Agenda

Metro Policy Advisory Council
February 6, 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.

Meeting begins promptly at 1:30p.m

1. PAC Business and Minutes (5 min)
   - Attendance
   - March 13th Meeting Reminder

2. Transit Oriented Communities (10 min)
   Working Committee Update

3. Equity Platform:
   - Overview presentation (10 min)
   - Questions & Answers (15 min)
   - Breakout sessions (30 min)
   - Reports back (15 min)

4. PAC Announcements (15 min.)
   - PAC Academy (proposed courses)
     a. Transp. Funding & Finance
     b. Key State & Federal Regulations
     c. Transit Operations & State of Good Repair
     d. Metro Project Delivery
     e. Interagency Partners (Who does what, e.g., TOC)

     - Status: Meas. M Admin. Procedures

     - Workshop MSP Admin. Procedures Implementation

5. Public Comment

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority
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### Metro Policy Advisory Council (PAC)
#### Representatives/Alternates Meeting Attendance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumers</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elderly/Disabled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Ramirez</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hernandez</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Gallagher</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Donahue</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Meaney</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Yee</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeAndra Dodds</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm Harris</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enviro/Social Equity - Low-Income Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Lindblad</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Podemski</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Norton</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Lane</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Osgood</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moises Gisneros</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Miller</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty Hicks</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalia Sotelo</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Clarke</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Munis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernie Crespo</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Feinberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieves Castro</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert So</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolink</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elissa Konove</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roderick Diaz</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre Colaiace</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector Rodriguez</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Cartwright</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Cameron</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Miller</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess Romo</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darin Chidsey</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naresh Amatya</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Kim</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamid Bahadori</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycyle/Pedestrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Hernandez</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romel Pascual</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Metro Policy Advisory Council (PAC)
### Representatives/Alternates Meeting Attendance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictions</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Pestrella</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Proano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seleta Reynolds</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridget Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel COG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Christoffels</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marisa Creter</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando Valley COG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bwarie</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway COG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvette Kirin</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Widstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay COG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacki Bacharach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Lantz</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County COG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Behen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolls Niebla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities COG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Estolano</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanna Hankamer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes/Malibu COG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Dipple</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Arden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Minutes

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL
Tuesday January 9, 2018

PAC Business and Minutes

Roll call.

Mark Christoffels moved, Jacki Bacharach seconded with change.

Measure M Admin Guidelines

Ms. Honish began by introducing the amended Measure M Admin Guidelines and detailed some of the specific changes with which the PAC expressed concern. Some of the changes include better clarity of Metro’s role, response times, specific delineation of what are eligible uses for the half-percent planning funds versus capital expenditures (i.e. capital lines begin at project environmental phase; half percent funds are applied prior to that), and the inclusion of the new Public Participation form.

Visionary Seed Funding now has a 40% match requirement per the amended Guidelines.

Terry Dipple asked for clarification on an item found on Page 3 of Therese McMillan’s memo. He received a Letter of No Prejudice and wanted clarity whether additional information is necessary for funds to be reimbursed in the future. Ms. Honish noted that there is now an MSP email box where questions may be submitted (MMGuidelines@metro.net). In response to Mr. Dipple’s question, she explained the finalized guidelines would be published soon and will contain information relevant to the related procedure.

Ms. Estolano, referring to the second paragraph of page 3 starting with “compensating,” stated COGs do not yet know what projects will be planned using funds. Ms. Honish clarified that if cash flow is available within 5 years, projects may commence. Mr. Christoffels followed-up with a clarifying question and Ms. Honish answered accordingly.

Mr. Dipple referred to page 2 of the memo, noting that language is unclear on whether or not an additional analysis is necessary if already included in original matrices. Both Ms. Honish and Ms. Wiggins answered no. Mr. Lantz then asked if an analysis on removing a project was required. Similarly, Ms. Wiggins answered no.

