



West Santa Ana Branch City Manager Technical Advisory Committee

Tuesday, February 9, 2021, 2:00 PM – 3:30 PM

TELECONFERENCE MEETING VIA ZOOM

Register in advance for this webinar:

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_2ZEI_pwHQsCXTSJit8N3Nw

Phone: 669.900.6833 Meeting ID: 836 4568 0833

AGENDA

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Welcome | John Moreno, Chair |
| 2. Approval of Minutes | |
| 30 min. 3. Overview of SCAG Value Capture Study Findings | Kimberly Clark, SCAG
Joseph Dieguez, Kosmont
Companies |
| 30 min. 4. Overview of Metro Cost Estimating Methodology
A. FTA Standard Cost Categories (SCC) Format
B. FTA Capital Cost Categories | Meghna Khanna, Senior
Director, Mobility Corridors,
Countywide Planning
June Susilo, DEO,
Program Management |
| 10 min. 5. Update on Status of Master Cooperative Agreements | Meghna Khanna |
| 6. Other CM TAC Items and Discussion | |
| 7. Next CM TAC Meeting – Tuesday, March 9, 2021 Via Zoom
Agenda Items: Update Project Cost Estimate and Update
on Federal Advocacy Efforts | |
| 8. Adjournment | |

2. Approval of Minutes

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

West Santa Ana Branch City Manager Technical Advisory Committee

January 12, 2021

Teleconference Meeting Via ZOOM

PRESENT: Chair, John Moreno, City of Paramount
Len Gorecki, City of Bellflower
Art Gallucci, City of Cerritos
Raul Alvarez, City of Huntington Park
Elaine Kunitake, Los Angeles County
Jennifer Vasquez, City of Maywood
Chris Jeffers, City of South Gate

ABSENT: Vice Chair, Gilbert Livas, City of Downey
William Rawlings, City of Artesia
Paul Phillips, City of Bell
Michael O’Kelly, City of Bell Gardens
Sal Lopez, City of Cudahy
Carlos Fandino, City of Vernon

ALSO PRESENT: **Electeds:** None.
County/Cities: Karen Lee, *City of Artesia*; Torrey Contreras, Kristin Aguila, *City of Cerritos*; Vaniah De Rojas, Aldo Schindler, *City of Downey*; Sergio Infanzon, *City of Huntington Park*; and Rafael Casillas, *City of Paramount*.
Metro: Meghna Khanna, June Susilo, Rick Meade, Raffi Hamparian, Michael Turner, Colin Peppard and Craig Hoshijima, *Metro Staff*.
Eco-Rapid Transit: Michael Kodama, Allyn Rifkin.
Gateway Cities COG: Nancy Michali, *WSAB City Manager TAC staff*; Karen Heit, Joel Arevalos and Sandra Mora, *GCCOG staff*.
Other: Norman Emerson, *Emerson & Associates*; Jason Law, *Baker McKenzie*; and Joe Linton, *Streets Blog*.
Five unknown numbers: please sign in.

Chairperson John Moreno called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm. He welcomed everyone to the meeting and said let’s get started. Mr. Moreno asked for approval of the minutes for the November 10, 2020 WSAB City Manager TAC meeting. Sergio Infanzon, City of Huntington Park moved to approve, and Len Gorecki, City of Bellflower, seconded the motion. There were no objections or revisions to the minutes from CM TAC members, and the November CM TAC minutes were approved.

Item 3. Update on WSAB Project

Chairperson Moreno introduced Meghna Khanna, Metro WSAB Project Manager, who will provide a briefing on the status of the WSAB Project, including the environmental document and enabling works efforts. He stated that it is imperative that the CM TAC cities demonstrate their support for the WSAB

Project by **completing the Master Cooperative Agreement approval process by September** (Locally Preferred Alternative selection) at the latest. Mr. Moreno then turned the meeting over to Meghna Khanna to lay out the key upcoming project tasks that will be completed during 2021, and to highlight the WSAB Corridor cities' role in each task.

