

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Transportation Committee

AGENDA

Wednesday, Dec. 2, 2020

Note Start Time - 4:30 P.M. Meeting

Gateway Cities Council of Governments

MEETING REMOTE LOCATION: VIA ZOOM

Register Here: https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_8KIkMotWODiUySLghYMZBO

AGENDA REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE ON THE GATEWAY CITIES COG WEBSITE AT WWW.GATEWAYCOG.ORG.

ON MARCH 4, 2020, GOVERNOR NEWSOM PROCLAIMED A STATE OF EMERGENCY TO EXIST IN CALIFORNIA AS A RESULT OF THE THREAT OF COVID-19. THE GOVERNOR HAS ISSUED EXECUTIVE ORDERS THAT TEMPORARILY SUSPEND REQUIREMENTS OF THE BROWN ACT, INCLUDING ALLOWING PUBLIC AGENCIES TO HOLD PUBLIC MEETINGS VIA TELECONFERENCING AND TO MAKE PUBLIC MEETINGS ACCESSIBLE TELEPHONICALLY OR OTHERWISE ELECTRONICALLY TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

PUBLIC COMMENTS: To address the Transportation Committee on any agenda item or a matter within the Transportation Committee's purview, please provide written comments by 3:00 p.m., December 2, 2020, via email to info@gatewaycog.org. All written comments submitted will become part of the official record.

- I. **CALL TO ORDER**
- II. **ROLL CALL**
- III. **AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA** - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).
- IV. **PUBLIC COMMENTS** – All written submitted comments will be read at this time.
- V. **MATTERS FROM STAFF**

VI. 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 October 7, 2020

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION: A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS.

VII. REPORTS – MEMBERS AND STAFF

- A. Metro Matters, Metro Board Meetings and Other Topics of Interest, Oral Report by Mayor Robert Garcia, Metro Director

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

VIII. REPORTS – COMMITTEES/AGENCIES

- A. Update on Metro NextGen Implementation by Joe Forgiarini, Senior Director of Service Performance and Analysis, LA Metro.

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

- B. COG Comment Letter for Metro Motion on “Modernizing the Highway Program”

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

- C. Metro Technical Advisory Committee Update, Lisa Rapp, Lakewood Director of Public Works.

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

IX. MATTERS FROM TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

X. 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, January 6, 2020.

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 ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
Item A
Approval of Minutes for
October 7, 2020

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 7, 2020**

4:30 P.M. Meeting

Gateway Cities Council of Governments

MEETING REMOTE LOCATION: VIA
ZOOM

Chair - MTA Director, Long Beach Mayor - Robert Garcia

The Meeting was called to order at 4:36 pm by Mayor Robert Garcia – City of Long Beach/MTA Board Director, roll call was taken:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Metro Board Director Mayor Robert Garcia – City of Long Beach, COG Board President – Mayor Maria Davila, City of South Gate, Mayor Ali Saleh – COG Second Vice President - City of Bell, Thaddeus McCormack – City Manager, City of Lakewood, William Rawlings, City Manager - City of Artesia, Commissioner Sharon Weissman – POLB, Tracy Beidleman – Long Beach Transit, Rachel Roque – Supervisor Hahn’s Office, Kevin Jackson – City of Long Beach, Bill Pagett – Public Works Officer.

OTHERS PRESENT: Nancy Pfeffer, Karen Heit, Joel Arevalos, Sandra Mora, – COG Staff, Mahogany Smith, Erica Copeland – CivicSpark Fellow, Ed Alegre, Raffi Hamparian, Michael Turner, Lucy Delgadillo – Metro, Andres Molina – WSP, Sara Baumann – Long Beach Transit, Henry Fung – Calwatch, Jocelyn Rivera-Olivas – Office of Supervisor Hahn, Hina Ahmad – Office of Assembly Member Patrick O’Donnell, Luke Klipp – Metro Transportation, Nina Turner, Theresa Dau-Ngo – Port of Long Beach, Karen Lee – City of Artesia. Unidentified callers – (818) 517-0739, (562) 292-0381, (562) 292-0381, (213) 247-6417

There was no general public comment. There were no matters from staff. The Consent Calendar was approved, motion to approve was made by Maria Davila, seconded by Sharon Weissman.