Ms. Lindblad asked about the addition of an appendix for documents but Ms. Meaney said it could be put in the Appendix as is. There was opposition to that and the MSP will stay the same. Overall, structure is still the same but there is more clarity and there is an appendix that includes forms that guides viewers through each step.
Ms. Bacharach said that there are clarity issues in how to secure the funding. She requested a draft funding agreement from Metro staff as soon as possible. She also asked whether each MSP has a separate funding agreement. Ms. Honish replied yes, and Ms. Bacharach noted that one of them, Subregional Equity does not have available cash flow. Ms. Honish noted that they would have to wait to do a funding agreement for that MSP, but not for any of the other 3. Ms. Bacharach asked who qualifies as a project sponsor and Ms. Honish responded a project sponsor can be determined, but that COGs should involve Metro early and often. Steve Lantz asked for difference between project sponsor and lead agency. Ms. Honish said she would look into it. Ms. Bacharach asked for recourse if Metro does not meet deadlines specified in guidelines. Ms. Honish said there would be recourse. Mr. Lantz pointed out vagueness in lapsing policy regarding administrative agreements. For instance, all agreement state they will lapse in three years. The uncertainty of the language, however, will be cleared by Ms. Honish – she believes the agreements states lapsing years plus 3.

Mr. Christoffels asked that Metro provide response to submitted PAC comments. He said there are questions that would presuppose CEQA, which is illegal. Ms. Honish said that the final version of the memo will include language that states “subject to availability.”

New Draft Admin Procedures (June 2018 Completion)

PAC will next be reviewing 2% Transit System Connectivity, Street Car/Circulator and Active Transportation ATP.

Jacob Lieb introduced and presented 2% ATP, the first active transportation program at Metro that exists with other funding opportunities. Some of the programs under ATP are already identified; however, there is still potential for additional and future priorities that will be established on a rolling 5-year basis. The local return is the most flexible funding source with two other funding sources including first-last mile. The state ATP program will be augmented annually.

Ms. Meaney laid out next steps and asked when cash flow would be available and Ms. Honish said June. Ms. Lantz asked whether there is order to priorities as listed on the documents provided and Mr. Lieb answered no. The Board would determine priorities for the first time this year and then every 5 years.

LRTP Policy Paper Outlines Introductions

Mark Yamarone introduced the next 4 policy paper outlines which include:

- Public Private Partnership
- Goods Movement
- TDM/Shared Mobility
- Transit Oriented Communities
PAC proceeded to breakout into smaller groups that allowed each group to provide insight as needed. Mr. Yamarone provided an introduction to the policy papers that included questions for each:

- **Public Private Partnership**
  - How should Metro prioritize projects for P3 developments?
  - What risk/cost is Metro willing to accept?
  - What role does equity play for Metro’s approach to a P3?

- **Goods Movement**
  - What are the appropriate policy directions for LA County’s goods movement system?

- **TDM/Shared Mobility**
  - How can Metro support TDM efforts throughout the County?

- **Transit Oriented Communities**
  - What TOC activities can be considered a “Transportation Purpose?”

Jenna Hornstock presented on TOC. There will be a new TOC policy decided on by the Metro Board and a policy paper that seeks to alter the current approaches to TOC. She also presented documents that will define and seek Board approval regarding:

- Metro’s TOC goals and objectives
- What is considered a “Transportation Purpose” (required for spending Measure M fund)

For TOC Policy, staff will form a PAC working group with target representation from each constituent group with bi-monthly meetings between January and May 2018. Metro staff would prepare materials and agendas. A draft of the policy will be presented to the Board in April; a final recommendation will be made to the Board in June 2018.

Drafts for the policy paper will begin in the spring with the onboarding consultants and a completed draft will be available in the fall. Questions for Paper will include definitions of TOC, goals, objectives of Metro’s approach to helping these processes, and what TOC activities considered transportation purpose.

Ms. Dodds asked what the difference between the policy and policy paper is. Ms. Hornstock and Wiggins followed up, stating the policy informs the paper. Ms. Dodds then asked how Policy will interact with the LRTP policy paper. Ms. Hornstock replied that the paper will draw from the policy and Ms. Honish confirmed.

**Public Comment Period**

Asiyahola Sankara from ACT LA discussed that higher income households are replacing lower income households and impacts of transit use. Mr. Sankara stated the policy and policy paper could be the catalyst that impacts the lives of communities of color. He also noted that small businesses are especially vulnerable to displacement from transit improvement projects.