Ms. Khanna thanked Chair Moreno and said that she would be joined in the presentation by other Metro project team members, including June Susilo, WSAB Project Program Management lead, along with Colin Peppard, Senior Director, OEI speaking to the P3 process, and Craig Hoshijima, Grants Management and Funds Administration, addressing the Project Funding Plan. Ms. Khanna stated that Metro staff would be sharing an update on the status of the WSAB Project using materials prepared for a Project Delivery Strategy report to be presented to the Metro Board's Planning and Programming Committee on January 20, 2021.

She initiated the presentation with a slide presenting all of the **project elements included in the WSAB Project's comprehensive, interdependent strategy**, which is focused on successfully completing the environmental clearance process, expediting project design and incorporating P3 activities. Project elements to be discussed today include: Metro Teams/Roles & Responsibilities, Overall Project Schedule, Environmental Clearance, Third-Party Engagement, Design Efforts, Enabling Works Sequence, P3 Timing, and the Project Funding Plan.

Ms. Khanna then provided a chart of the **Metro Teams/Roles & Responsibilities** with the Metro Board of Directors at the top making project approval decisions based on guidance provided by Phil Washington, Metro CEO, and an Executive P3 Working Group that meets once a month. This Working Group includes cross-departmental leaders from Planning, Program Management, Office of Extraordinary Innovation, (OEI), Vendor/Contract Management, Operations and County Counsel. The WSAB Project is led by Planning Project Manager and Board point-of-contact Ms. Khanna, with June Susilo serving as the P3 Project Manager and Board point-of-contact. They work closely together, and are supported by Planning and P3 Project Directors, Planning Leads/Departmental Liaisons to provide inputs required for the environmental process, and a Core P3 Project Team to provide program management and construction support. The Core P3 Project Team meets weekly.

The WSAB Project faces numerous environmental deadlines, and technical design and coordination challenges. The Project Team has met the environmental deadlines set with the Federal Transit Administration, and has identified techniques to expedite delivery of the WSAB Project even during the challenges posed by COVID-19. The WSAB Project also involves the participation of many third parties, including the Corridor cities, all partnering to successfully deliver the future rail project.

The **WSAB Project Schedule** illustrated the coordination of the many project efforts, including four major interdependent work efforts. These efforts are carefully planned to overlap to accelerate project delivery to the extent possible while ensuring the integrity of the environmental efforts. The four major work efforts are: Environmental and Advanced Conceptual Engineering (ACE) to a 15% level of design, along with the First/ Last Mile (FLM) Plan efforts; Third Party Coordination; Enabling Works (utilities, freight relocation and grade crossings); and P3 Project Scope (LRT, stations and other system elements). Key WSAB milestones include the release of the draft EIR/S for public review and comment in June 2021, and the Metro Board Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) decision anticipated in September 2021. Once the LPA decision is made, Metro staff will start working with the WSAB Corridor cities to develop station

area FLM plans. These station area-specific planning efforts will be based on the previously completed Transit Oriented Development Strategic Implementation Plans (TODSIP) prepared by Metro with the Corridor cities.

Extensive **Third Party coordination** has been initiated by June Susilo in a parallel effort to the environmental clearance process. These efforts include coordination with other agencies/entities such as Caltrans, the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and others. The intent of these efforts is to ensure project readiness once the environmental review process is done. Ms. Susilo stated that because Metro is contemplating P3 project delivery for the LRT construction, project readiness must include a **strategy to minimize high risk/high consequence elements of the project as much as possible ahead of the P3 contract**. This includes implementing an enabling works package to address freight relocation, utilities and grade crossings prior to entering into a contract with the P3 developer. Metro is also concurrently developing and preparing the necessary supporting strategies and documents for P3 project delivery for the LRT system.

Ms. Khanna clarified that the environmental review documents have been prepared based on a 15% level of design, and the enabling works design will be advanced to 30% later this year and incorporated to support the Record of Decision (ROD) anticipated in mid-Q2 of 2022. It is also important to advance design documents to support third party coordination efforts. Chairperson Moreno asked when the 30% level of design will be completed. Ms. Khanna replied that in order to expedite project delivery the project scope has been split between: 1) enabling work with design works with design work completed in 2022; and 2) the P3 scope of work which will be completed once the P3 contractor is on board in 2024.