Mayor Garcia gave the Metro report starting with the approval of the Metro FY 21 budget and the reductions it represents. He briefly mentioned the NextGen study was still being implemented but to a lesser degree. He expressed dismay in the inability of the federal government to assist state and local governments. He mentioned that the I-605 environmental analysis has been kicked back perhaps a year in the pursuit of an alternative that does not require the taking of houses. He believes there can be development of an acceptable option. He turned to Michael Turner for the state report. SB 288 was signed which exempts from CEQA, bus rapid transit (BRT), bikeways, and light rail transit (LRT) if it is located within a public right of way (ROW). SB 757, which limits the legal challenge period for transportation projects, made it to the Governor’s desk

but was tied to another bill which failed. SB 757 therefore was vetoed but may be reconsidered next year for approval.

For the next session, Metro wants a bill that would allow photo enforcement of parking in bus-only lanes. MTA cameras would transfer the enforcement to the local jurisdiction. Assemblymember Bloom was the sponsor, and the MTA will be seeking the opinion of the COGs and cities on this bill. MTA will also seek funding for zero-emission vehicles in trying to meet the state guidelines. The state has not funded the replacement of vehicles to meet the deadlines.

Raffi Hamparian, Metro Federal Government Affairs, spoke about the HEROES Act 2.0 to address the COVID funding shortages. The bill was considered dead but the White House and the House are in negotiation. The new bill may include airline bail-outs and reallocation of the original relief act funding. Passage depends upon House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin negotiating a bill; otherwise a lame duck Congress may deal with the aid topic. Mayor Garcia indicated that US Mayors had a session with Pelosi and that if the White House changes there may be a bill signed. Executive Director Pfeffer asked about the MTA legislative package and about collaboration with the MTA on West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) and other federal transit funding. Raffi replied that MTA is on the same page as the COG. The MTA package includes support for robust funding for transit. The authorization bill passed by Rep. DeFazio's committee includes \$5 billion for transit, double the amount in previous bills. The DeFazio bill will be the template for the next transportation bill after the new session. MTA was one of the few agencies to lay out very specific projects for the House. Mayor Garcia said he was confident that the Senate also wants a strong transportation bill.

Mayor Garcia turned the presentation over to Ed Alegre, Metro, who gave the presentation on Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) in the I-710 Corridor. Alegre spoke of the relation between the infrastructure improvements and the corridor project. He discussed the Countywide project and a demonstration underway in the San Gabriel Valley along the I-210.

The I-710 issues are incident-related congestion and poor diversion management. He went on to define ICM, which integrates all mobility within the corridor. Alegre discussed what goes into an ICM project: signals, detection, cameras, signage and communications amongst the systems. The equipment can reroute traffic around incidents, warn truckers and others not to enter the freeway, and handle signals at the arterial level. Potential project elements include possible access by 3rd party apps and air quality analysis. He illustrated how this process could work with a real incident that took place at 3 am and had repercussions all day long.

Mr. Alegre finished with the Caltrans/MTA joint grant application for Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) funding.

Transportation Committee Meeting Minutes
October 7, 2020

Pfeffer brought up the Complete Streets efforts by the COG and how this could possibly integrate with TCM as well as the BRT study being done by the MTA. Alegre is going to reach out to all of the cities.

Lisa Rapp had a conflict so Nancy Pfeffer gave a brief overview of the report that would be sent out to the Committee Members. Highlights included state extended deadlines on certain active transportation grant programs, and the expenditure of CARES Act funding, BRT progress and the same reports that Raffi and Michael gave.

Ali Saleh moved to receive and file all of the reports. The meeting was adjourned at 5:16.

VIII. REPORTS

Item B

**COG Comment Letter for Metro
Motion on “Modernizing the
Highway Program”**

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Nancy Pfeffer – Executive Director

SUBJECT: Comments - Modernizing the Metro Highway Program

Background

In June of this year the Metro Board approved a Motion that suggested changes in the highway program guidelines for Measures R & M.

The Board of Directors directed Metro staff to circulate recommendations to modernize the Metro Highway Program, including broadening its mission, expanding funding eligibility, recommitting to the previously adopted Metro Complete Streets Policy, and updating performance metrics.

The Motion requested councils of governments and regional partners to review and provide feedback on the Measure R Highway Program Criteria and Measure M Guidelines, which can be found in Attachments A and B, by Monday, December 7, 2020.

There are two sets of the guidelines changes attached including “redline” versions of Metro’s proposed changes with (yellow) highlighted sections indicate language that is being removed and red sections indicate new language.