Fanny Ortiz, ELACC representative as part of ACT LA, also discussed the implications transit corridors have on displacement. She noted she was displaced because of transit and urged the PAC to see TOC’s
as vital for communities of color. Ms. Sotelo thanked everyone for their time and public session concluded.

**Breakout Session Report-Backs**

Ms. Honish presented the P3 break out session.

Mr. Yamarone presented the Goods Movement breakout session. There was emphasis on land use side related to adjacent housing and Metro’s role commenting on state rail plan. Mr. Yamarone shared the use of corridor planning is also critically important to communities and environmental justice. He then shared that the group discussed the intersection between goods movement and complete streets, such as the local delivery issues that are increasingly facing difficulties and the need for parking and biking facilities. He then shared that his group discussed the role of truck-only lanes.

Dolores presented TDM and focused on the trip not taken and telecommuting. For example, flexible work hours are impacting transit. She also discussed the shared vehicle implications and that employer pass programs should look at neighborhoods rather than just employers. She then discussed the need to differentiate between carpooling and ride-hailing and that incentive programs need to be stronger to coerce ridesharing and parking benefits. Finally, Dolores shared about the connectivity between major hubs, education and placeholders, and how we must look at working spaces like We Work that help with telecommuting.

Ms. Hornstock presented on TOC. They had a robust conversation and highlighted what is accessible for whom, the affordability of types of households that need be considered, and how does TOC tie in with equity. Ms. Hornstock also shared how do TOC tie with equity and the roles that Metro can take to incentivize other municipalities to achieve goals, such as parking. TOC also discussed the connection between local use regulations and displacement and that Metro needs to look at small businesses and not just businesses when thinking about TOC. There will be a follow-up conversation regarding TOC in the upcoming weeks. The first meeting is scheduled on Monday, January 22nd.

Ms. Honish made a comment regarding the new program Low Income Fare is Easy. The program was made possible by the support of the Board.

Michael Cano informed PAC of SB-1 workshop, where they discuss the new programs funded by the California legislature bill passed in April. The workshop will focus on the strategies provided by the funding bill.

Finally, everyone was thanked for their time and the meeting adjourned at 3:33.
PAC Conference Call – Sustainability
December 18, 2017

- Examine overlap between Green Infrastructure
- What are national trends in sustainability
- Incorporating sustainable station design standards and first-last mile policies
- How are federal, state, and local level mandates affecting Metro
- How can sustainable investments result in job & housing growth
- What are the point sources of emissions for sustainability efforts, such as zero-emission buses
- What is Metro's role in state, federal, and local mandates regarding sustainability
- Overlaps with Green Infrastructure policy paper
- Making complete streets, first-last mile, and station design more sustainable
- Addressing job growth and housing as a result of sustainable practices
- Better analysis of zero-emission vehicles and quantifying point source emissions
PAC Conference Call – Innovations, Trends & Disruptors
December 18, 2017

- Real-time arrival data for bus & rail
- Fare payment innovation
- Innovative strategies to better serve and empower underserved communities, such as minorities, seniors, and disabled
- Maintaining Metro’s labor standards when participating in PPPs
- Autonomous Vehicles (including buses & trucks) connectivity with infrastructure
- How will AVs be coordinated at the federal, state, and local level
- How can disruptors, such as CicLAvia or Uber, impact the transit culture
- TDM strategies
  - Emphasis on first-last mile connectivity
  - Would like paper on TDMs specifically
  - TDM becoming relevant again
- Addition of Metro’s Visionary Project Seed Fund
- How innovations can serve seniors and disabled with respect to transit
  - How Lyft, etc. react to ADA and elderly
- Innovations as part of existing transit infrastructure
  - Real time trip data
  - dedicated bus lanes
  - Back door loading
- Innovations in pricing and fare payment
  - Emphasis on group passes; POS updates; landlord subsidies
  - To be neutral to mode and vehicle ownership
- Focus on “connected corridors” and signal synch
- Discussion of EV storage and charging
- How to maintain Metro’s employee labor standards when compared to private entities in P3 context
- Trends re Complete Streets and street capacities/usage
- How technologies might affect lower income groups
- Events like CicLAvia as disruptor in terms of perception of streets, etc.
PAC Conference Call – Active Transportation
January 16, 2018

