

# GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## Transportation Committee

### AGENDA

Wednesday, February 3, 2016

**4:30 p. m. Meeting**

**NOTE: NEW Start Time**

**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 January 6, 2016, will be presented at the next meeting.

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEM.

**VIII. REPORTS**

A. MTA Board Recap – Metro Board Meeting - Oral Report by Director Diane DuBois

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

B. MTA Long Range Transportation/Ballot Measure Project Prioritization

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

C. Recommendation of One Community Member to Metro Gateway Cities Service Council

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

**IX. REPORTS – COMMITTEES/AGENCIES**

A. Matters from Gateway Cities Service Council by David Hershenson, MTA – Oral Report

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

- B. Cap and Trade Update Report – Nancy Pfeffer, Gateway Cities, Director of Regional Planning

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

- C. LOSSAN Update – Oral Report

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

- D. Matters from I-5 JPA – Oral Report

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

- E. Matters from I-710 EIR/EIS Corridor Project – Oral Report

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

- F. Matters from SR-91/I-605/I-405 Major Corridor Project – Oral Report

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

- G. Matters from Eco-Rapid Transit – Oral Report

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

- H. Communications

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, March 2, 2016 4:30 PM.

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 will be Presented and Approved  
at the next meeting)**

**VIII. REPORTS**  
**ITEM C**  
**Recommendation of One Community**  
**Member to Metro Gateway Cities Service**  
**Council**

**TO:** Transportation Committee

**FROM:** Diane Dubois, MTA Director

**BY:** Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy

**SUBJECT:** Recommendation of One Community Member to the Metro Gateway Cities Service Council

**Background**

In September 2002, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) Board of Directors adopted a policy for the establishment of Service Councils for its newly created service sectors. One of the five sectors coincides almost exactly with the Gateway Cities COG territory. The COG requested and received recognition as the convening coalition charged with nominating Governance Council members.

At this time, the seat for one vacancy, held by a member of the community, will be filled.

**Issue**

In accordance with the policy and procedures, applications for the transit consumer position were accepted from December 13, 2015 through January 8, 2016. The vacancy was announced on the COG website, the MTA website, by newspaper advertising and by personal contact. One application was received from Mr. Samuel Pena, previously a member of the Service Council.

In accordance with the COG's procedure for filling this vacancy, the Transportation Committee will forward their recommendation verbally to the Board at the meeting.

**Recommended Action**

It is recommended that the Transportation Committee forward the nomination to COG Board and direct staff to submit the Board's nomination to the MTA Board of Directors for final approval.

**Attachments**

- Gateway Cities MTA Service Sector Council Nominating Policy and Procedure
- Application

## **Attachment 1**

### **Gateway Cities MTA Service Council Nominating Policy and Procedure As amended June 1, 2005**

#### **Council composition**

The Council was initiated with seven members including a majority of public transit users and not to exceed three (3) elected officials. The COG (acting as the convening coalition) exercised its right to expand the Council to nine (9) members on June 1, 2005. These nine (9) members shall include a majority of public transit users and not exceed four (4) elected officials.

#### **Nomination procedure**

When one or more vacancies occur, it will be determined how many of the vacancies may be held by elected officials. For elected official vacancies, if any, all applications received will be compiled and forwarded to the COG Board of Directors for its decision. For non-elected official vacancies, if any, all applications will be reviewed by the MTA Sector Subcommittee of the Transportation Committee after all elected official vacancies have been decided. The Subcommittee will recommend candidates for each vacancy to the Board of Directors for nomination to the Sector Council. All of the Board of Director's nominations will be forwarded to the MTA Board of Directors for its review and approval. In selecting among the applicants, the Subcommittee will strive for diversity of perspectives, expertise, geographic representation, and transit use including consideration of populations with special transit needs such as the elderly and the disabled.

#### **III. Outreach**

Applications will be accepted for a minimum period of three weeks. Notice of available applications will be posted on the COG website and mailed to all mayors, councilmembers, county supervisors, city managers and municipal transit providers in the Sector area as well as the Gateway Cities Partnership. A press release will also be issued.



## Metro Gateway Cities Service Council Membership Application

Meetings are held the 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday of the month at 2:00 PM  
Location: Salt Lake Park in Huntington Park  
Address: 3401 East Florence Avenue  
Meeting Duration: 1 – 1 ½ Hours

**Return completed and signed application no later than 4:00 pm Friday,  
January 8, 2016.**

to: Gateway Cities Council of Governments  
16401 Paramount Boulevard  
Paramount, CA 90723  
Ph. 562-663-6850; FAX 562-634-8216

Name Samuel A Peña  
Home address 4639 E 53<sup>rd</sup> Street  
City Maywood Telephone 323-228-1264  
Email sampena90270@yahoo.com  
Work address 14905 S. San Pedro Street  
City Gardena Telephone 310-4367310  
Occupation Municipal Relationship Manager

A. Please tell us why you are interested in serving on the Service Council.

I am very familiar with the Gateway Cities MTA Service Council. I was the 1<sup>st</sup> Chairman in 2003 and continued to be on the Board of Directors until December 2007. As a Board member, I truly understand the importance on the needs of the ridership in the Gateway Cities Sector. Needs like fare adjustments, route adjustments and the ability to have another avenue where our ridership can voice their opinions.

