lead for developing/implementing public information and community outreach processes and/or procedures.
   - Design and implementation should address forums for participation, frequency, and feedback to subregional entity governing board as input for decisions related to (3) below.

   B. How are the processes/procedures documented and communicated?
   - If a subregional entity believes a prior public outreach process adequately addresses public participation elements as framed by these questions, that justification must be clearly documented.
   - The final, proposed Public Participation Element shall be approved for incorporation into the 5-year MSP at a duly noticed subregional entity public hearing.
3. How will the range of interests outlined in (1) above be engaged in development of the following MSP Plan components? Subregions shall consult with stakeholders in the development of a Public Participation element.

A. Identification of candidate projects  
B. Selection of candidate projects  
C. Review and approval of overall 5-Year Program  
D. Implementation of projects within the Program

4. What is the timing of the Public Participation Element?

A. Public participation should be initiated at the outset of the MSP planning process for all projects considered for MSP programming to be truly relevant.

B. To ensure that a public participation element will be in place and implemented in the development of the first 5-year program, each subregional entity must address the Public Participation questions and submit them formally as a prerequisite for receiving the 0.5% planning funding. This formal submission is recommended via a standard template that will be provided by Metro (see attached, Public Participation form in the Appendix TBD).

C. The template for the first round of MSP program public participation may outline an intended approach that would be fleshed out over an appropriate period of time-- but importantly, would be activated as part of the project identification and selection process accompanying the first submitted 5-year program. Note that the 0.5% MSP planning funds can be used to develop public participation processes appropriate to that program.

D. Each 5-year program adopted by the subregional entity governing board would include a description of the established public participation element, and how it has been applied in developing the MSP program, and its recommendations.

Finally, the Public Participation Element must reference if, and to what extent, the subregion addresses performance measurement as part of the MSP 5-Year Plan, per the Measure M Administrative Procedures section on performance measurement (see Section 3).
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Appendix
Measure M Multi-year Subregional Programs
5 Year Plan Programming Forecast (Step 2, V.)

List each project, the location, relationship to MSP name/type, and description:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List the estimated cost of each project and funding sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>MSP $ Amount</th>
<th>Non-MSP $</th>
<th>Notes/Comments (e.g., Funding Sources)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List the annual funding for each project over the 5 year program (list each funding source on a separate row):²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>MSP $ Amount³</th>
<th>5 Year Total</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6+³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Metro may request additional information about a project regarding, among other things, its eligibility for MSP funding and readiness.
² The annual Measure M MSP funding cannot exceed the total available for the subregion.
³ The total Measure M MSP funding amount can exceed the 5 year total for planning purposes only. Funding outside the 5 year period is not guaranteed.
PROJECT READINESS

“Project Readiness” is essential in determining whether a project is ready for funding. It is important that project sponsors provide accurate and complete information for evaluating project readiness to avoid future funding delay.

Provide any/all evidence that project funding will result in timely development and completion of the project including the following information:

- Describe how the schedule provided is realistic to enable project completion based on the years funding is requested in the submitted Project Financial Plan, and is consistent with any and all regulations and policies for fund use, including but not limited to Metro/State/Federal lapping policies.

- List all owners of the right-of-way where the project is to be constructed. What are the existing uses of the right-of-way? Are there any future plans that might affect the project? Have the owners been contacted? If so, are they willing to sell the property?

- If the project requires the use of Metro-owned right-of-way, the project applicant is responsible for coordinating with Metro’s Real Estate Department and ensuring consistency with Metro’s Right-of-Way policy if the project is either adjacent to, or encroaches upon, Metro property or requires a formal permission for its use from Metro. The cost of any alterations to the Metro right-of-way to make it usable for a project, including relocations or removal of existing structures, or meeting other Metro conditions for use of the property will be the responsibility of the project sponsor.

- Identify all other agencies or organizations that are active participants in this project. Indicate how and when their involvement is required in order to implement this project.

- “Letters of support” by others should be included with the application package (not mailed separately to Metro’s CEO).

- Identify if there are any adjacent jurisdictions, agencies, property owners, etc., who would be impacted by the proposed project. Please list and describe outreach efforts, dates, participants and any results/issues that could impact the project’s schedule. Also, please identify if right-of-way condemnation would be necessary.

- Indicate the proposed project schedule below by filling in estimated or already completed dates for the project activity milestones.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Study Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Environmental Documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Meetings or Other Forums <em>(please list)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Environmental Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Environmental Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Board Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(please provide name of governing board entities below)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Plans, Specifications, and Estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Plans, Specifications, and Estimates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Right-of-Way Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Certification*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready to Advertise*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of Construction (Contract Award)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Completion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The right-of-way phase is complicated so applicants should be realistic about the length of time, particularly if condemnation will be necessary.*
SECTION 6.

PROJECT FINANCIAL PLAN

Complete and attach the financial plan for the project. Enter all amounts in nominal, or year-of-expenditure dollars and include any assumed inflation rates. Clearly identify all funding sources as either COMMITTED or UNCOMMITTED. Project applicants should note that if their application is awarded funding, all Local Match funding will be escalated accordingly and considered committed. All figures must reflect whole dollars.

A person duly authorized to sign for the organization (city manager, general manager, executive director, or high-ranking officer) must sign below:

I certify that all sources of grant funding have been identified in Project Financial Plan.

I certify that this project is not the full responsibility of a developer.

_________________________________________  _____________
Signature                                Date

_________________________________________
Title
# PROJECT FINANCIAL PLAN

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

## 1. PROJECT FINANCIAL EXPENSES

**NOTE:** INDICATE ALL AMOUNTS IN WHOLE DOLLARS FROM CURRENT FISCAL YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT EXPENSES *</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL EXPENSES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Design and PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Right-Of-Way Acquisition or Lease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Utilities Relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Equipment Purchase or Lease (e.g., computers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Vehicle Purchase or Lease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Construction Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING EXPENSES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Administration/Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Operating Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER EXPENSES (Specify):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 TOTAL PROJECT EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* List only expenses to be incurred in the completion of the Scope of Services of the project for which you are applying for funding. Expense categories are not applicable for all projects.

PLEASE INDICATE THE AMOUNT AND YEARS IF YOU HAVE INCURRED COSTS IN THE EARLIER YEARS OR IF YOU WILL REQUIRE ADDITIONAL FUNDING IN LATER YEARS FOR THIS PROJECT.
# 2. PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES

NOTE: INDICATE ALL AMOUNTS IN WHOLE DOLLARS FROM CURRENT FISCAL YEAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL EXISTING PROJECT FUNDING SOURCES *</th>
<th>Indicate if Committed or Uncommitted</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Federal Monetary (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Local Match to Federal Monetary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Federal Monetary (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Local Match to Federal Monetary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 State Monetary (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Local Match to State Monetary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 State Monetary (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Local Match to State Monetary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Local Monetary (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 In-Kind (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Other (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 TOTAL EXISTING FUNDING SOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* List only funding for expenses to be incurred in the completion of the Scope of Work of the project for which you are applying for funding, being sure to include all sources of grant funding.
Measure M – MSP Public Participation Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Subregional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsoring Agency</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSP Name</td>
<td>MSP Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
<td>Submission Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Name Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City, State ZIP</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.) Who has interest in MSP development (by program)?

Outline relevant and impacted interests. At a minimum, the public participation element must address the interests of COGs; Cities, Counties and other local jurisdictions; communities; and stakeholders.

2.) What process/procedures will be followed to meaningfully involve these groups?

a. Define who takes the lead for developing/implementing public information and community outreach processes and/or procedures.

Design and implementation should address forums for participation.
b. How are the processes/procedures documented and communicated?

If a COG/subregion believes a prior public outreach process adequately addresses public participation elements as framed by these questions, that justification must be clearly documented.

3.) How will the range of interests outlined in (1) above be engaged in development of the following MSP Plan components?

- Identification of candidate projects
- Selection of candidate projects
- Review and approval of overall 5-Year Program
- Implementation of projects within the Program
- Stakeholders consulted during plan development
- Responses to feedback

4.) What is the timing of the Public Participation Element?

A. Include a timeline/schedule for implementing the public participation element, and how it has been applied in developing the MSP program, and its recommendations.
B. Public participation should be initiated at the outset of the MSP planning process for all projects considered for MSP programming to be truly relevant.

5.) The Public Participation Element must reference if, and to what extent, the subregion addresses performance measurement as part of the MSP 5-Year Plan, per the Measure M Administrative Procedures section.

Please use a separate sheet if necessary or otherwise include information available at the time.
THIS PAGE IS A PLACE HOLDER FOR FUTURE FORMS
TO BE DEVELOPED AS NEEDED
3% Local Contribution to Major Transit Projects Administrative Procedures

The Measure M Ordinance includes a provision for 3% local contribution to major rail transit capital projects. The rationale for the contribution is that local communities with a rail station receive a direct benefit due to the increased access to high-quality transit service that is above and beyond the project’s benefit to the County as a whole. Countywide, the 3% local funding contribution represents approximately $1 billion in funding to support the project delivery identified in the Expenditure Plan. The 3% local funding contribution is a critical element of a full funding plan for these rail transit projects. The Ordinance includes provisions that allow development of a mutual agreement between a jurisdiction and Metro, and a default penalty if such an agreement cannot be reached.