- More emphasis on regional Active Transportation planning instead of only local projects
  - What type of ATP data is available for the different transit modes?
  - How is that data available to the public?
  - How can the public access the data?
  - How is the data broken down into different transit modes?
- Big data analysis to support ATP
- Planning for innovations in ATP along a 40 year horizon
- Planning for the future of multimodal transportation and the compatibility/issues with existing modes (i.e., bike-car relationship)
- What is the current ATP funding and how will the funding change?
- How can Metro focus more on safety in ATP?
- How does ATP relate to Sustainability, Complete Streets, Countywide BRT Program, TOC, etc.
  - Need to incorporate “Vision Zero”
- How is “Safe Routes to School” being incorporated into LRTP? Propose looking into surveys on travel data
PAC Conference Call – Highways
January 16, 2018

- SB1 - Behavior/expectations for Gas Tax, how costs can affect Silver Line, freeways, transit ridership, and travel behaviors.
- Goods Movement – highway roads network
- Transit lines that actually use the freeways
- Preventive traffic safety, collision, congestion, reduce fatalities
- Express Lanes:
  - Low income assistance for Express Lanes and uses of excess toll revenue (grant programs)
  - Lessons learned from program evaluation
  - Negative impacts from Express Lanes
- Background on why LOS is falling out and VMT being used
  - Valuating congestion, pros and cons of each performance measure
- AV – 10 years into the future. Safety and impact, errors, reduction of injuries
  - Multiple occupancy and electric
  - Pollution metrics
  - How it will change parking needs, curb space
  - Regulations, working with local agencies
PAC Conference Call – Public Private Partnership
January 23, 2018

- Identify regulatory and financial legal barriers for P3s in Los Angeles County
- Institutional capacity and opportunities for P3s
  - Can Metro be trusted to institutionalize P3s
  - Look into institutional gap
- Does Metro have legislative authority to replicate Canada’s P3 model?
- What methodology, by mode (i.e., highway, transit), have?
- What are some of the lessons learned in North America?
  - Specific to Denver? What has been documented from their P3s?
- Look into institutionalizing methods and how we can modify it to suit Metro’s needs.
- What is Metro OEI adopting in terms of best practices?
- What are the implications of all these questions on the LRTP?
- What is the role in the future of private sector financing vs public?
- What is the role of pension funds to fund P3s? Canada has used pension funds for long term investments at 5-6% interest. (Ontario teachers’ pensions largest in Canada.)
PAC Conference Call – Transportation Demand Management
January 23, 2018

- How does the Metro Board TDM motion fold into LRTP?
- How are we incorporating transit passes?
  - Focused on universities and students
  - Annual employer pass program, targeting companies with 20+ employees
  - Who's not being covered currently?
- Metro should be supporting existing and forming new TMOs and TMAs
  - Best practices in TDM
  - Identify how the various existing and past TMO/TMAs are different in their mission and operations
PAC Conference Call – Goods Movement
January 24, 2018

- Metro's request to the call participants on “what are the framing questions that the LRTP can address?”
- What types of funding are being committed to Goods Movement projects and who pays for these projects?
- How are goods movement taxes and fees being collected?
- Need for public education to bring awareness on that all highway projects have goods movement elements and benefits, and “goods movement” is not simply a private industry (logistics industry) practice as they rely on publicly managed infrastructure to operate
- Project prioritizing based on performance measures, i.e. 710 v ExpressLanes
- Logistics sector – what projects are needed and who benefits from investments in goods movement system?
  - Collaboration between agencies
  - Scale of delivery side
  - How will policy setting impact individual, not just goods movement arena?
  - What is the community impact? And how will other modes affect goods movement?
  - Street designs
- How will goods movement impact pedestrians and neighborhoods?
- Who are the system users? i.e., expand a discussion on vehicle types used for deliveries and what delivery purposes they serve
- Overall structure of the goods movement paper
  - High level policy setting
    - Project selection criteria/Project delivery
      - Benefits and impacts to logistics industry, communities and individuals