B. Describe your use of public transit.

While on the Gateway Cities MTA Governance Council, we created an “adopt a Route” where we would ride a route once a quarter and make a PowerPoint presentation to the Board

C. What special perspectives, skills or expertise would you bring to the council?

I formerly served as an elected City Clerk, City Council and Mayor of the City of Maywood. Currently, my role as a Municipal Relationship Manager, it lends me a continuing perspective of how important the role of elected officials and concern citizens play in the decision making process. I have served on local chamber of commerce boards, service organizations and am very familiar with the organizational processes and how agenda items are processed.

If additional space is needed for questions A, B or C, you may attach ONE additional piece of paper (Attached Résumé)

References:

Please provide the names and daytime phone numbers of three persons who can discuss your knowledge of and commitment to public transit and/or your ability to participate constructively in a group decision making process:

- (1) Name Owen Newcomer (Whittier) served on MTA Governance Council  
(2) Name Cherri Kelly (Norwalk) served on MTA Governance Council  
(3) Name Wally Shidler (Walnut Park) served on MTA Governance Council

Statement of interest and eligibility

I, Samuel A Peña, declare my interest and ability to serve on the  
(name)

Gateway Cities Service Council of the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA). I affirm that:

- I live and/or work in the Gateway Cities Service Area.
- I am not an employee of the MTA.
- I am available and will to the fullest extent possible attend an anticipated one Council meeting each month, in addition to a limited number of special meetings as needed.
- I have reviewed the MTA Board of Directors Code of Conduct, including but not limited to information about gifts, contracting and business interests, and I will abide by the Code. *Note: the Board of Directors Code of Conduct may be reviewed at the offices of the MTA, the offices of the Gateway Cities COG or on the MTA website at [www.mta.net/other\\_info/ethics/codes/codes\\_default.htm](http://www.mta.net/other_info/ethics/codes/codes_default.htm)*

Signature



01-04-16  
Date

# SAMUEL A. PEÑA

4639 E 53<sup>rd</sup> Street | Maywood, CA 90270 | 323-228-1264 | [SamPenago270@Yahoo.com](mailto:SamPenago270@Yahoo.com)

## OBJECTIVE

Display Leadership and Guidance to Organizations

## SKILLS PROFILE

- Excellent presentation Skills
- Professional understanding of Municipalities and Interdepartmental function of cities, public and government agencies
- Professional understanding of Municipal Agreements and private partnerships
- Develop a local plan to market private agency to municipalities and government agencies that are seeking solutions to streamline continuing relationship or develop plan for upcoming projects

## EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

### **Municipal Relationship Manager**

4/23/2008 — Present

*Republic Services, Gardena Hauling Division (CA)*

- Contract Management of Waste and Recycling Agreements with local municipalities
- Contract management of Waste and Recycling Agreement with local Unified School Districts
- Represent Republic Services in local meetings and official functions
- Work with Division General Manager to develop a sales and management strategy for local hauling division

### **City of Maywood**

7/1/1985 — 12/7/2007

*Mayor, City Council, City Clerk and Assistant City Manager*

- Work with Administrative Staff to maintain \$18 million annual budget for municipal services
- Develop policies for municipality
- Develop regional relationship with other local, state and federal public agencies
- Member of the MTA Governance Council for the Los Angeles
- Member of the LA County Library Commission
- State Assembly District Community Hero Award, 2005

## EDUCATION HISTORY

### **Bachelors of Art, Political Science**

6/1/1995

*University of California, Los Angeles)*

## ACTIVITIES

- Member and Past Chairman, Metro Gateway Cities Service Sector, 2003 to 2007
- Member and Past President, Maywood Lions Club, 1993 to Present
- Member of the Hawthorne Chamber of Commerce
- Member of the Inglewood Chamber of Commerce
- Member of Toastmaster, Director of Education Officer
- Member, Board of Directors, Hawthorne Chamber of Commerce
- Member, Board of Directors, Inglewood Chamber of Commerce
- Member, Asset Management Advisory Committee, Compton Unified School District

## In Connection with Transportation Committee Agenda Item VIII.B

**TO:** Transportation Committee

**FROM:** Diane Dubois, MTA Director

**BY:** Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy

**SUBJECT:** MTA Long Range Transportation /Ballot Measure Project Prioritization

### Issue

The development of a potential sales tax measure is proceeding. By next month a draft expenditure plan will be presented to the Metro Board. For the sales tax to be placed on the November ballot, an ordinance must be approved by the Metro Board in July of this year at the latest. Draft allocation plans are under development. The sales tax is estimated to have two components; an extension of Measure R beyond its current sunset of 203- and an additional ½ cent tax to commence in 2017 and expire in 2057. The combination of the augmentation of Measure R and the new tax is estimated to yield an additional \$120 billion in local sales tax revenue for transportation projects.