The Measure M Master Guidelines, adopted by the Metro Board in June 2017, included detailed language related to the 3% local contribution provision that has been incorporated here.
VIII. 3% LOCAL CONTRIBUTION TO MAJOR TRANSIT PROJECTS

INTRODUCTION

The Measure M Ordinance includes a provision for 3% local contribution to major rail transit capital projects. The rationale for the contribution is that local communities with a rail station receive a direct benefit due to the increased access to high-quality transit service that is above and beyond the project’s benefit to the County as a whole. Countywide, the 3% local funding contribution represents approximately $1 billion in funding to support the project delivery identified in the Expenditure Plan. The 3% local funding contribution is a critical element of a full funding plan for these rail transit projects. The Ordinance includes provisions that allow development of a mutual agreement between a jurisdiction and Metro, and a default penalty if such an agreement cannot be reached. The agreements shall be in accordance with these guidelines.

PROGRAM METHODOLOGY

The Ordinance calculates the local contribution based on the centerline track miles within a local jurisdiction with a new station in those jurisdictions. These guidelines reflect the nexus between mobility benefits provided to a jurisdiction based on the location and proximity of a new station. The local contribution will be calculated by dividing 3% of the project’s total cost, estimated after the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) of final design, by the number of new rail stations constructed on the line. For purposes of this section, determination of the local jurisdiction borders will be a new station located within one-half mile of the jurisdiction. Building on the Metro Board adopted First/Last Mile policy in 2016, which defines the “walkshed” around each station as a half-mile radius, the 3% local contribution requirement will be proportionately shared by all local agencies based upon the local agency’s land area within a one-half mile radius of a new station. Other arrangements agreed upon by every local jurisdiction in a project corridor with a local contribution obligation are also acceptable, provided that the total of all jurisdictions’ contributions equals 3% of the estimated project cost. A list of jurisdictions that may be affected, subject to changes determined by the environmental process, is included as Appendix A.

An agreement approved by both Metro and the governing body of the jurisdiction shall specify the total project cost as determined at the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) of final design. the amount to be paid by the local jurisdiction, and a schedule of payments. Once approved, the amount to be paid by the local jurisdiction shall not be subject to future cost increases.

Eligible Fund Contributions

Eligible fund sources to satisfy 3% local contribution include any funds controlled by the local agency or local agencies (e.g., General Fund, State Gas Tax Subventions, Prop. A, Prop. C and Measure R and M Local Return Funds, Measure M Subregional Program Funds), or any funds awarded from non-Metro competitive grant process funding. Measure M Subregional Program
Fund contributions must be accompanied by documented agreement from all jurisdictions that would otherwise be eligible for those sub-regional funds. In-kind contributions eligible to satisfy 3% local contribution include, but not limited to, project specific right-of-way and waiver of permitting fees, local agency staff time (incurred and forecast) if, those costs are specifically included in the project cost and contribution amount by the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) of final design.

Betterments

Betterments are defined consistent with existing policy adopted by the Metro Board on Supplemental Modifications to Transit Projects (October 2013). A “betterment” is defined “as an upgrade of an existing city or utility’s facility or the property of a Third Party, be it a public or private entity, that will upgrade the service capacity, capability, appearance, efficiency or function of such a facility or property of a third party.” Once the 30% design project scope and cost have been determined as the basis of the 3% contribution calculation, subsequent betterments cannot be included in that calculation, nor counted toward a jurisdiction’s eligible contribution. However, they may be included in the project scope if carried at the jurisdiction’s expense.

Active Transportation Capital Improvement Contributions

These guidelines reflect provisions adopted by the Board that allow for local jurisdictions to meet all or a portion of their 3% local contribution obligation through active transportation capital improvements and first/last mile investments that are included in the project scope and cost estimate at the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) of final design. All local first/last improvements must be consistent with station area plans that will be developed by Metro in coordination with the affected jurisdiction(s). The criteria for local first/last mile investments for first/last mile contributions are being developed by Metro, specifically to carry out integration of first/last mile within transit capital projects. First/Last mile improvements consistent with this section and included in project scope at conclusion of 30% of final design will not be considered “betterments” for the purposes of these Guidelines, and are eligible for local contribution obligations.

Local Contribution Limits

The 3% local contribution will only be calculated against the overall project scope and cost determined at the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) of final design. Local agencies cannot count other transportation investments that are not included in the project scope and cost estimate after the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) of final design. Metro staff will provide written notice to the affected jurisdiction(s) and a report to the Metro Board at the completion of thirty percent (30%) of final design.

Contributions for calculations assigned to the County of Los Angeles are to be determined by the County.
Opt-Out Option

Metro will withhold up to 15 years of Measure M Local Return Funds for local agencies that fail to reach a timely agreement with Metro on their 3% contribution prior to the award of any contract authorizing construction of the project within the borders of that jurisdiction. Local return funds from Proposition A, Proposition C, and Measure R are not subject to withholding. In some cases, principally in smaller cities, the default withholding of 15 years of local return from only Measure M Local Return Funds will be less than a formal 3% contribution. In these cases, the cities which default on making their full 3% contribution will suffer no further impact.

AUDIT REQUIREMENTS

Use of Measure M funds will be subject to audit and oversight, and all other applicable state and local laws.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Metro will provide annual reports to the Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee describing how uses of the Measure M Funds are contributing to accomplishing the program objectives.

REVISIONS TO PROGRAM GUIDELINES

These program guidelines may be revised by the Metro Board of Directors.

The following flow chart details the procedural steps and milestones for executing and administering the 3% local contribution agreements.

**Step 1 Establish Project Cost and 3% Local Contribution Assessments**

Conclusion of 30% Final Design sets project scope and costs to calculate 3% local contribution.

- Metro will notify and coordinate with agencies that may have a local contribution throughout the project development.
- The Metro Board will take action to acknowledge the conclusion of 30% Final Design for major transit projects, in order to identify the timing for calculating the 3% local contribution of the total project cost estimate at that time. The 3% contribution will be a percentage of the total project cost at 30% Final Design in year-of-expenditure dollars.
- Each affected agency will receive a notice of their local contribution amount estimate and payment schedule no less than 60 days prior to the Board action on the conclusion of 30% Final Design (as determined by Metro), which determines the 3% local contribution amount.
- Notice of the Board action on the project cost estimate at 30% Final Design will take effect beginning January 1, 2018. Agencies subject to the 3% local contribution with projects that had completed 30% Final Design prior to that date will not receive notices of Board Action.
- Board action will also specify the amount of the 3% local contribution assigned to each agency based on the Measure M Guidelines.
Step 2 Execute Local Contribution Agreements

An agreement approved by both Metro and the governing body of the jurisdiction shall specify the total project cost as determined at the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) of final design, the amount to be paid by the local jurisdiction, and a schedule of payments. The full amount of the local contribution should be paid by the completions of 50% of project construction. Once approved, the amount to be paid by the local jurisdiction shall not be subject to future project cost increases (amounts paid over time will be increase with the Construction Cost Index).

- Local jurisdictions may meet all or a portion of their 3% contribution through funding of active transportation capital improvements and first/last mile investments, that are included in the project scope and cost estimate at the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) final design.
- In-kind contributions eligible to satisfy 3% local contribution include, but not limited to, project specific right-of-way and waiver of permitting fees, local agency staff time (incurred and forecast) if, those costs are specifically included in the project cost and contribution amount by the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) of final design cost, and will be subject to the review and audit by Metro.
- Pursuant to the Measure M Ordinance, betterments are not an eligible contribution. The definition of “betterment” is detailed in Section VIII of the adopted Guidelines.
- Eligible fund sources to satisfy 3% local contribution include any funds controlled by the local agency or local agencies that can be legally expended on expenditures of this type.
- Other arrangements agreed upon by every local jurisdiction in a project corridor with a local contribution obligation are also acceptable, provided that the total of all jurisdictions’ contributions equals 3% of the estimated project.

Step 3 Opt Out

If no agreement is entered into and approved prior to the award of any contract authorizing the construction of the project within the borders of the jurisdiction, or if at any time the local jurisdiction is in default of any sums due pursuant to the approved agreement, all funds contained in the Local Return/Regional Rail Subfund allocated to that jurisdiction may, at Metro’s sole discretion, be withheld for not longer than fifteen (15) years and used to pay for the project until the three percent (3%) threshold is met.

This Opt Out provision does not exclude negotiations with Metro for a funding agreement. Once a fully executed funding agreement is in place Measure M Local Return fund may be released, partially or in full, depending on the terms of the agreement whichever is sooner.
Step 4 Payment of Local Contributions

- Metro will invoice the local agency per the payment schedule identified in the executed Local Contribution funding agreement.
- If Measure M Multi-year Subregional Program funds have been identified as a source to meet the Local Contribution obligation Metro will draw down on those MSP funds per the payment schedule identified in the executed Local Contribution funding agreement, accounting for amounts that may be programmed for other purposes.
- Local agencies claiming in-kind contributions to satisfy their Local Contribution requirement will submit documentation of the in-kind service performed for Metro’s review and approval.
- Failure to submit payment may result in loss of Measure M Local Return funds not to exceed 15 years.

