

# GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## Transportation Committee

### AGENDA

*Wednesday, August 2, 2017*

**5:00 P. M. Meeting**

**Gateway Cities Council of Governments**  
**16401 Paramount Boulevard, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Conference Room**  
**Paramount, California**

**STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 16401 PARAMOUNT BOULEVARD, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.**

**FOR YOUR INFORMATION:** The Transportation Committee will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The Transportation Committee cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the Transportation Committee, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee at the following times:

- A. **AGENDA ITEM:** at this time the Transportation Committee considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and
- B. **NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the Transportation Committee agenda; and
- C. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:** at the time for public hearings.

**Please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the Chair.**

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**
- II. **ROLL CALL – BY SELF INTRODUCTIONS**

**III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).

**V. PUBLIC COMMENTS** - Three minutes for each speaker.

**VI. MATTERS FROM STAFF**

**VII. CONSENT CALENDAR:** All items under the Consent Calendar may be enacted by one motion. Any item may be removed from the Consent Calendar and acted upon separately by the Transportation Committee.

- A. Approval of Minutes – Minutes of the Transportation Committee Meeting of May 3, 2017, are presented for approval.

**CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:**

**A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.**

**VIII. REPORTS**

- A. MTA Board Report – March Metro Board Meeting and Other Topics of Interest- Oral Report by Director Robert Garcia

**SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF**

- B. SB-1 Allocation to Cities – Presentation by Karen Heit, Gateway Cities COG Transportation Analyst

**SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF**

- C. Metro Bike Share Program – Presentation by Lia Yim, Transportation Planning Manager, Metro Bike Share

**SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF**

- D. Long Beach Bike Share Program – Presentation by Tony Cruz, Community Programs Specialist, City of Long Beach

**SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF**

**IX. REPORTS – COMMITTEES/AGENCIES**

- A. Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) Update by Yvette Kirrin, Gateway Cities COG Transportation Engineer – Oral Report

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT,  
POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

**X. MATTERS FROM TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**XI. ADJOURNMENT**

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 5:30 p.m. unless the Transportation Committee votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular Transportation Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, September 6, 2017, 5:00 P.M.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

**VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**  
**Item A**  
**Approval of Minutes**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

Gateway Cities COG Office, 16401 Paramount Blvd., Paramount, CA 90723  
May 3, 2017

The Meeting was called to order 5:02 pm, roll call taken by self-introduction:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

- Al Austin – COG President
- Mayor Robert Garcia – MTA Director
- Doug Drummond – Port of Long Beach
- Mike Egan – Chair, City Managers Steering Committee
- Christian Hernandez – Board of Directors
- Debra Johnson – Long Beach Transit
- Mohammad Mostahkami – Public Works Officer
- Bill Pagett – Public Works Officer
- Jose Pulido – City Managers Steering Committee
- Diana Tang – City of Long Beach

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

- Kekoa Anderson – Gateway Cities COG
- Julia Brown – MTA
- Fernando Dutra – COG 2<sup>nd</sup> Vice President
- Greg Farr, Caltrans
- David Frownfetter – State Senator Ricardo Lara
- Karen Heit – Gateway Cities COG
- Kalieh Honish – MTA
- Yvette Kirrin – I-5 JPA
- Luke H. Klipp – MTA Board Deputy
- Michael Kodama – Executive Director of Eco-Rapid Transit
- Juanita Martinez – NCE Engineering & Environmental Services
- Tim Patton – Acting Deputy to Long Beach Mayor Robert Garcia
- Nancy Pfeffer – Gateway Cities COG
- Wally Shidler – Metro Service Council
- Bonnie Temple – Kittelson
- Sharon Weissman – MTA Board Deputy

The Consent Calendar was approved without objection (Pulido moved/Drummond seconded).

Mayor Garcia began by reporting that he had a chance to tour the I-5 freeway with Mike Egan and with Metro staff, and he also received a briefing from the I-5 Joint Powers

Authority. Additionally, he talked about general issues related to the Metro Green Line.

