

June 13, 2017

Honorable John Fasana
Chair, Board of Directors
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: Project Advisory Council Comments on Revised Measure M Guidelines

Dear Chair Fasana:

On behalf of the Policy Advisory Council (PAC), we are pleased to submit this letter regarding the revised Measure M Guidelines (Guidelines). We would like to commend Metro staff for convening the PAC to gather substantive comments on Metro policies from across a broad spectrum of diverse stakeholders. We appreciate the strong staff support that Metro has provided to the PAC over the last several weeks of intensive review and discussion.

On May 16, 2017, we presented to the Metro Board a summary of the comments submitted by PAC members grouped into five general categories of issues. We identified the key areas of consensus and noted other areas where additional clarification or discussion was necessary to arrive at consensus. In the main, Metro staff has revised the draft Guidelines to address most of the major consensus issues identified by the PAC. In some cases, Metro has outlined the process and timing for resolving issues through the development of further administrative procedures. Metro staff has worked hard to answer questions, consider solutions and collaboratively work with the PAC to resolve concerns.

Following our last PAC meeting on June 6, members of the PAC submitted close to 35 additional comments on the revised Guidelines by the June 9 deadline we set for ourselves. This letter highlights concerns that remain unresolved regarding the major areas of consensus that we listed in our May 16 summary. We also note comments about points that were important to some stakeholders but needed additional clarification or discussion. Finally, we have attached an appendix that contains all the comments submitted by PAC members by the June 9 deadline to give the Metro Board the benefit of the full range of comments provided by individual PAC members.

Remaining Concerns About Consensus Issues

- Local Return, Transit Oriented Communities (TOCs) – On page 85, Metro added a reference to “Metro’s Transit Oriented Communities Program.” No such program exists. Instead, the language should state “as described in Metro’s Transit Oriented Communities Policy. In the absence of official Policy, jurisdictions should refer to the TOC Demonstration Program.” In addition, language should be added to clarify that all TOC activities described by the TOC policy (or Demonstration Program) are included in the definition of transportation purposes.
- Program Eligibility, Bus Rapid Transit – The Guidelines should be changed to explicitly state that municipal operators are eligible for BRT funds.

- Performance Metrics – The Guidelines should give clear direction to sub-regional entities to develop performance metrics as part of the Multi-Year Subregional Programs. Performance metrics are critical to being able to communicate back to voters whether these investments have been successful.

Points Raised By Some Stakeholders But Needing Additional Process /Discussion

- Potential expansion of eligibility for “Green Streets” beyond just stormwater improvements – On pages 42, and 78, “green infrastructure” or “green streets” should not be limited to only describing stormwater management benefits derived from natural processes. The definition should be expanded to include urban heat island mitigation, cooling benefits, shade and highly-reflective/less-heat-radiating materials. Incorporating cooling into transportation infrastructure delivers health benefits, and makes active transportation and waiting for the bus more viable options.
- Eligibility for 2% Highway Connectivity Programs – As criteria are developed for this program during the Administrative updates to the guidelines, the program guidelines should clarify the allocation between “earmarked” projects and discretionary projects. A preference for a more explicit tie to existing Goods Movement initiatives was suggested.
- Procurement goals – The Guidelines should set forth specific minimum procurement goals for Small Business Enterprises, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises.

A summary of comments provided by PAC members to the Draft Final Guidelines is provided in an Attachment.

In closing, the members of the PAC have worked diligently over the last two months to surface major issues, arrive at consensus where possible and highlight areas where additional discussion is needed to resolve questions. We appreciate the opportunity to work with Metro staff in a collegial, collaborative forum to bring greater mobility and a higher quality of life to our region. We look forward to continuing our efforts during the development of further administrative procedures and the preparation of other important policy documents.