Step 5 Annual Auditing and Reporting for Measure M Funds

Use of Measure M funds will be subject to audit and oversight, and all other applicable state and local laws. Metro will provide annual reports to the Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee describing how uses of the Measure M Funds are contributing to accomplishing the program objectives.
DRAFT VISIONARY PROJECT SEED FUNDING

Measure M makes $20 million available over 40 years (FY2018-FY2057) to be used for “Visionary Project Seed Funding.” This document provides a set of guidelines for how that funding will be distributed.

SUMMARY
Metro’s Visionary Project Seed Funding will be leveraged to help spark and develop innovative mobility concepts for Los Angeles County. The Seed Funding will be utilized as a tool to generate and develop concepts into actionable projects that can be implemented in the future, in addition to aiding in identifying potential funding streams for implementation.

To enable this program, Metro will enter into a contractual agreement with a consultant(s) who will provide direct research and staff support to grantees for innovative project ideas. The consultant will be selected for a minimum of a three-year contract with the option for renewal. Consultants will be evaluated based on their ability to deliver on a broad range of projects. Consultants may consist of professionals from private companies, educational, and/or non-profit institutions.

Metro will annually solicit project concepts and/or problem statements for consideration from eligible applicants (defined below). Proposals will be evaluated on a defined set of metrics developed in partnership with the contracted consultant. Metro may select one or more applicants for grant award each year. The selected grantee(s) will work with Metro and the contracted consultant to develop an innovation research and analysis plan for the duration of the term.

Consultant contracts and grantee awards will be overseen by Metro.

AVAILABLE FUNDING
$500,000 available annually, with the option to renew.

SELECTION OF CONSULTANT
Every three years, subject to reevaluation by the CEO, LA Metro will competitively solicit a consultant to assist in managing this program. Consultants will be selected based on their demonstrated expertise in transportation planning, engineering, and/or public policy academic research and their access to sufficient resources to deliver the contents of the contract.

SELECTION OF PARTNER AGENCIES

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS
Metro, Municipal Operators, Local Operators, Council of Governments are eligible for consideration for award(s). Eligible applicants may partner with private sector vendors, non-profits, or academic institutions. Private vendors need a public sector partner, with an interest in possible implementation, to be able to apply.

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS
Eligible applicants are directed to develop a problem statement detailing a specific project concept or a problem statement that could benefit from additional research-based support. Applicants will be
expected to provide a clear narrative on the challenge/goal that their agency is facing and to develop a preliminary outline for the scope of work.

Eligibility of projects is broad. Examples of potential categories the proposed technical assistance could address include, but are not limited to, the following:

- New mobility solutions
- Use of new and innovative technology ideas in transportation
- Safety or security improvements
- Substantial improvements in travel time and customer experience
- Major reductions in emissions or other environmental externalities
- Improvements in access for disadvantaged populations
- Connectivity to major trip generators
- Reduction of project costs compared to conventional delivery methods

**SELECTION CRITERIA**
To select the grantee(s) for the Visionary Project Program, a Metro team of reviewers will evaluate the following criteria:

1. **IMPACT AND OUTCOMES.** Applicants are expected to identify goals that their program seeks to achieve for Los Angeles County.
2. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION.** Applicants will be evaluated based on the clarity of the problem they are seeking to solve by means of the Visionary Project Seed Funding. High scoring applications will include a thoughtfully developed problem statement and methodology for exploration during the Visionary Project Program term.
3. **TEAM CAPACITY AND COMMITMENT.** Applicants will be expected to detail the team and its capacity to facilitate and manage the project during the three-year term.

**COST SHARING OR MATCHING**
The grant funded share of this project is up to 80 percent with a 20 percent agency match. Agencies may choose to provide a cost share match above 20 percent to expand the scope of their Visionary Project. Grant terms will be adjusted based on the projects that are selected.

**RESERVE/CARRYOVER REQUIREMENTS**
Metro's goal will be to spend or allocate these funds in a timely manner. However, Metro may reserve or carryover some or all of its allocation to the next fiscal year if necessary. Metro will begin the process of procuring a vendor and developing a notice of funding availability upon approval by the CEO.

**REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**
Metro will provide annual reports to the Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee describing how uses of Measure M Visionary Project Seed funds are contributing to accomplishing the program objectives.

**AUDIT REQUIREMENTS**
Use of these funds will be subject to audit and oversight as determined by Measure M and all other applicable state and local laws. Metro will retain all documents and records related to this program and the use of funds for a period of three years after the year in which the funds are expended.

**REVISIONS TO PROGRAM GUIDELINES**
These program guidelines may be revised by the Metro Board of Directors.
Yamarone, Mark

From: Honish, Kalieh  
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 4:16 PM  
To: Lor, David; Yamarone, Mark  
Subject: FW: GCCOG PAC comments to the Measure M guidelines

FYI. Comments.

Kalieh Honish  
EO, Countywide Planning & Development  
Long Range Planning  
213.922.7109 W  
213.948.1810 C  
We provide excellence in service and support.

From: Yvette Kirrin [mailto:Yvette@kes-inc.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2017 3:19 PM  
To: Honish, Kalieh  
Cc: Karen Heit; Jack Joseph  
Subject: GCCOG PAC comments to the Measure M guidelines

Dear Kalieh,

Below are the GCCOG comments to the MSP, Public Participation and 3% Contribution sections of the Measure M Guidelines.

Five-year Planning Process

- Unlike other subregions, Gateway Cities COG has one funded program in MSP; The I-605 “Hot Spots”. This initiative went from a “Highway Capital Project” in Measure R to an MSP program in Measure M. Because the I-605 project was a major capital project – project development has proceeded along the lines of a major project. There is a nine-year old collaborative effort between the MTA Highway Group and the Engineering/public works staff of the cities through a Technical Advisory Committee with the ultimate project selection and recommendation made by a Project Advisory Committee consisting of elected representatives of each of the corridor cities. This process has been in effect for nine years and has yielded consensus on major freeway improvements and off freeway corridor improvements that relieve congestion and improve mobility. Two of the major high dollar freeway components are in the project development phase (environmental clearance) and will require long-term funding plans for implementation, including the 605/5 and the 91/605. These funding plans may be divided into 5-year increments once they are determined.

We highly suggest that the process currently in effect for the Measure R I-605 Hot Spots be retained and MTA and the TAC/PAC work through the creation of five-year funding increments. We also ask that subregional entity adoption be kept consistent with the current process where only the I-605 “Hot Spots” jurisdictions approving project selection and not the entire COG which has not weighed in on any project development.
We request there be clarification on the use of debt funding for major projects selected by the I-605 PAC. The larger initiatives currently undergoing environmental review may be projects deemed appropriate for TIFIA or SB-1 funding through MTA. Under the Guidelines how this would be processed? The subregion will not choose to most-likely-choose-net to manage or construct the major projects and will eulid not engage in providing finding local funding for a-freeway interchange construction.

- Gateway Cities has a TBD funding target for Active Transportation Programs and the COG may consider allocating funds through the Subregional Equity funding – a decision that will be made later in 2018. Many of the elements of the Guidelines will be appropriate to the projects that may be submitted at that time.

Public Participation

- The GCCOG’s I-605 “Hot Spots” Program has been active for nine years. Public participation opportunities are provided at the city council level where non-freeway project development occurs, at the TAC level and the Project Advisory Committee (elected representation). Projects that achieve consensus are then recommended to the MTA Board for approval and funding. For major freeway improvements, Caltrans additionally has provided opportunities through their environmental review and approval process. There is no input or public presentation at the COG level as the . Furthermore, COG does not make any recommendations on project selection or funding.

We suggest is that the COG and MTA staff continue to work with the corridor cities and provide funding and structure for additional input at the local level where projects are developed and project nominations are made. A plan or internet tool that tracks and provides additional notification about project development at the city council level where the decisions/recommendations are made is entirely appropriate.

- Another public participation opportunity might be to expand outreach to support the development and prioritization of projects contained within the COG’s Strategic Transportation Plan (STP). The STP is an integrated comprehensive transportation plan that models the impact and benefit of each proposed transportation project and initiative. All COG cities participate in the process and public participation is appropriate and will facilitate meaningful public input.

3% Local Contribution

- The Gateway COG is appreciative of language within the Guidelines that allow for room to negotiate on the allocation of the 3% contribution within a transit corridor. For the West Santa Ana Branch there are cities that are expending or about to expend funds to create betterment opportunities within proposed station areas. These activities may include increasing land use densities and parking reductions as well as first/last mile planning for station areas. The 3% contribution should include these costs even though they are ahead of project definition. The costs incurred by these cities should be shared with other jurisdictions along the alignment once the 3% local portion has been met for that city. Arrangements should be made for the WSAB to fix the 3% contribution at the date the 30% design is completed in that year and not the year of expenditure. The WSAB has a delivery period of 2022 -2028 or 2022 – 2041 depending on whether the project is construction through with a public/private/partnership, or not. If project implementation extends beyond passed the 2028 timeframe, the contribution cost should remain within the 2028 timeframe. Cities that “opt-out” and wish to pay through a
withholding of local return should be given the option of making payments before the 30% final design figure is ascertained if they should so chose.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the guidelines.