Environmental Document Status and Review

Ms. Khanna stated that staff is **developing and analyzing four build alternatives** through the environmental process to provide an informed basis for public review and comment, and Board consideration for the LPA decision. As identified by Board action in 2018, the four build alternatives are two downtown Los Angeles to Artesia options, and two shorter segments focusing on the Gateway Cities portion of the WSAB project corridor. The two longer segments that were studied are: 1) Union Station to Pioneer in the City of Artesia, and 2) 7th/Metro Center to Pioneer. The two shorter segments are: 3) Slauson (A/Blue Line) to Pioneer, and 4) C/Green Line to Pioneer.

The draft EIR/S document will be released in June for a **public circulation period** ending in August. The release date is later than planned due to 180 days of SHPO (State Historic Preservation Office) delay, C/Green Line Station design exploration considering the I-105 Historic District designation, and Slauson Station design exploration. Public notice of the draft document release will be posted in local publications and on-line, and through the Federal Register by the FTA. Public meetings and hearings will be scheduled throughout the WSAB Corridor during the review period. In September, the Metro Board will select the LPA based on a variety of factors including environmental benefits and impacts, public input and funding availability. During the summer of 2022, it is planned that the FTA will issue a Record of Decision (ROD) on the Final EIS, and the Final EIR will be certified by the Metro Board.

Ms. Khanna then walked through a **Comparison Summary of the Four Build Alternatives** presenting the following information:

- The four build alternatives range from 19.3 miles for the two downtown Los Angeles to Pioneer options to 5.6 miles for the shortest C/Green Line to Pioneer alternative.
- A comparison of the proposed alignment configurations – at-grade, aerial or underground – was provided. She noted that even with an emphasis on building a primarily at-grade rail configuration in the Slauson to Pioneer segment, some portion of all four alternatives has been designed in an aerial configuration to address operational and safety needs, especially at the intersections.
- The number of stations was provided per alternative ranging from four for the shortest alternative to 12 for the alternative connecting to Union Station. Ms. Khanna noted all of the alternatives include a new C/Green Line station in the center of the I-105 Freeway, which is especially challenging and requires close coordination with Caltrans; and the demolition and construction of three bridges crossing the I-105 necessitated coordination with and approval of Caltrans and SHPO.
- The number and type of street crossings were described for each alternative, whether at-grade or elevated. Ms. Khanna highlighted the significant number of freight, freeway and river (Los Angeles, San Gabriel and Rio Hondo rivers) crossings required by the WSAB Project.
- She highlighted the number of miles that the LRT system will share the right-of-way (ROW) with freight operations, and the miles of freight relocation required per alternative ranging from 8.1-miles for alternatives 1, 2 and 3 to 1.3-miles for short alternative 4.
- Five park & ride facilities are planned for alternatives 1, 2 and 3; the shorter alternative 4 will have four facilities.

Many of the planned rail system features will require close coordination with other agencies, and Ms. Khanna turned the discussion over to June Susilo.

Third-Party Engagement

Ms. Susilo said there were a **significant number of parties to coordinate rail design and construction efforts with!** A risk-based strategy was developed focusing on establishing early working relationships with the affected agencies/entities. Freight coordination was at the top of the list with 50% of the future rail project operating on shared freight ROW involving the **UPRR and Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach**. Metro staff established a preliminary agreement with UPRR to work together and reimburse the railroad for their efforts working on the WSAB Project. The intent of the coordination efforts is to minimize rail network and real estate impacts, and to prioritize safe shared corridor operations. A first meeting was held with UPRR, and currently railroad staff is reviewing project documents prior to setting up a second meeting.

Third party engagement included establishing a working relationship with the **Gateway Cities Council of Governments (COG) and the 10 impacted cities through the City Managers Technical Advisory Committee**. Master Cooperative Agreements (MCAs) will establish a work plan to reimburse the cities for review of design documents and provision of city support during construction.

Ms. Khanna said thank you to the City Manager TAC and individual cities for working with Metro on executing the MCAs. These agreements will allow Metro to start enabling works design review with the cities, and for cities to be reimbursed for their efforts on project design review and construction support. Ms. Susilo emphasized how critical completion of the MCA process was in order to allow Metro to come to the individual cities and delve into design details and the cities to be reimbursed. Ms. Khanna reiterated that it was important for the MCAs to be approved and executed by September.