Very truly yours,

Roderick Diaz
Cecilia V. Estolano
Jessica Meaney

Summary of Comments on the Metro Revision to the Measure M Guidelines (5 June 2017)

MINOR concern – a concern related to specific aspects of the Revised Measure M Guidelines and the commenter feels can be addressed through either:

- (a) Metro's planned revisions according to their Administrative Development Timeline (Attachment D),
- (b) Clarifications/refinements on how Metro will interpret or apply the guidelines as currently written, or
- (c) Minor revisions that can wait for future PAC discussion or a future Metro process to revise the Guidelines at a later date.

MAJOR concern -- a concern significant enough to cause apprehension by the commenter about Metro adopting a portion of the Guidelines as currently written, either because an original comment was not addressed or because the revision created a new significant issue.

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
1	Kerry Cartwright	Port of Los Angeles (City of LA Harbor Dept.	Provider	<p>2% System Connectivity Projects (Highway Construction Subfund) (p. 43 of draft guidelines) The projected amount of annual funding for the "Highway – System Connectivity 2%" category is lacking in the program info and guidelines. The approved measure also listed "earmarked" projects that are within this subfund, thus diminishing the total available amount for a competitive process. Thus, the "Highway – System Connectivity 2%" program should be limited to solely goods movement projects, justified for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft guidelines emphasizes goods movement • Significant program earmarks for all other modes/needs, except ports/goods movement • Local return formula funds not accessible by the Ports of LA/LB on behalf of goods movement sector • Alameda Corridor East has Measure M (and R) earmarked projects • Difficulty obtaining formula subregional funds (via Gateway COG, South Bay COG, etc.) • Limited amount available in "2% Highway" program. <p>The development of the "Highway – System Connectivity 2%" program guidelines should be done collaboratively, and solely with the goods movement sector and pertinent public agencies and private sector entities. This should be done concurrently with the development of METRO's Goods Movement Plan. The goods movement sector has collaborated for many years at the federal, State, and regional level, and has already identified needs and projects. Hence, a minimal amount of time needs to be spent on this plan development. Additionally, a few to several critical, high priority projects should be earmarked initially, as done with numerous other Measure M projects as part of the approved ordinance. The Ports, SCAG, and METRO have collaborated for many years on such</p>	

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
				<p>priority projects, and identified them via numerous studies. Such projects include then Ports of Los Angeles/Long Beach rail projects that reduce truck trips throughout the region, as a few interchange projects on I-110 and SR 47.</p>	
2	Jess Romo	Long Beach Airport	Provider	N/A	
3	KeAndra Dodds	Enterprise Community Partners	Consumer		<p>Local Return: TOC Investments (Revised Guidelines Pg. 85) - While I appreciate the attempt by Metro staff to respond to our comments, the changes did provide more clarity. The new reference to Metro's Transit Oriented Communities Program is not helpful because there is no program with that title. There is a TOC Demonstration Program, TOC Planning Grants, Joint Development Program, the MATCH program, and affordable housing policies, all of which relate to TOCs, but none which clearly delineate specific activities or investments that will be considered TOC investments, and thus eligible for local return. We recognize the need to not be overly prescriptive and to allow for innovation, but there must be clearer guidance on what types of investments are eligible. Given Metro's Board adopted policies and programs, we recommend that eligible investments include those that: 1. Support the development and preservation of affordable housing, as defined in Metro's joint development policy, in TOCs; 2. Support the inclusion of small businesses in mixed use buildings in TOCs; 3. Help remove land use barriers to transit-oriented development; 4. Implement best practices and policies for sustainable and transit-supportive land uses across a variety of neighborhood typologies; and 5. Otherwise ensure inclusive and equitable transit-oriented communities for those at all income levels.</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
4	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	Thank you for the timeline, and we'd like to see item XIX be advanced to 6 months consistent with item IX-XII.	
5	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	Page 7, No. 5 Stated the addition of "Subregional funding reductions". What does this mean? Please clarify.	
6	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	Regarding Contingency Subfund creations, it's not clear how these can be established if the minimum revenues are not achieved. Will the contingency be funded by % similar to the other subfunds?	
7	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	Although advancing MSP projects is mentioned, using metro bonding as a tool is not specific to this section.	
8	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		Now that the TFP has been removed as the funds forecasting methodology, what cash flow determination will be used?
9	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		The I-5 has been determined to be a local project yet self financing is not an option. This doesn't appear to be feasible. Please clarify the potential options outside of advancing the project via Metro Bonding or outside leveraged funds.
10	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		In order to ensure that betterments are including by the 30% final design it's imperative that jurisdictions be credited for work done in advance, to be prepared and have the items incorporated into the appropriate documents (EIR, design plan etc.). Retroactive work by the jurisdictions that gets incorporated into the Final 30% design should count as 3%.
11	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		There has not been any changes to the SC transit projects to provide relief for the 3% contribution, as these projects aren't attributed to our subregion. These projects should be Exempt from 3% local contribution. Additionally, if exemption of 3% is denied, and there are savings on the project, it's not