Yvette Kirrin, PE
GCCOG Consultant Engineer
626-644-8058 cell
Five-year Planning Process

- Unlike other subregions, Gateway Cities COG has one funded program in MSP: The I-605 “Hot Spots”. This initiative went from a “Highway Capital Project” in Measure R to an MSP program in Measure M. Because the I-605 project was a major capital project – project development has proceeded along the lines of a major project. There is a nine-year old collaborative effort between the MTA Highway Group and the Engineering/public works staff of the cities through a Technical Advisory Committee with the ultimate project selection and recommendation made by a Project Advisory Committee consisting of elected representatives of each of the corridor cities. This process has been in effect for nine years and has yielded consensus on major freeway improvements and off-freeway corridor improvements that relieve congestion and improve mobility. Two of the major high dollar freeway components are in the project development phase (environmental clearance) and will require long-term funding plans for implementation. These funding plans may be divided into 5-year increments once they are determined.

We highly suggest that the process currently in effect for the Measure R I-605 Hot Spots be retained through the Measure R timeframe and MTA and the TAC/PAC work through the creation of five-year funding increments. Through the existing subregional approval process. We also ask that subregional entity adoption be kept consistent with the current process where only the I-605 “Hot Spots” jurisdictions approving project selection and not the entire COG which has not weighed in on any project development.

We request there be clarification on the use of debt funding for major projects selected by the I-605 PAC. The larger initiatives currently undergoing environmental review may be projects deemed appropriate for TIFIA or SB-1 funding through MTA. Under the Guidelines how this would be processed? The subregion will not choose to manage or construct the major projects and will not engage in providing local funding for freeway interchange construction.

- Gateway Cities has a TBD funding target for Active Transportation Programs and the COG may consider allocating funds through the Subregional Equity funding – a decision that will be made later in 2018. Many of the elements of the Guidelines will be appropriate to the projects that may be submitted at that time.

Public Participation

- The GCCOG’s I-605 “Hot Spots” Program has been active for nine years. Public participation opportunities are provided at the city council level
where non-freeway project development occurs, at the TAC level and the Project Advisory Committee (elected representation). Projects that achieve consensus are then recommended to the MTA Board for approval and funding. For major freeway improvements, Caltrans additionally has provided opportunities through their environmental review and approval process. There is no input or public presentation at the COG level as the COG does not make any recommendations on project selection or funding.

We suggest is that the COG and MTA staff continue to work with the corridor cities and provide funding and structure for additional input at the local level where projects are developed, and project nominations are made. A plan or internet tool that tracks and provides additional notification about project development at the city council level where the decisions/recommendations are made is entirely appropriate.

- Another public participation opportunity might be to expand outreach to support the development and prioritization of projects contained within the COG’s Strategic Transportation Plan (STP). The STP is an integrated comprehensive transportation plan that models the impact and benefit of each proposed transportation project and initiative. All COG cities participate in the process and public participation is appropriate and will facilitate meaningful public input.

3% Local Contribution

- The Gateway COG is appreciative of language within the Guidelines that allow for room to negotiate on the allocation of the 3% contribution within a transit corridor. For the West Santa Ana Branch there are cities that are expending or about to expend funds to create betterment opportunities within proposed station areas. These activities may include increasing land use densities and parking reductions as well as first/last mile planning for station areas. The 3% contribution should include these costs even though they are ahead of project definition. The costs incurred by these cities should be shared with other jurisdictions along the alignment once the 3% local portion has been met for that city. Arrangements should be made for the WSAB to fix the 3% contribution at the date the 30% design is completed in that year and not the year of expenditure. The WSAB has a delivery period of 2022-2028 or 2022-2041 depending on whether the project is construction through a public/private/partnership. If project implementation extends beyond the 2028 timeframe, the contribution cost should remain within the 2028 timeframe. Cities that “opt-out” and wish to pay through a withholding of local return should be given the option of making payments before the 30% final design figure is ascertained if they should so chose.
Manjeet and Kalieh,

We appreciate the extension of time on submitting the comments on the Measure M Administrative Procedures.

On behalf of Mark Pestrella, Director of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works we are pleased to review and provide our comments to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) on the proposed Draft Measure M Administrative Guideline Comments. Please find our comments below:

General Comments:
Subregion/subregional entities and COG seem to be used interchangeably. Considering that not all subregions have Council of Governments. We recommend that the term “Subregion” should be used consistently throughout the Admin Procedures. Note that:
- The North County subregion has the North County Transportation Coalition
- Arroyo Verdugo has a Joint Powers Authority
- Los Angeles County does not have a seat on Las Virgenes Governing Board
- The Central Subregion is made up of the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles and does not have a Joint Powers Authority

Funding Agreements & Requirements
Section 2: “Supplemental funds are funds other than MSP or Local Return funds that are needed to fully fund a project. Supplemental funds can include Metro in kind resources, such as additional technical support, Metro sponsorship or other Metro staff resources.”
- Should this state that Supplemental funds can include agency in kind resources?

3% Local Contribution to Major Transit Projects Administrative Procedures
Step 2: In-kind contributions eligible to satisfy 3% local contribution include, but not limited to, project specific right-of-way and waiver of permitting fees, local agency staff time (incurred and forecast) if, those costs are specifically included in the project cost and contribution amount by the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) of final design cost, and will be subject to the review and audit by Metro.

- Local agencies will need clarification for when eligibility for capturing these costs will begin.

Step 3: If no agreement is entered into and approved prior to the award of any contract authorizing the construction of the project within the borders of the jurisdiction, or if at any time the local jurisdiction is in default of any sums due pursuant to the approved agreement, all funds contained in the Local Return/Regional Rail Subfund allocated to that jurisdiction may, at Metro’s sole discretion, be withheld for not longer than fifteen (15) years and used to pay for the project until the three percent (3%) threshold is met.

- This can be viewed as inconsistent with the statement on page 3 that contributions will be determined by the County.

Should you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at (622)458-7812.

Thank you,

Angela Driscoll
Government Relations
Los Angeles County Public Works
d. 626.458.7812
c. 626.476.8202

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Williams, Marquis" <WilliamsMar@metro.net>
Date: December 11, 2017 at 9:37:49 AM PST
To: Adam Lane <alane@labusinesscouncil.org>, Andre Colaface <colaface@accessla.org>, Andres Ramirez <aramirez@pacoimabeautilful.org>, Angela George <ageorge@dwp.lacounty.gov>, Bridget Smith <bridget.smith@lacity.org>, blindblad@climateresolve.org <blindblad@climateresolve.org>, "Cecilia Estolano" <cecilia@elpadvisors.com>, Colin Donahue <colin.donahue@csun.edu>, "Dalila Sotelo" <commissionersotelo@hotmail.com>, Dalila Sotelo <dalisotelo@hotmail.com>, Darin Chidsey <chidsey@scag.ca.gov>, "Darrell Clarke" <darrell@dclarke.org>, David Feinberg <davdf.feinberg@smgov.net>, Devon Provo <dprovo@labusinesscouncil.org>, Elissa Konove <konove@scrra.net>, Eric Widstrand <eric.widstrand@longbeach.gov>, "Erik Jansen" <erik@la-bike.org>, Ernie Crespo <ecrespo@gardenabus.com>, "Frank Miller" <fmiller@burr.org>, "Golez, Rose" <GolezR@metro.net>, Hamid Bahadori <bahadori.hamid@aaa-calif.com>, Hector Rodriguez <hrodriguez@accessla.org>, "Hilary Norton" <hnorton@tpgre.com>, "Honish, Kalieh" <HonishK@metro.net>, "Hornstock, Jenna" <HornstockJ@metro.net>, Jacki Bacharach <jacki@southbaycities.org>, Jess Romo <jess.romo@longbeach.gov>, "Jessica Arden"
For Section 1

With regard to the following:

To receive 0.5% Measure M funding for planning activities, the subregional entity must notify the designated Metro MSP contact in writing, identify the MSP program, and provide the proposed scope of work, amount requested, basis for estimated cost (including firms or persons that will be compensated), subregional capital projects that are subject of the planning activities, and a representation that the requestor has approval of all entities in the subregion that are eligible to receive MSP funding.

Why does Metro need all of this detail up front? If the COG is asking for 5 years worth of planning funds, the scope of work, firms or persons being paid (why does Metro need the specific persons or firms being paid with these funds and how that is pertinent to expenditure of the funds) subregional capital projects that are subject of the planning activities (it is impossible to identify the capital projects upfront if the purpose of the funding is to establish that particular list), and a representation that the requestor has approval of all entities in the subregion that are eligible to receive MSP funding (this term needs to be defined) will change. Could Metro simply include conditions of expenditure in the funding agreement that must be met and state expenditures may be subject to audit for compliance similar to other Metro funding MOU’s?