Due to the project plans requiring six new six existing freeway crossings, Ms. Susilo and her team met with and established working agreements with **Caltrans** to allow for an iterative process for freeway crossing design and construction. The addition of an infill C/Green Line station in the center of the I-105 Freeway will require close design coordination and approval by Caltrans. This effort is further complicated with Metro's planned addition of Metro Express lanes on the I-105 Freeway. Ms. Khanna stated that, in support of the rail project's impacts on this and other freeways, Ms. Susilo was required by Caltrans to prepare and submit a separate environmental review document – a Project Study Report (PSR). This review process was started earlier than usual to expedite project delivery and resolve potential high risk issues.

Chairperson Moreno asked for questions and comments at this point in the presentation, and introduced the new city manager from the City of South Gate – Chris Jeffers – and offered his and other CM TSC members' help in supporting South Gate on moving ahead on completing the MCA process.

Allyn Rifkin, Eco-Rapid Transit representative, asked if there were any maintenance yard differences among the alternatives. Ms. Khanna replied that two maintenance and storage facilities are being cleared as part of the environmental clearance process. One site is located in the City of Paramount and the second location is within the City of Bellflower. The Metro Board will select the final maintenance and storage facility site as part of the LPA decision.

Ms. Khanna moved the third-party engagement presentation forward by discussing coordination with the **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)** due to three required river crossings – the Los Angeles River, the Rio Hondo and the San Gabriel River. She noted that the environmental document was required to address Federal Section 404 (Federal Clean Water Act related to waterways, rivers, etc.) and Section 408 (USACE review and approval process to modify, alter or occupy USACE-constructed public works). A working relationship has been established with the USACE.

In addition, Ms. Khanna stated that Ms. Susilo has established a working relationship and agreement with the **CPUC** to meet project delivery milestones. Ms. Susilo has started geotechnical underground utility investigations at the 31 planned at-grade crossings. The CPUC approval process typically is an 18-month application and design review, which can only begin after the completion of the environmental process clearance process. (Environmental clearance is a prerequisite to the CPUC approval process.) Ms. Susilo said that final at-grade crossing decisions will require consensus by the CPUC, UPRR and each city. She will work with the cities to complete the grade crossing details, which must be developed to the 60% level of design before submittal to the CPUC.

Utilities are a high risk item for the project. Ms. Susilo stated that the future rail alignment interfaces with 213 utility assets controlled by 64 owners. She has started field investigation and ground verification, which will verify if the utilities are in conflict with the project design and clarify different design requirements, which will be used to resolve any utility/project conflicts.

Design Efforts

Metro's design strategy is intended to **advance project engineering for each system component to the optimal threshold to minimize challenges and risk**, while ensuring the integrity of the environmental effort. In other words, strategies to advance design work are identified so as to not jeopardize the EIR/S

document and/or process. Project components/efforts have been identified as falling into either of two categories:

- **Higher risk** – long-lead efforts with significant coordination required with other agencies/entities. Enabling works design advanced to a 60-100% design level to minimize cost/schedule risks/uncertainties. Metro and its contractors are taking the lead on the higher risk items such as grade crossing, utility and freight relocation enabling works design and construction.
- **Lower risk** – design and construction of the LRT system (LRT system/guideway, stations, etc.) on environmentally-cleared ROW with high risk enabling works completed. Limit design efforts to a 15% level of design before selecting a P3 developer who will complete the design process.

Enabling Works Sequence

Ms. Susilo then addressed **completing the design and construction of high risk/high consequence and critical path project elements prior to construction of the LRT system to minimize risks to the overall project, contain costs and support accelerated project delivery**. The identified ten actions allow Metro and its consultants to advance the design, approval and construction of enabling works to set the foundation for the future P3 developer. Several of the activities are underway, such as advancing the design for freight relocation, grade crossings and utility relocations, and performing subsurface geotechnical borings and potholings. The identified work sequence does not preclude Metro from hiring a Construction Management/General Contractor for enabling works. Part of this work sequence includes Preparation of a Request for Qualifications/Request for Proposals for the project delivery method identified by the Metro Board. The final step in this work sequence is groundbreaking for the enabling works construction.