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
					clear that the savings, if 3% is collected, that it won't go to a different subregion.
12	Seleta Reynolds	Los Angeles Department of Transportation	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	<p>1. The guidelines are still missing either a) performance metrics for each program or b) a clear direction to sub-regional entities to develop their own. It is important to be able to measure and communicate back to the voters whether or not the investments they agreed to are successful and how we plan to measure success.</p> <p>2. The guidelines must align better with the Office of Planning and Research's direction to incorporate Vehicle Miles Traveled either instead of or in addition to Level of Service as an evaluation methodology for highway projects. The highway program in particular (p. 35) references roadway widening as a tool to improve Level of Service, a notion that has been debunked repeatedly. As cities in Los Angeles County work to comply with OPR's deadline for changing the analysis methodology and mitigations for transportation projects, Metro's guidelines will create confusion and potentially legal uncertainty.</p> <p>3. (At the request of the Mayor's office) All mentions of green infrastructure and green streets (pg. 42 and 78) only refer to stormwater management benefits and leave out important urban heat island (UHI) mitigation / cooling benefits, which really should be addressed in our built streetscape environment, since asphalt is such a large contributor to the UHI effect. Instead, these definitions should be expanded to include shade and highly-reflective / less-heat-radiating materials to at least create the opportunity for investments that could make active transportation and waiting for the bus more appealing.</p>	

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
13	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		Page 30 under MSP Highway (Construction Activities), the last sentence states "It is expected that local jurisdictions will contribute to total project costs", which isn't mandatory per the Ordinance. Please remove the statement or change the language to "encourage".
14	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	Regarding HOT Lanes and the Tier Funding, the issue requires further clarification of how the project will pay for them.	
15	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		Regarding the removal of eligible projects within the Highway MSP specifically Two-Way left turns or right turn lanes, and intersection and street widening. The removal of these options within the guidelines are limiting options to improve safety and traffic flow. Street widenings specifically are capacity enhancements that have a direct nexus to freeway operations. It appears that arterials are being eliminated from eligibility altogether. In many cases safety and traffic improvements are necessary to improve access to freeways. These removals need to be placed back into the guidelines, and need to be eligible uses, as options for congestion relieve need to be maximized and not limited.
16	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		Add I-5 JPA to Eligible Recipients as part of the 2% System Connectivity Projects (Highway), as other agencies including ACE Authority are eligible.
17	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	Language needs to be softened, removed or suggested as an example (verses in alignment) regarding City of LA policies for Streetscape Enhancements and Great Streets. It's seems inappropriate for subregions to conform with the City of LA policy.	
18	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	Regarding the definition of Active Transportation, "rolling modes" should be detailed or more definitive as there are many new mainstream modes such as e-	

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
				bikes, Segway's, skateboards, motorized wheelchairs, scooters, etc. Please expand the definition.	
19	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	Clarification is still required regarding if MSP's and Major projects assigned to a subregion are eligible for the 2% SC Project (HWY Subfund) competition?	
20	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		Regarding Visionary Project Seed Funding, the 40% match isn't reasonable. A 20% and/or In-Kind match should be considered.
21	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		Regarding Subregional Equity Program, the considerations should mirror the funds availability dates accorded to the SFV.
22	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		Regarding the SEP, the statement regarding funds available "if any" is concerning, and these funds should be bonded against, as the SFV is going to be funded ASAP. The Board added the funds, so the subregions should receive it, verses leaving an "if any" option.
23	Yvette Kirrin	GCCOG	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	2% ADA Paratransit Eligible Recipients should be broadened to be any transportation agency providing ADA services, including local operators, such as dial a rides.	