With regard to the following:

The project sponsors are expected to submit reasonable expenditure estimates based on credible project readiness documentation. Metro will request that project expenditures are removed from the plan, and will not program funds for the project, if in Metro’s estimation, the estimates are not likely to be met

What if the project sponsor’s professionals that created the expenditure estimates disagree with Metro staff? Is such a decision appealable to the Metro Board?

With regard to the following:

c) Final Jurisdictional Support/Community or Council actions (e.g., resolution)
If the project is in the conceptual phase with no detailed plans or environmental documentation completed, this is impossible to obtain and actually violates CEQA’s due process procedures by “pre-determining” the conclusion of the CEQA process. This requirement only makes sense for construction ready projects.

For Section 2

With regard to the following:

_The lapsed funds will not be deducted from the MSP or subregional total, but the near term available funding will be redistributed at the discretion of Metro based on cashflow. The first consideration for distribution of the available funding will be any outstanding LONP requests, for eligible program or project expenditures. Metro must consider all demands on the MSP cashflow, including the need for debt service, to determine the best discretionary use of the lapsed funding._

Since Metro has ultimate approval of all 5 year MSP programming including any amendments, this should simply be re-worded as follows: “The lapsed funds will not be deducted from the MSP or subregional total. Lapsed funds shall be re-programmed through an amended 5 year plan approved by the subregional entity and then submitted and approved by Metro.”

For Section 5

With regard to the following:

- _List all owners of the right-of-way where the project is to be constructed. What are the existing uses of the right-of-way? Are there any future plans that might affect the project? Have the owners been contacted? If so, are they willing to sell the property?_

Project readiness can be for projects ready to proceed to design and environmental clearance. If the funding is for these phases, the above requested information violates CEQA’s procedures regarding due process. The above only makes sense for “construction ready” projects.

With regard to the following:

_“Letters of support” by others should be included with the application package (not mailed separately to Metro’s CEO)._

The term “others” needs to be defined. Also an explanation as to why this is even required would be helpful.

With regard to the following:

_Identify if there are any adjacent jurisdictions, agencies, property owners, etc., who would be impacted by the proposed project. Please list and describe outreach efforts, dates, participants and any results/issues that could impact the project’s schedule. Also, please identify if right-of-way condemnation would be necessary._

Agencies cannot make public assumptions about specific properties to be acquired by condemnation nor make such statements until property negotiations have commenced and failed. To do so violates due process. This statement should be deleted.
If you have any questions regards these comments please contact the undersigned

Mark Christoffels, Director of Transportation Planning
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
1000 S. Fremont Ave, Unit 42, Alhambra, CA 91803
626-457-1800
mchristoffels@sgvcog.org

Mark Christoffels, CEO/Chief Engineer
Alameda Corridor East Construction Authority
4900 Rivergrade Rd, Suite A120, Irwindale, CA 91706
626-962-9292
mchristoffels@theaceproject.org
December 11, 2017

Therese McMillan, Chief Planning Office
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Draft Measure M Administrative Guidelines Comments and Concerns

Dear Ms. McMillan:

Thank you for extending the administrative deadline through January 2018 to allow the Policy Advisory Committee to consider other comments submitted by December 11 from other COGs.

This memo is written to document the South Bay Cities Council of Governments (SBCCOG) initial comments and concerns with the revised Measure M Administrative Procedures: Multi-Year SubRegional Programs 5-Year Plan Process and other draft policy papers discussed at the December 5, 2017 Policy Advisory Committee meeting. These comments were reviewed and approved by the SBCCOG Transportation and Steering Committees. We expect to provide additional comments as future versions are circulated, but we wanted to submit our initial comments by December 11 as requested by Metro staff.

**DRAFT MEASURE M ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES**

Section 1, Step 2 – Five Year Forecast

**ADDITION OF CORRIDOR PROJECT DEFINITION:**
The guidelines should explicitly define corridor plans which would include several related initiatives as a project within the MSP definition. The Measure M administrative guidelines also need to include corridor program development as project development. The guidelines should include an explicit statement such as, “Development of a corridor planning document to identify a program of improvement initiatives is considered an eligible project expense to be included in the Five-Year Plan”

Utilizing a programmatic corridor approach to streamline project delivery for the Measure M MSP highway program will allow Caltrans and other local agencies to collaboratively define longterm/ultimate transportation concepts within a common corridor footprint. As mentioned during Caltrans’ SBL outreach, this concept has received broad support from both cities and Caltrans staff. The SBCCOG expects to include several corridor projects in its initial 5-year program since this approach is
particularly beneficial for projects that cross local jurisdictional boundaries and those involving segments of the state highway system.

An additional benefit of this approach is that, once the corridor footprint is defined, any project lead agency along the corridor will only need to demonstrate consistency with the master corridor footprint for Caltrans encroachment permit processing.

Section 1, Step 2 – Preliminary list of Projects

DOCUMENTATION OF AGREEMENT ON FIVE YEAR PLAN:
The current guidelines require, "... a representation that the requestor has approval of all entities in the sub-region that are eligible to receive MSP funding." We are concerned with the practicability of obtaining approval of all eligible recipients, let alone as a pre-condition of executing a funding agreement to prepare a 5-Year plan. We recommend instead that the sub-region provide proof to Metro of an approval action by its Board of Directors to accept MSP funding and that all of the cities have been informed of the recommended approval action and have been provided an opportunity to participate in the program under which the actions are being recommended, and that the Board has taken into consideration any potentially-eligible entity's comments and concerns.

Section 1, Step 2, Sub-section V – Preliminary List of Projects & Five-Year Plan

PROJECT DELIVERY:
It may not be possible to deliver a project within a five-year program timeframe, especially if projects require environmental clearance. In the Measure R South Bay Highway program, we have determined it is more realistic to identify the scope and costs of project milestones that will be completed within a five-year period. The funding agreements are executed only for the included milestones with subsequent milestones included in funding agreements after annual updates determine their inclusion is timely.

Section 1, Step 2, Sub-section VI

EXAMPLES:
The current guidelines require project sponsors to develop a nexus finding for their project with a MSP program type. The guidelines should include examples of eligible projects for each of the types of MSP programs. Although the sub-regions will develop detailed MSP policies and procedures for the MSPs in their sub-region, it would be helpful for Metro to include a list that would provide sample project descriptions for each type of MSP program, but not limit the types of eligible projects. The list would be similar to the example lists that are included in Local Return guidelines for Proposition A, C and Measure R.

Additionally, while transportation demand management is already eligible, funding broadband infrastructure and other technologies that support trip elimination and reduction of vehicle miles travelled to encourage and enable working at home or in neighborhood centers should be listed as examples.
Section 1, Step 5 – Annual Update

UPDATE PROCESS:
The SBCCOG intends to institute an annual update process of the initial 5-year Plan. This provides the opportunity to update costs and schedules and to add and delete projects and milestones. However, we are concerned that there will be insufficient administrative funding within the 0.5% administrative cap for each of the MSP programs for this very important update. From our experience with the Measure R program, this annual update process is essential to the success of the program because it continuously involves new elected officials and staff that represent our local jurisdictions in the process.

Section 5

Similar to the comments noted above (in Section 1, Step 2, Sub-section V, the guidelines should be changed to reflect the completion of project milestones within the 5-year plan rather than completion of the entire project.

3% LOCAL CONTRIBUTION TO MAJOR TRANSIT PROJECTS

Eligible Fund Contributions
APPROVAL PROCESS:
It is unrealistic to require MSP contributions to be accompanied by documented agreement from all jurisdictions that would otherwise be eligible for those sub-regional funds. The decision-maker for allocation of these funds in each sub-region is the relevant council of governments. Each of the COGs will have to adopt its process for determining how allocations will be approved. Metro should not administratively impose a 100% affirmative vote on the use of any sub-regional allocations.

Early 3% Contributions

PROJECT REQUIREMENTS:
Two of the three local jurisdictions in the next segment of the Green Line South are working with Metro staff to develop transit centers on the prospective station sites that likely will be constructed before the rail segment is environmentally cleared. The local jurisdictions are willing to coordinate the design of the transit centers to allow subsequent integration of the rail line station and to pay the early design and construction costs needed to expedite the transit centers opening as long as the early expenditures are allowed as eligible credits to meet their required 3% contribution. The guidelines need to include process language that allows such an agreement to be timely executed by the local jurisdiction and Metro. In addition, the value of early contributions should be adjusted by the Consumer Price Index for the period between the investment in eligible project elements and the 30% final design of the project.

3% Contribution Overmatch Sharing

AGGREGATION:
The projected local investment in the two transit centers being constructed at two future Green Line South stations will likely significantly exceed 3% of the rail line. The 3% Guidelines should allow the overmatch to be shared with other local jurisdictions that have a responsibility for a 3% contribution within
the rail project segment up to the 3% aggregate contribution requirement for the future rail project segment(s).

VISIONARY PROJECT SEED FUNDING

Grantees should be able to participate in the selection of their technical consultant and fellow from the bench created by Metro in order to assure that the consultant and fellows have the appropriate experience and expertise for their specific project.

Grantees' 20% match should include their in-kind costs for participating in the project.