Mayor Garcia reported on several items from the April 27 Metro Board Meeting. Regarding the Eco-Rapid Transit Corridor, he noted that the Metro Board voted on the four preferred staff options, selected from an initial list of six options. He stated that the four preferred staff options are all similar in the Southern portion of the line up to about Huntington Park. He distributed a Metro presentation on the four options, showing the difference in the routes between Huntington Park and downtown Los Angeles. He stated that an essential discussion item for the four alternatives is whether or not the Eco-Rapid Transit line connects with the Metro Blue Line, or if it takes a more easterly north-south route that does not connect with the Metro Blue Line. He stated that Metro staff will present at a Gateway Cities COG meeting so that cities can give their feedback on their preferences.

Mayor Garcia noted that the first new train on the Metro Blue Line began revenue operations on Monday, May 1. He stated that Metro will be replacing all of the original rail vehicles over the next couple years. He mentioned that the City of Long Beach is working on the light synchronization on the Metro Blue Line along Long Beach Boulevard. He also stated that Metro has a goal to cut ten minutes off of the full travel time between downtown Long Beach and downtown Los Angeles.

Finally, Mayor Garcia mentioned the Metro Board's approval of a motion by Supervisor Solis to extract the bike corridor portion of Motion 22.1 from the rest of that motion, as it pertains to the I-710 project, in order to allow for construction to proceed on the bike corridor in advance of the remainder of the project.

The report was received-and-filed without objection (Drummond moved/Pulido seconded).

Mayor Garcia introduced Kalieh Honish from Metro to present on the draft Measure M guidelines.

#### Reports – Committees/Agencies

Kalieh Honisch from Metro presented on the Measure M guidelines. [Handout distributed to committee members]

Honisch reported that:

- Measure M is more comprehensive and complex than Measure R and does not have a sunset.
- Measure M has increased oversight and evaluation mechanisms.
- Proposed Draft Guidelines seek to: reinforce fiduciary responsibility; provide guidance framework for all aspects of Measure M; and use lessons learned from Measure R
- No project will be negatively impacted by the advancement of any other project.

- Metro wants to see project readiness before funds can be locked down for that phase of a project.
- Regarding the Multi-year subregional programs, these (1) were developed from the mobility matrices; (2) meet the guideline definitions; (3) remain within expenditure plan program funding, with flexibility being built in for Subregions to borrow from their own multi-year program funding); and, (4) must meet “timely use of funds” requirements.
- Additional guidelines will be developed for 2% ATP, 2% Highway, and 2% Transit (system connectivity). A small amount in each of these funding streams is already earmarked for certain projects.
- About half of Measure M funds will go to LA county transit operators, cities, ACCESS Services, and Metro to address mobility in Los Angeles
- May 26 is the deadline to submit public comments on the draft Measure M guidelines.

The committee members asked questions of Kaylieh Honish.

Fernando Dutra asked what is meant by “project readiness”. Honish responded that a precise “project readiness” definition is still under development. Technical criteria for this will require further time, and Metro will take another year to fine-tune these criteria.

Mike Egan asked about the \$100K minimum local return issue, clarifying that the intent has been to create a minimum using another pot of funds that would not take from other cities. He expressed concern over how this gets structured. Mayor Garcia responded to Egan that no decision has been made regarding a minimum for local return. The Mayor is trying to figure out a mechanism for smaller cities to get supplemented without taking funds from other cities.

Mike Egan stated that there is very strong concern in Norwalk regarding the 3% local share requirement. The Green Line extension’s benefit to the City of Norwalk would be negligible, since the connection to Norwalk Metrolink/Amtrak station is the big rationale. Egan also asked about the lapsing policy, which Honish stated is 3 years plus 1 (or 4 years total).

Egan asked any considerations by Metro for jurisdictions seeking approval for a larger project than might be funded exclusively by Measure M funds. Honish urged the COG to provide these concerns/comments officially to Metro. Mayor Garcia noted that if there’s a project that requires multi-year of funds, there should not be an issue with that. Honish clarified that, for specific situations, Metro is willing to work with cities to make sure that more accessible colors of money are available to them and to ensure that requirements for certain colors of money don’t hinder projects. Honish also noted that SB1 will provide additional resources in the future.