Chair Moreno asked for questions and comments from CM TAC members. Mr. Rifkin, Eco-Rapid Transit representative, asked about the status of the Los Angeles River Confluence Station study efforts. Ms. Khanna stated that the feasibility study for the confluence station is now underway again, and the findings are planned to be presented to the Metro Board at the same time as the final EIR/S. The confluence station study is being coordinated with all other projects underway in the area, including the Los Angeles River plans being developed by Frank Gehry and his team for the County of Los Angeles.

P3 Timing

Colin Peppard, Metro Senior Director, OEI, spoke to the **P3 challenges and evolving process**. The P3 development and implementation effort tracks the progress of the environmental clearance process and the enabling works development and procurement efforts. The process being developed is intended to maximize the benefits of P3 while minimizing the challenges, which include limited potential to bring in innovation to the project, and concerns that P3 may drive up the project cost if risks are not properly identified, mitigated and allocated for. Their efforts are focused on where P3 partners/process can bring value and add innovative ideas to WSAB Project delivery. Mr. Peppard and his team are pulling together procurement documents based in part on examples that have been used successfully on other P3 rail projects.

He shared the schedule of the **Metro P3 team's activities** through issuance of the P3 solicitation. Mr. Peppard emphasized that it is a "three-party dance" and that the moves have to be carefully coordinated to ensure success. (The three parties involved are the P3 effort, the Planning/EIS effort and the Project Management/engineering/Third party effort.) Several tasks have been completed, including

performing an updated risk analysis for the enabling work and Initial Operating Segment (IOS) LRT scope and a preliminary **Value for Money (VfM) analysis** for internal review. (Value for Money analysis compares the relative merits of P3 procurement against one or more other procurement routes, usually traditional public financing.) Current teamwork is focusing on developing a **WSAB Business Case evaluation** for internal Metro review, and then moving on to development of a **Funding and Affordability Assessment and Procurement Strategy** by September 2021, possibly providing support to the Board's LPA discussion. The team will then update the Value for Money Analysis based on the LPA and update P3 procurement documents and contract before the LPA decision, and update the VfM to allow for issuance of a P3 RFQ upon award of the enabling works contract.

Chairperson Moreno asked if there were any questions of Mr. Peppard, and hearing none moved on to the next agenda item.

Project Funding Plan

Craig Hoshijima, Strategic Financial Planning, addressed the **Project Funding Plan**. The Metro Board requested a funding strategy for the WSAB Project if the increased project scope and accelerated schedule required reconciliation of project funding needs with the Measure M Expenditure Plan, and the Metro financial forecast would validate financial feasibility. The revised Project Funding Plan effort will be based on the updated project cost available in March 2021, and will consider the following:

- Measure M identifies \$1 billion for a FY28 project, and \$3 billion for a FY41 project (2015 dollars).
- Evaluation of alternative funding to support the accelerated project schedule, including capital investment grants strategy, such as **Federal New Starts funding**.
- Assessment of the potential impact of P3 financing through the P3 team's **WSAB Business Case** and follow-on **Funding and Affordability Assessment and Procurement Strategy**. Pursuing a P3 strategy may impact the WSAB Project's financial structure, but would not increase the total project funding required.

Chairperson Moreno thanked the Metro team for a very thorough presentation and asked for questions. Hearing none, he commented that everyone possibly was overwhelmed by the information.

Len Gorecki, City of Bellflower, asked how the Local Contributions would be incorporated into the Project Funding Plan as the local contribution amounts will not be known until after the LPA decision. Ms. Khanna said that the Funding Plan would be updated as the final project cost and the amount of local contributions are identified. Mr. Gorecki asked how the cities can actively participate in the cost discussion. What about cities who cannot afford their local contribution? Ms. Khanna said that the 3% Local Contribution discussion will be brought back to the CM TAC and that Metro team members (Adam Stephenson and Shawn Atlow) would participate in that future discussions. This issue also can be discussed privately with each city.

Mr. Hoshijima clarified that the Project Funding Plan will be continually updated and refined with the updated project cost estimate in March, the Board's direction on the LPA and any new funding sources, including federal funding. The Measure M guidelines call for the 3% Local Contribution to be established at the 30% level of design.