Using a formula based upon population and employment, the Gateway subregion is anticipated to be allocated \$4.1 billion (FY14 dollars) over the life of the new tax. The COG Board recommended the following major projects/initiatives be funded by this subregional allocation,

Project	Cost Assumption	Draft Subregional	Difference
<b>Gateway Cities</b>			
Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase II - Washington Blvd.	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 957,000
Green Line Eastern Extension (Norwalk)	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ -
I-5 Corridor Improvements (I-605 to I-710)	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,059,000	\$ 41,000
I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements	\$ 850,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 550,000
I-710 South Corridor Project	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 3,500,000
SR 60/I-605 Interchange HOV Direct Connectors	\$ 260,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 60,000
West Santa Ana Branch (Eco Rapid Transit Project)j	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,035,000	\$ 965,000
Active Transportation Program		TBD	
Gateway Cities Subtotal	\$ 10,210,000	\$ 4,137,000	\$ 6,073,000

### Projects/Initiatives not included in Measure R

Gateway Cities nominated projects exceed the subregional allocation by over \$6 billion. Projects such as the I-710 are estimated at between \$5-8 billion, and it is assumed to be paid for by a combination state, federal and private sector dollars, assigning \$500 million to the subregional allocation. If MTA applies the same funding plan to the I-5 Corridor, a portion of the \$4.1 billion should be available to support other projects and other modes. The recommendation made in September of 2015, elevates active transportation to the level of a major project initiative to receive this funding.

**Question:** If the major projects funding plan is restructured to free up some of the subregional allocation, is active transportation the highest priority? Designating a single mode as a high priority in the ordinance would lock revenues to that mode for the life of the Measure which may not be appropriate.

**Recommendation:**

- Alter the COG recommendation to include applying any subregional funds available after the major initiatives funding plans are established towards achieving the goals and projects of the Gateway Cities Council of Governments Strategic Transportation Plan (STP) without being mode specific. This will allow the Gateway COG cities maximum flexibility over the the 40-year life of the sales tax. The STP projects and initiatives in all modes have quantifiable GHG reduction and mobility benefits that will meet MTA LRTP objectives.

Issues with the Non-major capital portion of the new sales tax measure:

A working group was established for the non-major capital allocation for the new sales tax measure. The non-major capital side includes potential funding for transit operations, local return, and state of good repair, Metrolink and paratransit.

The group has created numerous versions of allocation for the \$60 billion that will accrue in this category.

The following issues need to be addressed:

- What is the appropriate percentage for Local Return?
- What is the appropriate percentage for State of Good Repair (amount needed to maintain and rehabilitate the Countywide transit facility).
- Should there be any modal specific allocation for Local Return or should the rules be determined by the cities and the MTA?
- Should there be a specific set-aside in local return for a specific mode; i.e. active transportation.

The GCCOG has advocated the allocation of 25% of the non-major capital portion of the new measure be allocated for local return. He COG has taken no other position on the non-capital side.

**Recommendation:** The COG should continue to support the allocation of 25% of the non-capital side to local return. Under the next tax measure the description for local return in the ordinance should include the following language:

*“Major street resurfacing, rehabilitation and reconstruction, pothole repair, left-turn signals, bikeways, pedestrian improvements, streetscapes, signal synchronization, storm water run-off and treatment, and transit”.*

This language reflects the Measure R Ordinance language plus the inclusion of storm water run-off and treatment as eligible items. It is important that the new tax measure keep local return as flexible as possible to reflect the needs of cities for the coming 40-years, locking local return into specific allocations for active transportation or transit or any other specific mode does not allow the local decision making that will allow cities to best determine their improvement allocations for the upcoming decades. Maintaining maximum flexibility is critical to making a new sales tax measure successful.

The GCCOG should also support an allocation of funding for Metrolink capital/operations for reasons that are specified in a separate presentation by Metrolink management. A determination of the exact percentage allocated to Metrolink should be determined by the Countywide working group.

### **Recommendation**

Recommend the above positions to the COG Board to send to the MTA for consideration with the development of the potential sales tax measure.