

Summary Table of Public Comments Received

The table below summarizes and responds to the substantive comments submitted during the public comment period (8/26/22 – 10/26/22) for the Measure M 3% Guideline Revisions.

COMMENT	COMMENTER	RESPONSE	EDITS
General			
“Revisions will have a burdensome long-term financial impact on the city” in particular “withholding 15 years of Measure M funds”	Artesia, Huntington Park, South Gate, Gateway Cities Steering Committee	Per the Measure M Ordinance, 3% of the total project cost of any Measure M Expenditure Plan Major Project coded “T” shall be paid by jurisdictions along the corridor. Metro is required to collect this contribution and will continue to work with jurisdictions to ensure transparency and flexibility.	N
We support the proposed revisions to the Measure M Guidelines.	City of Los Angeles	Thank you for your comment.	N
Calculation and Distribution			
“Clarify jurisdictional responsibility for 3% Contributions related to the I-105/B Line Station and future WSAB stations being planned.”	Huntington Park	Per the Ordinance, jurisdictions containing station construction owe a portion of the 3% contribution even where station construction occurs primarily within right-of-way owned by another agency. Working with jurisdictions, Metro will examine each station footprint to establish the presence or absence of construction in a given area.	N

ATTACHMENT B

COMMENT	COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EDITS
The planned B/Green Line station should fall under the jurisdiction of Caltrans and Metro, and should be removed from the 3% local contribution calculations. Local contribution calculations should focus only on the station elements located within the city of South Gate’s local jurisdiction boundaries, not those within Caltrans right-of-way”	Huntington Park	The C Line/I-105 Station is part of the WSAB project definition. Stations included as part of the total project cost estimated as of 30% design will be subject to the 3% contribution requirement. Local contribution requirements for stations constructed as part of future separate projects will depend on the project funding source.	N
“Design plans are being completed for the Future Rio Hondo Confluence Station, along with cost estimates and funding plans by multiple regional and state stakeholders and entities. Responsibility for the 3% local contribution obligation for this future rail station supporting a regional/state project should not be the responsibility of a single local city.”	Huntington Park	The Future Rio Hondo Station is not part of the WSAB Project and will require its own environmental clearance and further design. Local contribution requirements for stations constructed as part of future separate projects will depend on the project funding source.	N
“The City requests that change to the calculation for the 3% local contribution not be considered if it results in increasing the amount of the contribution”	South Gate	Metro determined that we would not be able to legally enforce the 3% calculation and allocation method as described in the 2017 Measure M Guidelines. The contribution for each jurisdiction must be based on track mileage only as described in Ordinance. Jurisdictions along a corridor may use their own distribution method if they choose, so long as the total 3% contribution is met.	N
Provide Appendix A Local Jurisdiction Information for the WSAB Project	Gateway Cities Steering Committee	Metro revised this Appendix and posted it on the Measure M website.	N

COMMENT	COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EDITS
Funding Sources			
“allow cities that do not have stations to credit their Metro-approved First/Last Mile improvements towards the three percent local obligation of a city with a station in the same area”	Artesia, Huntington Park	Metro agrees this is allowed under the Measure M Ordinance and Guidelines as written and does not require further revisions to the Guidelines.	N
Request that any unmet 3% contribution “be requested as part of the federal project funding submission”	Artesia,	Metro anticipates needing to demonstrate local financial commitment as a prerequisite to receiving Federal funding support. The 3% local contribution is a key component of that local financing.	N
“we request a more complete discussion of Subregional Investments”	Huntington Park, South Gate	Metro plans to create additional guidance and procedures apart from the Guidelines for evaluating in-kind contributions, including subregional investments. This will allow Metro and jurisdictions the most flexibility when considering whether a proposed contribution adds value to the Metro project.	N
“Add a separate guidelines section discussing In-Kind Contributions to reaffirm that in-kind contributions count towards a jurisdiction’s 3% local contribution. Clarify when guidance on the handling of in-kind contributions will be available for public review and comment.”	Huntington Park, Gateway Cities Steering Committee		N
“Ensure consistency in the inclusion and discussion throughout the guidelines of the eligible 3% local contributions available to local cities/jurisdictions beyond funds controlled by the local agency or agencies: subregional investments, In-kind contributions, and First/Last Mile project credits. Add “FLM” in the introductory language to “Eligible Fund Contributions”	Huntington Park, Gateway Cities Steering Committee	Since FLM improvements are not required to be in the project scope and cost by 30% design, they should not be called out in the introductory language to the in-kind discussion. There is a separate section that specifically addresses FLM investments.	N