Issue

The Gateway Cities Council of Governments highway program has operated under the Measures’ defined highway project corridors. Under Measure R the COG has three highway corridors: the I-5 Corridor, the I-710 and the I-605 “Hot Spots” Interchanges. Under Measure M, the same corridors have been designated, although the I-605 “Hot Spots” Interchange Improvements is now a Multi-year Subregional Program (page 2 of measure expenditure plan) as opposed to an Expenditure Plan Major Project (page 1 of measure expenditure plan).

Metro’s goal to increase flexibility in the use of highway funds is a good one. Omitting restrictive project eligibility language will allow for more creative or technologically advanced congestion solutions. Also, we understand that local benefits may arise from a multi-modal approach to transportation planning and project implementation.

However, in revising the guidelines, it is important to maintain the integrity of freeway corridor-based plans that have been undertaken to address the well-defined articulated needs of each of the corridors. Many of the suggested guideline changes have the potential to diminish the effectiveness of individual highway corridor projects by broadly spreading funding or allowing for the diversion of funding to other modes. We request that

the Guidelines retain and recognize the existence of well-articulated corridors and maintain geographic boundaries on eligible uses of funds. We also believe that references to “Improve freeway traffic flow” (Measure R) and “Improve freeway traffic flow; reduce bottlenecks and ease traffic congestion” (Measure M) should not be removed from the Guidelines as they are fundamental to both sales tax measures.

Recommended Action

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee review the draft letter and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors.

Attachments

- Draft Comment Letter
- MTA Recommended Revisions (includes Attachments A and B)

Draft Comment Letter

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Attn: Fanny Pan, Deputy Executive Officer

Dear Ms. Pan:

Re: Modernizing the Metro Highway Program - Gateway Cities Council of Governments Comments

The Gateway Cities Council of Governments Board of Directors is pleased to comment on Metro efforts to modernize the guidelines for the Measures R & M highway programs.

Unlike other subregions, the Gateway Cities area is severely impacted by roadways (freeways and highways) that were designed in the 1950s and 1960s and do not conform to modern traffic demands or design safety standards. Furthermore, the regional and national impacts of freight movement in the Gateway Cities still need to be addressed. The Measures R & M highway program funding is extremely important to these mobility needs within the subregion. And while both measures promise substantial future transit investments in our region, most residents still need a car for basic mobility and access.

Metro's goal to increase flexibility in the use of funds is a good one. Also, we understand that local benefits may arise from a multi-modal approach to transportation planning and project implementation. However, in revising the guidelines, it is important to maintain the integrity of freeway corridor-based plans that have been undertaken to address the needs described above. Many of the suggested guideline changes have the potential to diminish the effectiveness of highway projects by broadly spreading funding or allowing for the diversion of funding for other modes.

Both sales tax measures were "sold" in large part by promising to improve traffic congestion – this promise may be diluted with the broadening of definitions. We do believe, however, that broader, less restrictive language created by removing restrictions from eligible projects is beneficial to providing creative solutions to traffic congestion.

Specific changes are addressed:

- It is not appropriate to remove the words "traffic flow" from the highway improvement program; this language is part of the voter-approved ordinance and the ballot language and is a critical term. The term "Improve traffic flow" is prominent in the preambles and ballot language for both Measures R & M.
- Eliminating the funding restriction language regarding expansion of vehicle capacity allows for the potential development of better solutions for interchange improvements.
- Elimination of the qualification "located generally within a one-mile corridor of any state highway" makes funding available region-wide for virtually any mobility investment. Removing the physical nexus from freeway corridors has the

potential to dilute funding that was intended to improve congestion and increase safety associated with the highway system. This would be an example of a change that does not maintain the integrity of freeway corridor plans.

- Removal of qualifying language for interchange modifications, ramp modifications, and safety is beneficial and may provide for more creativity in developing projects to address mobility issues.
- The eligibility of additional improvement projects should be limited to the geographic parameters or boundaries of the highway corridor projects. A coordinated bus priority or active transportation corridor that crosses or is an integral part of a highway corridor project should be eligible.
- The projects listed below will be eligible under the new language and could accelerate the positive mobility impacts of corridor projects. However, if they are eligible, they should be kept within the corridor to provide mobility relief and not just implemented anywhere.
 - On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements;
 - Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways;
 - sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps;
 - pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks;
 - transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies.