Mr. Gorecki said he understood the process, but the range of anticipated local contribution amounts per city can be understood based on current project cost information. What about other Metro projects?

What happened when cities could not contribute the identified level of local contribution funding? Ms. Susilo said Metro staff would research and share information on other projects. Ms. Khanna said, to her understanding, no city has refused to contribute.

Mr. Hoshijima said that the 3% local contribution is detailed in the Measure M Ordinance approved in 2016, but prior to Measure M, local contributions were not specifically detailed. Under Measure R, there were discussions between Metro and the cities on the amount and timing of the local contributions.

Mr. Gorecki said he understood that there was no timeclock on city payments under Measure R, but that there is under Measure M. He is asking Metro for a change to the requirements. Ms. Khanna suggested a follow-up conversation in March-April to resolve, Metro will have an updated project cost at that time. Rick Meade, Metro P3 Project Director, said the CM TAC members raised good questions and they deserve good answers, and a meeting will be scheduled to address them.

Chairperson Moreno asked when will we know the different costs of each alternative? Ms. Khanna responded that the cost per alternative will be shared in March. He asked how the cities can provide input on the decision to encourage the selection of the least expensive downtown alternative? Ms. Khanna said cities can provide input on the LPA decision through the environmental public review and comment period leading up to the LPA decision by the Metro Board.

Karen Lee, City of Artesia, asked Metro staff to clarify that the enabling and project design work would be to the 30% level of design. Ms. Susilo responded that the level of design would be different for the enabling works and the LRT project design. Design work for the enabling works related to freight relocation, utilities and grade crossings may be advanced to a 60% level of design to resolve project issues and constraints only after the completion of environmental clearance. The enabling works design will be completed based on Board's LPA decision and coordination with the affected jurisdictions, agencies and entities. The LRT system design work will be completed by the P3 developer, who will not be on-board until 2024 at the earliest. The P3 developer could advance the 15% level of design to a 30% level of design during 2024-25.

Item 4. Update on Federal Advocacy Efforts

Chairperson Moreno moved the agenda on to a discussion of the **opportunities to coordinate and support federal advocacy efforts for the WSAB Project with Metro**. Vice Chair Gil Livas will lead the efforts for the CM TAC city managers.

Nancy Michali, CM TAC staff, spoke about the excellent initial meeting held with Metro Government Relations staff about funding advocacy efforts. Both Michael Turner and Raffi Hamparian have successfully delivered federal and state funding for Metro rail projects. They are interested in working with the CM TAC cities on coordinating federal and state advocacy efforts. It will help secure funding for the project to have to have the WSAB Corridor's cities actively involved in and supporting the project as elected officials like to fund projects that make multiple constituencies happy. At the CM TAC level, Mr. Livas is identifying lobbyists available from CM TAC cities to assist in advocacy efforts. A WSAB Project-specific conference call will be scheduled to plan next steps based on a timeline map from the Purple Line prepared by Mr. Hamparian as an example of how Metro prepares an advocacy approach and action plan.

Michael Turner, Deputy Executive Officer, Government Relations, said Metro and CM TAC staff had a good initial conversation on opportunities to coordinate with the WSAB CM TAC cities on providing federal and state advocacy for the WSAB Project. Metro has an excellent team that has provided successful leadership in securing state and federal funding for other Metro rail projects. He concentrates on state advocacy/funding efforts, while Raffi Hamparian leads federal efforts.

Raffi Hamparian, Senior Director for Federal Affairs, Government Relations, said thank you to Ms. Michali for organizing the call with Metro – federal advocacy is her natural habitat, and he looks forward to working with WSAB CM TAC city members and her. He has extensive federal advocacy/funding experience having successfully completed five full funding grant agreements (securing federal New Starts funding) for Metro rail projects, including recently for the Purple Line subway extension. The federal New Starts funding program is very competitive on a national level, and having unity and solidarity among WSAB Project stakeholders around a common goal and message will be the key to successfully securing federal funding. Mr. Hamparian provided an example of project not working due to lack of united stakeholder support. A rail project related to serving Duke University was down to the final yard line on securing a Full Funding Grant Agreement from the FTA when one stakeholder had second thoughts about moving forward on the project, and the project funding agreement, and ultimately implementation of the project, collapsed. (And the federal funding went to another project.)

