



Board Report

File #: 2019-0033, **File Type:** Motion / Motion Response

Agenda Number:

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING
JANUARY 24, 2019**

Motion by:

BUTTS

Related to Item 43: The Re-Imagining of LA County: Mobility, Equity, and the Environment (Twenty-Eight by '28 Motion Response)

I have a number of questions related to the Board report and several instructions pertinent to the Issues before us and would like to amend Item 43 and would like to have staff return to the Board with their responses to the Questions in their February Report.

Questions

1. On Attachment B of the Board report, it states that the earliest any revenue realization can happen is 12 to 24 months. Can you further explain in detail the planning and development process for this?
2. Normally a plan like this requires careful planning, analysis and thorough outreach? Is this element part of your 12 to 24 month process?
3. Is it an accurate assumption that you would want to hire consultant experts to lead a study of this magnitude - is the procurement process included as part of the 12 to 24 month process?
 - a) **Instruct** the CEO to bring forward a schedule on the program approach that details the tasks to be performed during the 12-24 months?
4. In Attachment B you propose that a ten-year estimate can generate **up to** \$134 billion in revenues if you add up all the congestion pricing options. How did you arrive at the estimate for these revenues?
5. In the same attachment you state you can realize savings by exploring Public-Private-Partnership opportunities. What other alternatives have you examined besides Public-Private Partnerships as a means to save project costs?
6. Will the Feasibility Studies include exploring new technology, such as monorail or other technology that can significantly reduce project costs and timelines compared to traditional 100 year-old

technology like underground heavy rail or light rail? AND

7. How will the NexGen Program fit into the scenarios described in Item 43?

Instructions

- A. Direct Metro Staff to return to the Board with information pertaining to the Scope, the proposed Budget and Study Timeline prior to conducting the Feasibility Studies for a Congestion Pricing Pilot strategy;
- B. The CEO shall bring forward a schedule on the program approach that details the tasks to be performed during the 12-24 months?
- C. Monitor the State's Road Charge Program for potential synergistic opportunities and monitor the City of San Francisco's Congestion Pricing projects for potential lessons learned.
- D. The proposed "Sacred Items" for Approval before are subject to future Review and Revision if circumstances arise where the Board feels such Review and Revision is warranted; and

I, Therefore, Move that the Board submit these questions and approve the list of Instructions to the CEO and prepare specific responses to the questions for incorporation in their Report at the Executive Management Committee in February.