Measure M Changes

Specific comments:

- Retain the wording “enhance safety by reducing conflicts” – for subregions with high truck volumes this is a critical goal for the highway subfund projects such as the I-605 Hot Spots.
- Retain the wording “within one mile of a state highway; or farther than one mile as determined on a case by case basis” - maintaining the importance of a geographic nexus with highways and freeways and the integrity of the freeway corridors being planned.
- Add the following language at the end of this sentence: *Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements can be shown, such as a measurable reduction in Vehicles Miles Traveled or safety improvements.*
- Retain the geographic boundary for the one-mile radius for improvements to preserve the benefit to highway safety and mobility.
- The same comments on the additional eligible projects under Measure R are also applicable here; multi-modal projects should be included when they are an

Transportation Committee Meeting
December 2, 2020

integral part of the corridor or when they intersect an established highway corridor.

Multi-Modal Connectivity Definition Comments:

- What is “new mode and access accommodation”?

Freeway Interchange Improvement Definition Comments:

- Retain the one-mile from the state highway with the ability to go beyond on a case by case basis.

If there are any questions, please call Nancy Pfeffer, GCCOG Executive Director at 562 663 6850.

Sincerely,

Maria Davila, President
Gateway Cities Council of Governments

cc: Board of Directors - Gateway Cities Council of Governments

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO MEASURE R HIGHWAY PROGRAM CRITERIA

The following shall replace Measure R Highway Program eligibility criteria in their entirety:

Project Eligibility for Highway Operational Improvements and
Ramp/Interchange Improvements

The intent of a Measure R Highway Operational Improvement is to improve multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability along an existing State Highway corridor by reducing congestion and operational deficiencies that do not significantly expand the motor vehicle capacity of the system, or by incorporating complete streets infrastructure into the corridor, in accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro's Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan. In addition to those eligible projects on the State Highway System, for Measure R, projects located on primary roadways, including principal arterials, minor arterials, and key collector roadways, will be considered eligible for Operational Improvements and for ramp and interchange improvements.

Examples of eligible improvement projects include:

- interchange modifications;
- ramp modifications;
- auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges;
- curve corrections/improve alignment;
- signals and/or intersection improvements;
- two-way left-turn lanes;
- intersection and street widening
- traffic signal upgrade/timing/synchronization, including all supporting infrastructure;
- traffic surveillance;
- channelization;
- Park and Ride facilities;
- turnouts;
- shoulder widening/improvement;
- safety improvements;
- on-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements;
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways;
- sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps;
- pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks;

- transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies.

Up to 20% of a subregion's Operational Improvement dollars may be used for soundwalls. Landscaping installed as a component of an operational improvement must be limited to no more than 20% of a project's budget. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible. Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to State Highway Operational Improvements can be shown, such as a measurable reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled.

TRACKED CHANGES VERSION

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO MEASURE R HIGHWAY PROGRAM CRITERIA

The following shall replace Measure R Highway Program eligibility criteria in their entirety:

Project Eligibility for Highway Operational Improvements and Ramp/Interchange Improvements

The intent of a Measure R Highway Operational Improvement is to improve **traffic flow in multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability along** an existing State Highway corridor by reducing congestion and operational deficiencies **at spot locations** that do not significantly expand the **design capacity of the system and are intended to address recurrent congestion** *motor vehicle* capacity of the system, *or by incorporating complete streets infrastructure into the corridor, in accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro's Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan.* In addition to those eligible projects on the State Highway System, for Measure R, projects located on primary roadways **located generally within a one mile corridor of any State Highway**, including principal arterials, minor arterials, and key collector roadways, will be considered eligible for Operational Improvements and for ramp and interchange improvements.

Examples of eligible improvement projects include:

- interchange modifications **(but not to accommodate traffic volumes that are significantly larger than the existing facilities were designed for);**
- ramp modifications **(acceleration – deceleration/weaving);**
- auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges;
- curve corrections/improve alignment;
- signals and/or intersection improvements;
- two-way left-turn lanes;
- intersection and street widening
- traffic signal upgrade/timing/synchronization;
- traffic surveillance;
- channelization;
- Park and Ride facilities;
- turnouts;
- shoulder widening/improvement;
- safety improvements **that reduce incident delay;**
- *on-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements;*
- *Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways;*
- *sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps;*
- *pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks.*

- *Transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies*

Up to 20% of the Arroyo Verdugo, Las Virgenes/Malibu and South Bay Subregion's Operational Improvement dollars may be used for soundwalls and bike lanes. *Landscaping installed as a component of an operational improvement must be limited to no more than 20% of a projects budget. State of good repair, maintenance and/or beautification projects are not eligible.* Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to State Highway Operational Improvements can be shown, *such as a measurable reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled.*

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO MEASURE M GUIDELINES, SECTION
X MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMS (HIGHWAY SUBFUNDS)

The following shall replace subsection 'A. "Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements" definition: ' in its entirety.

Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements includes those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, travel times; and reduce recurring congestion, high-frequency traffic incident locations, and operational deficiencies on State Highways. Similarly, improvements which achieve these same objectives are eligible on major/minor arterials or key collector roadways. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related project phases as referenced in Sections IX and X and are subject to eligibility criteria and phasing thresholds that will be developed within 6 months as part of the applicable administrative procedures. In Accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro's Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds. Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements can be shown, such as a measurable reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- System and local interchange modifications
- Ramp modifications/improvements
- Auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges
- Alignment/geometric design improvements
- Left-turn or right-turn lanes on state highways or arterials
- Intersection and street widening/improvements
- New traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, including left turn phasing, signal synchronization, and all supporting infrastructure
- Turnouts for safety purposes
- Shoulder widening/improvements for enhanced operation of the roadway
- Safety improvements
- Freeway bypass/freeway to freeway connections providing traffic detours in case of incidents, shutdowns or emergency evacuations
- Express Lanes
- On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways
- Sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps

- Pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks
- Transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TOM strategies

The following shall replace subsection 'C. "Multi-Modal Connectivity" definition' in its entirety.

"Multi-modal Connectivity" definition:

Multi-modal connectivity projects include those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and network performance; provide network connections; reduce congestion, queuing or user conflicts; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; encourage ridesharing; and reduce vehicle miles traveled. Project should encourage and provide multi-modal access based on existing demand and/or planned need and observed safety incidents or conflicts. Subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under "Pre-Construction Activities" title under Readiness in Section IX. State of good repair, maintenance and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- Transportation Center expansions
- Park and Ride expansions
- Multi-modal access improvements
- New mode and access accommodations
- First/last mile infrastructure

The following shall replace subsection 'D. "Freeway Interchange Improvement" definition' in its entirety.

"Freeway Interchange Improvements" definition:

Freeway Interchange Improvements includes those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance safety by reducing conflicts; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, and travel times; and reduce recurring congestion and operational deficiencies on State Highways. Similarly, improvements on major/minor arterials or key collector roadways which achieve these same objectives are also eligible under this category. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under "Pre-Construction Activities" title under Readiness in Section IX. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro's Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic

Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. State of good repair, maintenance improvements and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

The following shall replace subsection 'E. "Arterial Street Improvements" definition:' in its entirety.

"Arterial Street Improvements" definition:

Arterial Street improvements include those projects, which upon implementation would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, and travel times; and reduce recurring congestion and operational deficiencies. Projects must have a nexus to a principal arterial, minor arterial or key collector roadway. The context and function of the roadway should be considered (i.e., serves major activity center(s), accommodates trips entering/exiting the jurisdiction or subregion, serves intra-area travel) and adopted in the City's general plan. In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro's Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under "Pre-Construction Activities" title under Readiness in Section IX. State of good repair, maintenance improvements and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- Intersection or street widening
- Two-way left-turn or right turn lanes
- New traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, including left turn phasing
- Sight distance corrections/improve alignment
- Turnouts
- Safety improvements
- On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements
- Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways
- Sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps
- Pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks
- Transportation infrastructure in a street right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies

TRACKED CHANGES VERSION

RECOMMENDED REVISIONS TO MEASURE M GUIDELINES, SECTION X MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMS (HIGHWAYSUBFUNDS)

The following shall replace subsection 'A. "Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements" definition:' in its entirety.

Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements includes those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and system performance; *enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability*; *enhance safety by reducing conflicts*; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, travel times; and reduce recurring congestion, *high-frequency traffic incident locations* and operational deficiencies on State Highways. Similarly, improvements which achieve these same objectives are eligible on major/minor arterials or key collector roadways *within one mile of a State Highway; or farther than one mile as determined on a case by case basis*. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related project phases as referenced in Sections IX and X, and are subject to eligibility criteria and phasing thresholds that will be developed within 6 months as part of the applicable administrative procedures. *In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro's Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds.* State of good repair, maintenance and/or *stand-alone* beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds. *Other projects could be considered on a case-by-case basis as long as a nexus to Highway Efficiency and Operational Improvements can be shown, such as a measurable reduction in Vehicles Miles Traveled.*

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- System and local interchange modifications
- Ramp modifications/improvements
- Auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges
- Alignment/geometric design improvements
- Left-turn or right-turn lanes on state highways or arterials
- Intersection and street widening/improvements *on a State Conventional Highway or within one mile of a state highway, or on a major/minor arterial on a case by case basis*
- *New traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, including left turn phasing, signal synchronization and all supporting infrastructure*
- Turnouts for safety purposes
- Shoulder widening/improvements for enhanced operation of the roadway
- Safety improvements *that reduce incident delay*
- Freeway bypass/freeway to freeway connections providing traffic detours in case of incidents, shutdowns or emergency evacuations
- ExpressLanes
- *On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements*
- *Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways*

- *Sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps*
- *Pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks*
- *Transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies*

The following shall replace subsection ‘C. “Multi-Modal Connectivity” definition:’ in its entirety.

“Multi-Modal Connectivity” definition:

Multi-modal connectivity projects include those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and network performance; provide network connections; reduce congestion, queuing or user conflicts **and encourage ridesharing**; *enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; and encourage ridesharing*. Project should encourage and provide multi-modal access based on existing demand and/or planned need and observed safety incidents or conflicts. Subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. State of good repair, maintenance and/or *stand-alone* beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- Transportation Center expansions
- Park and Ride expansions
- Multi-modal access improvements
- *New mode and access accommodations*
- *First/last mile infrastructure*

The following shall replace subsection ‘D. “Freeway Interchange Improvement” definition:’ in its entirety.

“Freeway Interchange Improvements” definition:

Freeway Interchange Improvements includes those projects, which upon implementation, would improve regional mobility and system performance; enhance safety by reducing conflicts; improve traffic flow, trip reliability, *and* travel times; and reduce recurring congestion and operational deficiencies on State Highways. Similarly, improvements on major/minor arterials or key collector roadways which achieve these same objectives **within one mile of the State Highway**, are also eligible under this category. Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. *In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic*

Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds. State of good repair, maintenance improvements and/or stand-alone beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

The following shall replace subsection ‘E. “Arterial Street Improvements” definition:’ in its entirety.

“Arterial Street Improvements” definition:

Arterial Street improvements include those projects, which upon implementation would improve regional mobility and system performance; *enhance multimodal efficiency, safety, equity, and sustainability; enhance safety by reducing conflicts*, improve traffic flow, trip reliability, and travel times; and reduce recurring congestion and operational deficiencies. Projects must have a nexus to a principal arterial, minor arterial or key collector roadway. The context and function of the roadway should be considered (i.e., serves major activity center(s), accommodates trips entering exiting the jurisdiction, serves intra-area travel) and adopted in the City’s general plan. *In accordance with the Board-adopted policies set forth in Metro’s Complete Streets Policy, Active Transportation Strategic Plan, and First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, complete streets projects and project elements are eligible for highway subfunds.* Highway subfunds are eligible for pre-construction and construction related work phases of projects with the restrictions outlined under “Pre-Construction Activities” title under Readiness in Section IX. State of good repair, maintenance improvements and/or *stand-alone* beautification projects are not eligible for Highway subfunds.

Examples of Eligible Projects:

- Intersection or street widening
- Two-way left-turn or right turn lanes
- *New traffic signals and upgrades to existing signals, including left turn phasing*
- *Sight distance corrections/improve alignment*
- Turnouts
- Safety improvements *that reduce incident delay*
- *On-street bus priority infrastructure, including but not limited to bus lanes, signal prioritization, queue jumps, bus boarding islands/curb extensions, and bus stop improvements*
- *Class I, II, III, or IV bikeways*
- *Sidewalk improvements, including but not limited to widening, shade trees, and curb ramps*
- *Pedestrian safety improvements, including but not limited to bulb-outs, refuge islands, midblock crossings, pedestrian signals/beacons, raised intersections/pedestrian crossings, and scramble crosswalks*
- *Transportation infrastructure in a public right-of-way that supports the implementation of TDM strategies*