The need for a 20% grantee match should be conformed throughout the document to consistently replace the previous 50% local match.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Kurt Weideman, SBCCOG Chair
Councilman, City of Torrance
January 4, 2018

Therese McMillan, Chief Planning Officer  
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)  
One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Sent via: metroPAC@metro.net  

Re: Comments on Draft Measure M Administrative Guidelines – MSP & Visionary Seed Funding

Dear Ms. McMillan:

Thank you and your team for inviting PAC feedback on the initial set of Measure M administrative guidelines, and for giving due consideration to the differing opinions that you come across in that inclusive process.

Below please find a few areas for potential improvement that have been identified by environmental and social equity stakeholders.

Multi-Year Subregional Programs (MSP)

Section 3 – Performance Measures

Performance measures have the potential to be a powerful tool to help drive infrastructure investments in a more multi-benefit direction, but only if they are applied in a meaningful way. As the draft guidelines are now, the application of subregional performance measures is removed from any decision-making and public engagement processes and thus will not necessary motivate improvements in performance. We recommend that Metro:

1. Tie these subregional performance measures to other competitive funding evaluations (e.g. 2% system connectivity funds) as a way to leverage these guaranteed subregional funds to achieve more and better. This could be a way to motivate COGs to engage in this performance measures process more robustly, and also give Metro a way to provide feedback to subregions (that they are likely to receive constructively) on their 5-year plans.

2. Proactively provide further guidance on qualitative and quantitative metrics by adding detail to the table provided and in the form of an appendix to these administrative guidelines. For example, under 'improve environmental quality', it could be helpful to list urban heat, stormwater runoff, and habitat as potentially relevant aspects to consider, because otherwise COGs might not think to do so. This is an opportunity to improve COGs knowledge of best practices, and it should not be too hard of a task for Metro to undertake, since previous memos shared with the PAC did contain a greater level of detail.
Section 4 – Public Participation

The final paragraph of this section seems to make it optional as to whether COGs include information on performance measures in their public participation activities. We recommend changing the word “if” to “how” as a way to ensure that public engagement activities can be based on multi-benefit information about performance measures and in that way give the public more content to engage with.

Visionary Project Seed Funding

Selection of Consultant & Cost Sharing or Matching

The previously-stated 50% match requirement is too steep for grassroots-initiated projects to be able to meet. Lowering this requirement to 20% or even lower would create more opportunity for community-based organizations to partner with eligible applicants, which might otherwise be too reluctant to dedicate such a significant portion of their organizational budget to solving an issue identified externally by stakeholders.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Bryn Lindblad
Associate Director, Climate Resolve
DRAFT GUIDELINES

XVI. 2% System Connectivity Projects (Transit Construction Subfund)

Authority

Authority for this subfund comes from Section 7.B. of the Measure M Ordinance and Section XVI of the Measure M Guidelines.

Eligible Uses

As described in the Measure M Ordinance, transit construction consists of “a capital only project or program including environmental, design, and construction work in public transit rights-of-way or in support of the capital needs of the public transit system, such as rolling stock, transit stations, or transit stop improvements. Transit construction can also include first/last mile improvements.” Several major projects in Measure M could be funded by this category, but the fund is not limited to those expressly listed in Measure M.

Who can apply?

- Los Angeles County
- Cities in Los Angeles County
- Transit agencies in Los Angeles County
- Airports
- Ports
- Metro

Evaluation Criteria

Project evaluation criteria may consider:

1) Regional Significance & Intermodal Integration:

- The degree to which the project supports the recommendations and goals for transit as stated in Metro’s adopted LRTP.

- The degree to which the project is part of a regional program to address mobility, reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality.

- The project’s connectivity with and ability to complement nearby transit projects.

- The degree to which the project provides access to regional trip generators, regional activity centers, fixed guideway, and Metrolink, and improves access between jurisdictional boundaries.
• The degree to which the project promotes improvements among transit services by different agencies.

2) First/Last Mile Improvements:

• Priority will be given to existing plans for pathways to eligible stations as described in the Measure M guidelines for Active Transportation and First/Last Mile.

3) Project Need and Benefit to the Transportation System:

• The degree to which the project creates mobility benefits for the region, including improved access for the transit-dependent population.

• The project’s contribution to a balanced and integrated transit system.

• The potential for the project to increase transit use, and to improve the transit system.

• The extent to which the project eliminates or corrects deficiencies in the transit system, such as existing gaps, bottlenecks, or points of congestion/overcrowding.

• The importance of the project to the effective operation and management of existing transit facilities and systems.

• The extent to which the project furthers previous actions supporting the project or area services such as completing partially funded project segments.

4) Local Match Considerations:

• Leverage of local investment or local contribution.

5) Cost Effectiveness:

• The project’s cost effectiveness in relationship to the total project cost.

• The applicant’s demonstrated commitment to covering life-cycle operational and maintenance expenses.

6) Land Use and Sustainability Policies/Principles:

• The project’s ability to advance the goals and priorities of the adopted Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

• The jurisdiction/agency demonstrates that the project is complemented by programs or activities that will implement the RTP/SCS, while also increasing the effectiveness of the project.

• The jurisdiction/agency demonstrates its commitment to coordination activity with the land use planning authority. Evidence may be a SCAG Sustainability Program (formerly Compass Blueprint) project, a Strategic Growth Council Planning Grant, Metro Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Planning Grant, Transit-Oriented Communities (TOC) Program, or similar program.
ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (2%) –
MEASURE M ADMINISTRATIVE GUIDELINES
OUTLINE/DISCUSSION DRAFT, JANUARY 5, 2018

1. GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT PROCESS/DISCUSSION WITH POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL
   - For the January 9, 2018 meeting, staff is sharing a first draft outline in order to introduce intended structure of guidelines and frame key points for discussion
   - Focused discussion conference call to be scheduled between January and February PAC meeting
   - More detailed PAC discussion in February
   - Anticipated Board adoption by June
   - Anticipated first program cycle for fall 2018, allowing for results of Cycle 4 State Active Transportation Program to help inform near term priorities

2. CONTEXT FOR REGIONAL ATP
   - Measure M creates a regional ATP for the first time
   - This program exists within the larger realm of funding opportunities for active transportation including:
     - Local Return
     - Multiyear Subregional Programs
     - Other Measure M programs and funds (Transit Capital/First/Last Mile, Highway Program)
     - State ATP
   - This program should not be viewed as the sole or even primary funding source for local active transportation. Its purpose is to strategically apply funding for key priorities, and to leverage other available money, notably from State ATP which has been heavily augmented through SB 1 and Cap-and-Trade

3. KEY POINTS IN DRAFT OUTLINE
   - Potential priorities include:
     - Regional scale active transportation corridor projects
     - First/Last Mile associated with transit capital projects
     - Open competitive program
     - Matching grant program geared toward supporting local applications to State ATP
   - Policy framework focusing on:
     - ATSP (regional network inclusive of first/last mile)
     - Safety/Vision Zero
   - Procedural considerations similar to MSP
     - Five year fund estimate/prioritization/program development
     - Evaluation/metrics
     - Participation
     - Readiness
Introduction

Measure M establishes, for the first time, a regional Active Transportation Program which creates new opportunities to fulfill active transportation policies and objectives. This program exists in the context of other new and on-going funding opportunities. These include:

- Local Return
- Multiyear Subregional Programs geared toward active transportation and related
- State Active Transportation Program, as recently augmented by SB1 and Cap-and-Trade

As such, the intent of this regional ATP program is to establish priorities on a rolling basis in order to best leverage other available funding to achieve key regional objectives.

The objectives of the Active Transportation Program (2%) are to improve and grow transit access through expanding multi-modal connectivity and to improve the regional active transportation network, as established in the Active Transportation Strategic Plan. The program establishes active transportation as an integral element to Metro’s countywide transportation system by fostering and supporting greater active transportation usage and improved safety. The adopted Measure M Guidelines elevate safety by stipulating that projects funded through Measure M should support the protection of pedestrian and bicycle safety in parallel with Vision Zero or equivalent policies.

1. Applicable Policy and Usage

The following policies will be applied to administration of the Metro Active Transportation Program (2%). Policies are cited in the adopted Measure M Guidelines and are listed here for information and to indicate potential program priorities.

Overarching Policies:

I. Active Transportation Strategic Plan (ASTP), May 2016
   Defines the Regional Active Transportation Network and identifies strategies to expand the reach of transit.

II. Design for Safety/ Vision Zero
Projects funded through Measure M should support the protection of pedestrian and bicycle safety in parallel with Vision Zero or equivalent policies.