Mohammad Mostahkami asked about guidelines still needing to be developed in the next year. Honish stated that right now Metro just has an index of locations in the guidelines that will require further time for development in the next year. In the case of countywide BRT, there's a note in the guidelines about development of an updated strategic countywide plan, which will include technical requirements for a technical BRT process including performance metrics for determining various phases for BRT "pots" of development.

Mostahkami asked about the 3% local share requirement and whether cities' work on first/last-mile is eligible. Honish responded that the criteria for this are still under development and invited further comment to be submitted by the COG on this point. Honish did clarify, however, that first/last-mile betterments have to be within the project development scope; anything added that was not previously considered would be considered a "betterment." Anything that's part of the project development scope that is paid by a city would be included in the 3% local share requirement.

Mostahkami asked about the 2% ADA/Paratransit/Seniors discount item and whether any transit provider that offers ADA paratransit services on behalf of LA County transit operators is eligible to receive these funds. Honish did not recall exactly, but stated that the draft guidelines use recurring language that can be found in the FAP distribution.

Mayor Garcia requested that these and other suggestions by committee members be sent to the COG chair.

Motion to Receive-and-File (Dutra/Pulido 2nd): Approved without objection at 5:37PM

Karen Heit reported on the Multi-Year Subregional Equity Funds. Heit stated that these funds are not included in the Measure M expenditure plan, but are in the multi-year programs. There are no funds allocated to these funds. She recommended including this in the COG's comments to Metro, requesting that the all COGs be afforded the same courtesy that the San Fernando Valley was provided (within the next year). Heit stated that Metro is suggesting five-year allocations. The Gateway COG is supposed to receive \$244,000,000 in these funds over 40 years.

Motion to approve report (Egan/Dutra 2nd): Approved without objection at 5:41.

Motion to table report on Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) Update (Dutra/Sulido 2nd): Without objection at 5:42PM.

Meeting adjourned at 5:43PM.

**VIII. REPORTS  
ITEM B**

**SB-1 Allocation to Cities –  
Presentation by Karen Heit, Gateway  
Cities COG Transportation Analyst**

**TO:** Transportation Committee  
**FROM:** Jack Joseph, Deputy Executive Director  
**BY:** Karen Heit, Transportation Analyst  
**SUBJECT:** SB-1 Allocation to Cities

Earlier this year the California State Legislature passed and Governor Brown signed into law the *"Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017"*, SB 1 (Beall). This \$52.0 billion (over ten years) state transportation investment program includes a number of funding categories, e.g., transit capital, active transportation, freight corridors, local planning.

One of the most significant investment programs of importance to local jurisdictions is the *"Local Streets and Road Program."* According to the State Department of Finance Los Angeles County cities will receive over \$240.0 million (annually) to address the deteriorating condition of our Local Street and arterial network.

New estimated allocations for each city are located on the attached table. These allocations are estimates and are subject to change. The estimates for FY2017-18 are for a partial year of funding from these new sources. The first full year of funding will be FY2018-19.

Additionally, each city is required to prepare a "completed project report" containing the following:

- 1) project completion date;
- 2) amount of funds expended on the project; and
- 3) estimated useful life of the improvement.

The timeframe for allocation of these funds is tight as indicated below - Project lists are due to the CTC by September 15, 2017.