24	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
	Hilary Norton	FAST	Consumer	<p>Page 6 - Project Acceleration, Third Bullet, "Elements that determine eligibility of matching funds from available federal/state discretionary funding sources.</p> <p>Page 22 - Eligible Fund Contributions, End of section paragraph, add language "...amount by the conclusion of thirty percent (30%) of final design, Asset management portfolios, Performance Incentive Grants."</p> <p>Page 37 – Intelligent Transportation Systems, Eligible uses category Add Bullet "Coordinate with Countywide BRT program to optimize on time performance and improved bus speed operations"</p>	<p>Page 10 - Performance Metrics definition. Need clarity on the definition of performance metrics. Does that reflect the December 2015 Performance Metrics for the Mobility Matrix or will these be a new set of Metrics? Will the PAC be advised on how to define them or will that be up to the Metro Board? Does this mean transit and highway programs will have performance on whether or not they are moving more people or are they moving more goods that essential to the consumer driven sales tax receipts which fund our Measure M program? For example, according to LAEDC, 78% of the volume and 64% of the value of the Regions goods move through our streets and highways so should one project be jeopardized over a subjective definition. With this aspect of Performance Metrics, please consider the following definitions as this is consistent with the Mobility Matrix has now been replaced with the Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) Project Development process;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects with the broadest economic benefit that increases sales tax revenue receipts; • That leverage current and future sources of state and federal funding (and must be timely in their request for matching funds); • Based on project readiness; • Projects that optimize opportunities for TOCs/TODs; • Consider communities with the highest need; • Project prioritization should be made in the context that we are expecting an economic downturn and must optimize the revenue that we collect, while being able to most effectively leverage private and public resources in a manner that would expedite major projects to meet or exceed timelines promised to Measure M voters. <p>Page 21 - 3% Local Contribution Need Clarity How</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
					<p>does this definition reflect new stations that intersect existing lines, an example would be the Northern Crenshaw Extension with the Purple Line on Wilshire. Would that be considered a retrofit of an existing or the building of something new? The goal should be to incentivize ridership increases through Multi-modal connectivity so outside of Active Transportation if a local jurisdiction uses and encourages private funding to construct a transit center or Mobility Hub adjacent to a rail station, Does that count towards a city's 3% match?</p> <p>Page 47 – Metro Active Transportation, Reporting requirements, typo? "Metro will provide annual reports to the Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee describing how uses of Measure M system connectivity projects (Highway construction) (replace with Active Transportation) funds are contributing to accomplishing the program and strategic plan objectives."</p> <p>Page 55 – Countywide BRT, Eligible projects first paragraph, language amended "...potential for ridership increases including station amenities, restrooms for health, safety and quality of life,"</p> <p>Page 57 in Subregional Equity Funds. Need Clarity. A detailed explanation should identify where this fund is located relative to the Measure M pie slice, as we recall back in the June 2016 Board meeting through a motion by Director John Fasana, this Subregional Equity pot was to be incorporated as part of the 2% system connectivity, Is this still true?</p> <p>Page 67 – 20% Transit Operations, Eligible uses category. Last sentence "Metro will develop policies that will define and establish criteria for implementing pilot programs that increases ridership and improves operational reliability" Page 67 – 20% Transit</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