**Supportive Policies/Strategies:**

i. **Complete Streets Policy, October 2014**
Creates and establishes Complete Streets commitments and planning process. Of note requires that local agencies applying for Metro discretionary competitive programs must have a Complete Streets policy in compliance with State law.

ii. **First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, April 2014**
Defines a rationale for first/last mile improvements and provides an approach to plan and design improvements surrounding any transit station.

iii. **Countywide Sustainability Planning Policy (CPSS) December 2012**
Defines sustainability principles and priorities, key concepts, planning framework, and evaluation metrics.

iv. **First/Last Mile Motion 14.2, June 2016**
Allows locally funded first/last mile improvements to be counted toward the 3% local match requirement for rail transit projects. Policy has been further refined by local match provisions in the adopted Measure M Guidelines and is pending additional provisions in First/Last Mile Guidelines for transit capital projects to be developed over the first half of 2018.

v. **First/Last Mile Motion 14.1, May 2016**
Designates streets within the Actives Transportation Strategic Plan’s 661 station areas as the Countywide First/Last Mile network, and directs several first/last mile planning and implementation activities. Requires inclusion of first/last mile implementation as part of new transit projects.

vi. **Bike Share Policies/Motion 22.1, July 2015**
Describes criteria for funding of local bikeshare programs.

2. **Eligible Uses**

As described in the Measure M Ordinance, Active Transportation consists of “non-motorized transportation via walking, bicycling, or rolling modes.” Adopted Measure M
Guidelines establish eligibility criteria and definitions for Active Transportation programs along with related programs such as first/last mile, mobility hubs, greenways. Eligible projects are comprised of capital expenditures that achieve program goals.

Several major projects listed in the Measure M Expenditure plan may include elements (notably first/last mile components of transit capital projects) that can be funded from this program, as well as from other sources.

The adopted Measure M Guidelines identify the LA River Waterway and Bikepath as being funded through this program.

3. Fund Estimate
In order to develop a five year program, as described below, Metro will first provide an estimate of available funding for the five year increment, consistent with process identified for other Measure M programs.

4. Program Development Prioritization
The Active Transportation Program may fund any number of eligible activities. Program priorities are expected to shift over time, and as such, a high level program identifying current priorities will be developed and adopted every five years.

Priorities will consist of varying programmatic efforts that may include, but are not limited to:

Metro
- Regional scale active transportation corridor projects (e.g. LA River Waterway and System Bikepath, Rail to River, 710 corridor bike path projects)

Metro and Local
- First/Last Mile implementation for Transit Capital Projects

Local
- Provide Matching Grant Program to local agencies
- Open competitive program, subject to specific criteria/application process TBD
Projects or programs are subjected to assessment every five years to evaluate the performance and significance to inform future program priorities.

5. Performance Evaluation/Metrics
Metro will evaluate the effectiveness of the Active Transportation/First/Last Mile program through the application of performance metrics. Metro will analyze program performance at the time of program adoption and with any subsequent updates. Metrics to be used will be based on those identified for other Measure M programs, notably the Multi-Year Sub-regional Programs.

6. Participation
Stakeholders and the public are able to participate in the formation of the five year plan and any interim updates through mechanisms identified in the Public Participation Plan.

7. Program Adoption
The Metro Board will adopt the five-year program based on a recommendation from Metro staff.

8. Subsequent Process (for competitive/match for local projects); to include:
Should the Board adoption include either a competitive call for projects, or a matching grant program, the identification of specific projects will be subject to additional process including project selection criteria and an application process. Timelines and process for any such additional process will be described at the time of program adoption. Potential considerations are listed here for information.
   a. Competitive Application: criteria/considerations likely to include – implementation of Metro policies/programs (e.g. regional Active Transportation Priority Network), leverage, community support, benefit to DACs.
   b. Local Match Application Process: Local Match Program funded through Measure M Active Transportation Program is likely to be focused on maximizing competitiveness for State ATP funding and may proceed in a manner similar to the existing grant technical assistance program favoring well-developed, locally supported projects.

9. Final Adoption of Project List
Following any subsequent process (e.g. competitive process), Metro will propose a final project list for Board adoption. Project list will include, at a minimum, the following information:

- Project sponsor
- Name/description
- Measure M funding amounts by year
- Other funding source funding amounts by year

10. Annual Update
Metro staff may propose for Board adoption, updates of the program on an annual basis. Updates are intended to accommodate changes in the project list and/or funding assumptions including timelines.

11. Funding Agreement
All funding agreements will be executed between Metro and project sponsors and will be subjected to Metro Board approval.

12. Readiness
Project readiness is essential in determining whether a project is ready for funding. Part of the process is built on the assumption that projects or programs will obligate Measure M funds at the time they are ready to use them. It is important that project sponsors provide accurate information for evaluating project readiness.

Provide any or all evidence that project funding will result in timely development and completion of the project including the following:

- Describe how the schedule will enable realistic project completion based on the years funding is requested, and is consistent with any and all regulations and policies for fund use.
- List all owners of the right-of-way where the project is to be constructed and any or all future plans that might affect the project.
- If the project requires the use of Metro-owned right-of-way, the project is responsible for coordinating with all relevant Metro departments to ensure consistency with Metro’s policies and processes. The cost of alteration to any Metro right-of-way will be the responsibility of the project sponsor.
- Identify all other agencies or organizations that are active participants in the project.
• Letters of Support by others agencies or organizations should be included with the application package.
• If there are any adjacent property owners, agencies, jurisdictions, etc., who would be impacted by the propose project, outreach efforts and schedule should be identified in the application package.
Notes

Lump sum would be provided in the first five years for initial capital costs only. Project sponsors are responsible for ongoing operations and maintenance. Funds that are not expended are only available for other System Connectivity Capital Projects.

Objective

This funding category seeks to improve mobility, air quality, transit access, and sustainability by funding streetcar and local circulator projects.

Who can apply?

All public agencies that provide transportation facilities or services within Los Angeles County. These include: cities, the County of Los Angeles, the State of California Department of Transportation, and transit agencies eligible for federal funds. Transportation-related public joint powers authorities (JPAs) must be sponsored by one of the above public agencies. Metro may choose not to award funds or execute a Funding Agreement (FA) or Letter of Agreement (LOA) with applicants who have outstanding audit issues from previous Calls for Projects, or who are not in compliance with any current FA/LOA Scope of Work or Lapsing Policy requirements.

What types of projects are eligible?

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) describes a streetcar system as operating routes predominantly on streets in mixed-traffic with single-car trains and frequent stops. A circulator is described by the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) as local transit service limited to a small geographic area or to short-distance trips.

All projects must provide evidence for the following as described in the FTA’s Small Starts policy guidance:

- Mobility improvements
- Environmental benefits
- Congestion relief
- Cost-effectiveness
- Economic Development
- Appropriate Land Use
TRANSIT ORIENTED COMMUNITIES
DRAFT

Policy Paper PAC Outline

I. Overview

Traditionally transit agencies have focused their mission on a combination of planning, constructing, and operating the public transit system with a focus on moving people from station to station. Community impacts, both positive and negative, were relegated to local jurisdictions to manage, promote or mitigate. It has now become evident that a regional serving transit system makes a tremendous impact on the communities that surround it. As a leader in this area, Metro has begun expanding its impact and scope of services from the narrow definition of transit lines and stations into the communities beyond.

This broader goal cannot be achieved by Metro or by its municipal partners alone; it is a partnership between these entities along with the local communities we serve. Metro can and should understand the impacts and the possibilities inherent in its role as a transportation agency and develop policies and procedures that promote Transit Oriented Communities (TOCs).

II. Existing Metro Plans, Policies, Programs, and Guidelines

a. Existing Policies
   i. **PENDING POLICY** – “TOC Policy” (will inform Measure M Guidelines implementation)
   ii. Joint Development Policy (includes 35% affordable housing goal)
   iii. Affordable Housing Policies
   iv. Systemwide Station Design Policy
   v. Complete Streets Policy
   vi. First / Last Mile Strategic Plan
   vii. Sustainability Planning Policy
   viii. Active Transportation Strategic Plan
   ix. Joint Development Unsolicited Proposals Policy

b. Existing Programs and Plans
   i. Joint Development Program
   ii. Active Transportation Grant Assistance Program
   iii. Business Interruption Fund
   iv. First/Last Mile Planning
   v. TOD Planning Grant / TOC TIF Pilot Program
   vi. MATCH and Small Business Loan Funds
   vii. West Santa Ana Branch TOC Strategic Implementation Plan
   viii. Westlake / MacArthur Park Street Vending Pilot Program
III. Questions

a. How do we define the concept of TOCs?
b. How do we identify the goals and objectives of Metro’s approach to enabling TOCs?

c. What TOC activities can be considered a “Transportation Purpose”?
d. How will TOC activities address; Gentrification, Displacement and Affordable Housing?

e. How do we differentiate between projects and programs that are appropriate for the 1/2 mile radius walk-shed and 3 mile radius bike-shed?
f. How can Metro work with local land use authorities to incentivize their implementation of TOC principles?
Public Private Partnerships – P3s

Policy Paper Outline

I. Overview
A Public-Private Partnership (P3) is a mutually beneficial collaboration between a public agency and a private sector entity. Through this contractual arrangement, the skills and assets of each sector are shared in delivering a service or facility for the use of the general public. In addition to the sharing of resources, each party shares in the risks and rewards potential in the delivery of the service and/or facility. Metro is looking at P3s as a means to accelerate delivery of our much-needed transportation projects or otherwise enhance service.