<b>Key decision dates:</b>	
Public Review of Guidelines	June 30-July 10, 2017
CTC Adoption of Guidelines	August 16-17, 2017
Call for Projects	August 18, 2017
<b>Project Lists due to CTC</b>	<b>September 15, 2017</b>
CTC Adopts List of Eligible Cities	October 18-19, 2017
CTC Submits List of Projects to State Controller	November 1, 2017

A city must provide with a project list a public record that projects proposed for RMRA funding through the Local Streets and Roads Program have been included in an adopted city or county operating budget. Examples of an acceptable public record include:

- a.) An excerpt from the city/county's regular operating or capital improvement budget including the relevant list of projects and an adopting resolution;
- b.) An excerpt from the city/county's regular operating or capital improvement budget including the relevant list of projects and meeting minutes documenting approval at a regular public meeting.
- c.) An excerpt from the city/county's amended operating or capital improvement budget including the relevant list of projects, or the staff report specifying the projects to be included, as well as an adopting resolution or meeting minutes documenting approval at a regular public meeting. Submittal of electronic copies of the relevant excerpts from an operating budget (or amendment) and support documentation (i.e. resolution or minutes) is encouraged.

The use of Roadway Maintenance Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) local streets and roads allocations must be used for projects "that include, but are not limited to," the following

- Road maintenance and rehabilitation
- Safety projects
- Railroad grade separations
- Traffic control devices
- Complete street components, "including active transportation purposes, pedestrian and bicycle safety projects, transit facilities, and drainage and storm-water capture projects in conjunction with any other allowable project."

RMRA funds may also be used to satisfy a match requirement in order to obtain state or federal funds for eligible projects.

SB1 also contains non-obligatory intent language regarding the use of funds. "To the extent possible and cost effective," cities and counties are to use a use: advanced recycling techniques that reduce greenhouse gas emissions;

These elements are:

- Technologies and material recycling techniques that lower greenhouse gas emissions and reduce the cost of maintaining local streets and roads through material choice and construction method.
- Systems and components in transportation infrastructure that recognize and accommodate technologies including but not limited to ZEV fueling or charging and infrastructure-vehicles communications for transitional or fully autonomous vehicles.

- Project features to better adapt the transportation asset to withstand the negative effects of climate change and promote resiliency to impacts such as fires, floods, and sea level rise (where appropriate given a project's scope and risk level for asset damage due to climate change).
- Complete Streets Elements (such as project features that improve the quality of bicycle and pedestrian facilities and that improve safety for all users of transportation facilities) are expected to be incorporated into RMRA funded projects to the extent (as deemed by cities and counties) beneficial, cost-effective, and practicable in the context of facility type, right-of-way, project scope, and quality of nearby facilities.

**Recommended Action**

Receive and file this report

## Local Streets and Roads - Projected FY2017-18 Revenues

*Based on State Dept. of Finance statewide revenue projections as of May 2017*  
**These allocation amounts are estimates subject to change**

City	Loan Repayment (1)	Road Maintenance Rehab. Account (2)
Artesia	19,317	95,391
Avalon	4,266	21,064
Bell	42,010	207,449
Bellflower	87,657	432,854
Bell Gardens	49,145	242,683
Cerritos	56,537	279,182
Commerce	15,020	74,169
Compton	115,822	571,936
Cudahy	28,149	139,004
Downey	130,645	645,133
Hawaiian Gardens	17,078	84,333
Huntington Park	68,329	337,412
Industry	516	2,548
Lakewood	91,590	452,279
La Mirada	56,797	280,465
Long Beach	554,885	2,740,058
Lynwood	82,960	409,660
Maywood	32,288	159,440
Montebello	73,141	361,177
Norwalk	120,474	594,910
Paramount	64,532	318,665
Pico Rivera	73,539	363,143
Santa Fe Springs	21,121	104,295
Signal Hill	13,356	65,954
South Gate	113,936	562,625
Vernon	240	1,187
Whittier	101,079	499,135

- (1) Pursuant to the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, the state general fund will repay loans from transportation funds totaling \$706 million over three years and in monthly installments beginning FY2017-18. Local streets and roads will be paid \$225 million: \$75 million in each year, half to cities, half to counties. See Gov. Code Sec 16321.

Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA - Streets and Highways Code Sec 2030 et sec.) includes funds from the following taxes enacted by the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017: the 12-cent gasoline excise tax, 20 cent diesel fuel excise tax, transportation improvement fees and transportation loan repayments. FY2017-18 is a partial year of funding from these new sources. The first full year of funding will be FY2018-19.