ATTACHMENT B

COMMENT	COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EDITS
<p>“Subregional investments” definition should include any sub-regional investment or capital project that is within 3-miles of the WSAB light rail project that will improve pedestrian, bike, public transit, and/or vehicular access to a WSAB station</p>	<p>South Gate</p>		<p>N</p>
<p>The City of South Gate requests that Metro count several (list provided) “subregional investment” projects toward the city’s local match.</p>	<p>South Gate</p>	<p>Locally led improvements may receive credit if they are included in the project scope and cost by 30% design or are qualifying FLM projects.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>The City requests consideration for the inclusion of newly constructed transit centers (built by the local jurisdiction) and their amenities to qualify as part of the required three-percent (3%) local contribution for new rail lines and major transit projects</p>	<p>Torrance</p>		<p>N</p>
<p>Under “Local Contribution Limits” Revise: “...will not include costs for First/Last Mile and approved in-kind improvements delivered by ...”</p>	<p>Gateway Cities Steering Committee</p>	<p>In-kind contributions envisioned in this section add value to the core transit project (e.g. ROW, parking) and therefore are necessarily part of the project scope at 30% design.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Similar to allowing credit for qualifying FLM investments in a scenario where Metro is withholding MM Local Return, Metro should also allow credit for in-kind contributions.</p>	<p>Gateway Cities Steering Committee</p>	<p>Metro agrees this is allowed under the Measure M Ordinance, and the clarification is reflected in the revised Guidelines.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>FLM-specific</p>			
<p>“To encourage the transfer of FLM credits, the guidelines should clarify that cities preparing FLM plans are required to implement their FLM plans”</p>	<p>Huntington Park</p>	<p>Per Metro’s First-Last Mile Guidelines, Metro leads the FLM planning phase but does not require that jurisdictions subsequently implement FLM project. Jurisdictions are responsible for selecting, designing, and implementing FLM projects.</p>	<p>N</p>

COMMENT	COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EDITS
<p>“Strengthen text to incentivize provision by First/Last Mile investments by jurisdictions, and clarify when the FLM criteria will be available for public review and comment” Add “and incentivize” to the sentence that addresses the Metro Board provisions.</p>	<p>Huntington Park, Gateway Cities Steering Committee</p>	<p>Metro agrees, as this is consistent with the language and intent of Motion 35, and has revised the Guidelines to add “and incentivize.” The FLM project prioritization methodology was adopted by the Metro Board (2022-0265) in October 2022. This action follows the Board approval of the FLM Guidelines (2020-0365) in May 2021.</p>	<p>Y</p>
Timeline/Process			
<p>“Provide more information on the 3% contribution negotiation process, including additional discussion of how and when the 3% negotiation process is initiated by Metro with the affected cities.” Define “timely agreement”.</p>	<p>Huntington Park, Gateway Cities Steering Committee</p>	<p>These procedural elements remain unchanged and are included in Metro’s publicly available Measure M Administrative Procedures. A “timely agreement” will generally be one that is executed prior to construction commencing on stations and guideway.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>“Provide a definition of what is meant by “station.”</p>	<p>Huntington Park, Gateway Cities Steering Committee</p>	<p>Station elements delivered by Metro will vary from station to station. They will be consistent with Metro’s Systemwide Station Design Standards Policy as well as Metro’s Rail Design Criteria, and will generally include construction of platforms, passenger circulation, and parking as appropriate.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>“Clarify local return withholding requirements, including default withholding and ‘suffering no further impacts.’”</p>	<p>Huntington Park, Gateway Cities Steering Committee</p>	<p>Rephrased this sentence to clearly mean that either the full 3% contribution based on the 30% design cost estimate, or the up-to-15-year local return withholding will satisfy the contribution requirement in the Ordinance. Also clarified the sentence to mean there will be no further <u>financial</u> impacts related to the 3% contribution from the jurisdiction.</p>	<p>Y</p>

ATTACHMENT B

COMMENT	COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EDITS
<p>“Metro's proposed approach places a timeline that limits the City's ability to meet its 3% local funding contribution which was not contemplated by Measure M. ... This approach precludes the City from pursuing grant funding for transportation and subregional investments ... The City requests that revisions be made until the completion of the WSAB construction to identify, implement, and fund transportation and subregional investments to meet its 3% local contribution and provide ample time to pursue grant funds.”</p>	<p>South Gate</p>	<p>Measure M does allow for the time that jurisdictions might need to arrange finances by basing the total project cost on scope and estimate at 30% design. A jurisdiction may pursue financing, including grant funds, after 30% design to support FLM and in-kind improvements.</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Clarify: does this written notice trigger initiation of negotiation of 3% local contribution agreements between Metro and affected local jurisdictions?</p>	<p>Gateway Cities Steering Committee</p>	<p>Not necessarily. The written notice provides an estimate of the local contribution and requests that the jurisdiction identify staff to work with Metro on development and execution of a 3% agreement.</p>	<p>N</p>