II. Introduction to Public Private Partnerships
a. What is a public private partnership? What isn’t a public private partnership?
b. Potential benefits of a P3
   i. Risk Transfer
   ii. Innovation
   iii. Project Acceleration
c. Potential reasons to not do a P3
d. Types of P3s
e. How to evaluate whether a P3 is the best fit for your project

III. P3 Best Practices

IV. P3s at Metro
a. Metro’s UP Policy and Process
b. Metro’s evaluation criteria
c. Step’s OEl has taken to prepare for P3 procurement

V. Metro’s Resources and Funding
a. Local funding (Prop A, Prop C, Measure R, Measure M)
b. Federal Financing

VI. Policy Framing Questions
a. How should Metro prioritize projects for P3 development?
b. What risk/cost is Metro willing to accept?
c. What role does equity play for Metro’s approach to a P3?
Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Shared Mobility

Policy Paper Outline

I. Overview
   Transportation Demand Management (TDM) is a general term for various strategies that increase transportation system efficiency. TDM is a program of information, encouragement and incentives provided by local or regional organizations to help people know about and use all their transportation options to optimize all modes in the system. These are both traditional and innovative technology-based services to help people use transit, ridesharing, walking, biking, and telework.

   Shared mobility refers to the shared used of a vehicle, bicycle, or other transportation mode. It is a transportation strategy that allows users to access transportation services on an as-needed basis. Shared mobility is an umbrella term that encompasses a variety of transportation modes including car sharing, bike sharing, ridesharing, on-demand ride services, micro transit, and other modes.

II. Introduction
   A. Regional responsibility
   B. Metro’s responsibility

III. What is Transportation Demand Management (TDM)?
   A. Definition
   B. Programmatic Initiatives
   C. Informing design and infrastructure development
   D. Objectives and metrics

IV. Regional Initiatives
   A. County-level initiatives
   B. SCAG TDM Strategic Plan 6 County
   C. SCAG Study on Telecommuting
   D. SCAG’s Future Communities Pilot Program

V. City-Level
   A. New City of LA TDM Ordinance
   B. City of Santa Monica
   C. City of Glendale
   D. Mobility Hubs

VI. Metro
   A. TDM Mode Call for Projects
   B. Regional Rideshare
   C. Metro Vanpool Program
   D. Metro Bike Share
   E. Parking Management
   F. Annual Employer pass programs
   G. Congestion Reduction Program
   H. First/Last Mile Strategic Plan
   I. Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Grant Program
   J. Complete Streets Policy
   K. MicroTransit Pilot Project
   L. Active Transportation Strategic Plan

VII. Best Practices Summary

January 5, 2018
A. Travel subsidies and incentives
B. Parking Pricing
C. Trip Planning
D. Bicycle and Pedestrian infrastructure
E. Public/Private Partnerships
F. Emerging Technology and Innovation

VIII. LRTP Framing Questions
A. How can Metro support TDM efforts throughout the County?
B. What new metrics should be used to evaluate programs?
C. How do we service areas without active TMA/TMOs?
D. How do we incorporate rapid technological advancements?
E. How can TDM initiatives best inform and support policy and local land use decisions?
Goods Movement

Policy Paper Outline

I. Overview

The ability to efficiently move freight/goods throughout Southern California’s transportation network is crucial to the mobility and economic vitality of the region, the state and the nation. With international trade flourishing, local communities will continue to see a steady increase in trucks and freight trains carrying freight/goods handled by the San Pedro Bay ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, Los Angeles International Airport and other major gateways and ports of entry throughout Southern California.

II. Introduction to Metro’s Goods Movement Planning
   a. What is goods movement planning
   b. LA County’s goods movement system profile
      i. Highway network
      ii. Rail network
      iii. Intermodal facilities
      iv. Ports of entry – waterborne and airborne
      v. Warehousing and distribution facilities
   c. System users
      i. Trucks – long-haul, short-haul, and local deliveries
      ii. Freight rail
      iii. Urban deliveries – small vans and personal vehicles
   d. Challenges and opportunities
      i. Congestion
      ii. Safety
      iii. Economic sustainability and competitiveness
      iv. Air quality
      v. Community impacts
      vi. Land use conflicts
      vii. Increase in home deliveries and associated urban deliveries
      viii. Vehicle, infrastructure, and communication technology advancement
   e. Why Metro needs goods movement planning
      i. Coordination and collaboration with partner agencies at local, state, and federal level

III. Existing Metro Plans, Policies, Programs, and Guidelines
   a. Goods Movement focused plans and programs
      i. Multi-county Goods Movement Action Plan
      ii. Countywide Zero-Emission Trucks Collaborative
      iii. Gateway Cities Technology Plan for Goods Movement
   b. Programs with goods movement elements
      i. Highway planning
ii. Regional rail

IV. Funding Sources for Goods Movement Program and Projects
   a. Local funding
   b. State funding
      i. Formula
      ii. Discretionary
      iii. Project eligibility
   c. Federal funding
      i. Formula
      ii. Discretionary
      iii. Project eligibility

V. Best Practices
   a. What other regions are doing for their goods movement planning?
   b. Goods movement performance measures
      i. Data availability and accuracy
      ii. Methodologies and analyses, finding the causes of congestion and conflicts
      iii. By facility type – Freeways, highways, local arterial, and rail mainline

VI. LRTP Framing Questions
   a. What are the appropriate policy directions for LA County's goods movement system?
   b. What are the appropriate performance measures and evaluation criteria for regional and local goods movement projects?
   c. What role do local agencies have in achieving regional goods movement goals?
Contact:

FAME ASSISTANCE CORPORATION
323.870.8567
rrtpinfo@famecorporations.org
famecorporations.org

If you live in:

EAST/CENTRAL CITIES REGION: Atwater Village, Boyle Heights, Central City, Chinatown, Cypress Park, Eagle Rock, East Los Angeles, Echo Park, El Sereno, Glassell Park, Griffith Park/Los Feliz, Hancock Park, Highland Park, Hollywood, Koreatown, Lincoln Heights, Mid-City, Mid-City West, Montecito Heights, Mt. Washington, Pico Union, Silver Lake, Westlake and Wilshire area.

SAN FERNANDO AND NORTH COUNTY CITIES:

SOUTH LOS ANGELES/SOUTH BAY REGION:

WESTSIDE REGION: Beverly Hills, Brentwood, Culver City, Malibu, Mar Vista, Marina del Rey, Pacific Palisades, Palms, Park La Brea, Playa del Rey, Playa Vista, Santa Monica, Sawtelle, West Hollywood, West Los Angeles, and Westwood.

Contact:

HUMAN SERVICES ASSOCIATION
562.806.0250
rrtp-info@hsala.org
hsala.org

If you live in:

GATEWAY REGION: Artesia, Bell, Bell Gardens, Bellflower, Cerritos, Commerce, Compton, Cudahy, Downey, Hawaiian Gardens, Huntington Park, La Habra Heights, La Mirada, Lakewood, Long Beach, Lynwood, Maywood, Montebello, Norwalk, Paramount, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Signal Hill, South Gate, Vernon and Whittier.

SAN GABRIEL REGION: Alhambra, Arcadia, Azusa, Baldwin Park, Bradbury, Citrus, Claremont, Covina, Duarte, El Monte, Glendora, Industry, Irwindale, La Cañada Flintridge, La Puente, La Verne, Monrovia, Monterey Park, Pasadena, Pomona, Rosemead, San Dimas, San Gabriel, San Marino, Sierra Madre, South El Monte, South Pasadena, Temple City, Vincent, Walnut and West Covina.


Save on fares with LIFE.

Low-Income riders can save more with LIFE coupons.

In addition to Metro fares, use LIFE coupons towards purchasing fares on:

M
bigbluebus
culver CITYBUS
LADOT
LONGBEACH
BADLINES
Montebello
SANTA CLARITA
TRANSPORTATION

Metro
Rider Relief is now LIFE. (Low-Income Fare is Easy)

Now, qualifying riders can save even more on Metro 7-Day or 30-Day Passes with LIFE coupons.

> Monthly savings have increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro 30-Day Pass</th>
<th>New monthly coupon value</th>
<th>Final pass price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Disabled</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Vocational</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student K-12</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

> See if you are eligible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household size</th>
<th>Annual income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$31,550 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$36,050 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$40,550 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$45,050 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$48,700 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$52,300 or less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sign up in just three steps:

1. CALL
   Contact the administrator in your area to begin the application process. See reverse for contact information.

2. APPLY
   Visit your local agency to submit your application, proof of eligibility documents and receive your coupon booklet.

   Your coupons will be valid for one cycle, ending in either June or December, depending on when you apply.

3. REDEEM
   Use your coupon towards the purchase of a Metro 7-Day or 30-Day Pass, or towards fare on:
   - Antelope Valley Transit Authority (AVTA)
   - Culver CityBus
   - Foothill Transit
   - LADOT Transit
   - Long Beach Transit
   - Metro
   - Montebello Bus Lines
   - Norwalk Transit System
   - Santa Clarita Transit
   - Santa Monica Big Blue Bus
   - Torrance Transit

   Call 866.TAPTOGO or visit taptogo.net/vendors to find a vendor that redeems LIFE coupons.