In December 2020, the Metro Board gave Government Relations staff clear direction to advocate for and secure a robust level of funding for and from the New Starts Program for Metro projects. CEO Phil Washington has been lobbying in Washington, DC for increased federal transportation funding as part of the Congressional “Invest in America” federal funding discussions. Current Congressional funding discussions are seeking to triple future New Starts funding, which would increase available federal funding from \$2.1 billion in FY21 to \$3.5 billion in FY22, and up to \$5.5 billion annually in later years. The major step is to get the WSAB Project into the federal New Starts pipeline. Southern California Congressional leaders Lucille Roybal-Allard and Linda Sanchez are strong WSAB Project proponents.

He looks forward to developing a robust New Starts funding strategy for the WSAB Project. Completion of the draft environmental review work, and refining the project cost and funding plan will allow the project to be assessed for national competitiveness using the FTA’s New Starts Rating Analysis criteria. The project will need a high ranking to successfully compete for federal funding. He looks forward to negotiating a completed WSAB Full Funding Grant Agreement for the WSAB Project.

Chairperson Moreno asked for CM TAC member comments and questions on the planned federal advocacy efforts.

Michael Kodama, Executive Director, Eco-Rapid Transit, stated that Eco-Rapid Transit was fully supportive of the WSAB CM TAC’s efforts, and for the CM TAC to let him know what help was needed. He asked what is the best way for Eco-Rapid Transit to coordinate with the CM TAC on federal advocacy efforts? Chairperson Moreno said it was best to contact and work with Ms. Michali as she is the coordinator for all advocacy efforts and the clearinghouse for federal advocacy information.

Mr. Turner mentioned that, at the state level, the two policy committee chairs were from Los Angeles and were knowledgeable and supportive of the project. Ms. Khanna mentioned the upcoming WSAB Project update meeting to be held with CEO Phil Washington that is being organized by Eco-Rapid Transit. Chairperson Moreno clarified that the planned meeting was a joint effort between Eco-Rapid

Transit and the WSAB City Managers TAC and that councilmembers and city managers would be in attendance.

Vaniah Rojas, Assistant to City Manager Gilbert Livas, City of South Gate, said that Mr. Livas has started the process of speaking with the CM TAC city managers regarding federal lobbyist availability and their interest in participating in federal and state advocacy efforts. He will provide an update at the next meeting.

Chairperson Moreno emphasized the need for the WSAB CM TAC cities to approve and execute their MCAs with Metro. Three cities – Bell, Downey and Paramount – have completed the MCA process. Three city efforts are pending – Bellflower, Huntington Park and South Gate. Ms. Khanna highlighted her willingness to work with all cities, and especially with the cities of Cudahy and Vernon to complete the MCA process. She is happy to meet with city representatives and quickly move forward on completing the MCA process prior to September 2021.

Item 5. Other CM TAC Items and Member Discussion

Chairperson Moreno asked for final questions and comments from CM TAC members, and hearing none moved to adjourn the meeting. The next WSAB CM TAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 9, and the agenda will focus on the SCAG Value Capture Study Final Recommendations and possibly Metro's preliminary analysis of the New Starts Rating Analysis for the WSAB Project. He urged members to reach out with ideas for agenda items to Gil Livas, Nancy Michali or him. Chair Moreno made a final call for comments and hearing none, adjourned the meeting at 3:23 pm.

5. Update on Status of Master Cooperative Agreements

Status of WSAB Master Cooperative Agreements

City	Initial Meeting	Follow-up Meeting	City Council Info Presentation	City Council Approval
Artesia	✓			
✓ Bell	✓	✓	✓	✓
Bellflower	✓	✓	Pending	
Cerritos	✓			
Cudahy	✓			
✓ Downey	✓	✓	✓	✓
✓ Huntington Park	✓	✓	✓	✓
✓ Paramount	✓	✓	✓	✓
South Gate	✓	✓	Pending	
Vernon	--			

As of 2/5/21