					<p>Operations, Maintenance of effort. Second sentence (add language) In addition to implementing new transit services programs that improve headways and hours of operation, eligible recipients may use Measure M 20% funds...</p> <p>Page 72 – ADA Add Bullet: "C) Community outreach to identify and ensure that performance metrics as outlined per contract for this program fund are adhered to and are followed."</p> <p>Page 74 – State of Good Repair Add Bullet: Station improvements that increase ridership and transit system capacity to handle more riders</p> <p>Page 92 – Local Return, Audit Requirements, First Sentence A financial and compliance audit will be conducted annually as part of Metro's Consolidated Audit Program to verify adherence to the Measure M guidelines and be subject to review by the Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee.</p> <p>Pages 98 and 99. Appendix A - Potential 3% jurisdictions. There are examples per the Measure M ordinance and Expenditure plan, where the project explicitly does not assume a specific mode or technology of corridor (LRT vs HRT) that has not had a proper vetting through an environmental impact report. The problem with such assumption is that it prejudices the Environmental Review Process and could place Metro in a litigious pickle albeit innocently. Those examples include on the list: East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor, Sepulveda Pass Corridor, Vermont Corridor, Lincoln Blvd Corridor. All specific technological (LRT or HRT) references should be removed from the list and simply explained "All 3% corridors are all assumed (funding permitted) as rail corridors. Whereas past or currently under environmental review planned definitions, distinction</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
					<p>of phasing or branching or logical extensions of existing Metro Rail lines or under constructed corridors to establish a consistency in definition Examples are; West Santa Ana Corridor, Eastside Phase 2 (SR 60 or Washington Blvd), Green Line extension to Torrance or Orange Line Conversion to Rail where there is specific language included in both the expenditure plan and attachment explanation.</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
25	KeAndra Dodds	Enterprise Community Partners	Consumer	<p>While the guidelines reference alignment with "Vision Zero" or equivalent policies, Metro does not have its own Vision Zero policy to guide investments. We recommend investing in the development and adoption of regional Metro Vision Zero guidance (policy, toolkit or framework) simultaneous to developing sub-guidelines for the 2% Active Transportation category. While specific investments and Vision Zero policies will likely be implemented by local jurisdictions rather than Metro, a regional Vision Zero policy would encourage local jurisdictions to adopt their own policy or provide guidance in the absence of such local policy.</p>	
26	KeAndra Dodds	Enterprise Community Partners	Consumer		<p>The final guidelines should anticipate a transportation equity policy in the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and include mechanisms to advance social equity in the implementation of Measure M programs, such as prioritization and/or set-asides in funding programs. While there were some changes to address this, the revised guidelines still do not include explicit mention of social equity nor the recognition that social equity will be considered in the implementation of Measure M once the LRTP is adopted. It makes the most sense to add it to the administration and oversight section.</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
27	Jacki Bacharach	South Bay Cities Council of Governments	Jurisdiction (City or COG)		<p>Page 7 – At the bottom of Page 7, #5 – Sub-regional funding reductions should come from the sub-region in which the shortfall is happening. It is not clear in the document. Sub-regional funding should be used only with the concurrence of the responsible “sub-regional entities”.</p> <p>Acceleration of projects must not: 1) Reduce the potential funding available for addressing cost containment using the methods listed on page 7; or 2) delay current regional and sub-regional projects due to redirecting funding for acceleration.</p> <p>Page 10 – 1) Sub-regional entities should be consulted before the Metro Board is asked to approve all performance metrics through its 5-year assessment process in consultation with the Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee. Particularly with respect to the sub-regional program and project criteria, the sub-regional entities should also be consulted. 2) Requiring approval only during the 5-year assessment may delay project readiness. There should be a process to accelerate approval changes more often than every 5 years.</p> <p>Page 11 – Any change in subregional boundaries should only be made with consensus of all the sub-regional entities affected.</p> <p>Page 12 – In 2nd group of bullets – the new one re: Changes in Technology should also include better service to the customer/consumer. Bottom of page 12 – The guidelines allow the Metro Board to amend the “Schedule of Funds Available” to accelerate an Expenditure Plan Major Project at any time but changes in commitments to current projects will only be evaluated every 10 years. The two policies are in conflict. Funds from a project that is completed with cost savings or a project that is no longer viable should</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
					<p>be available for re-programming in the following fiscal year.</p> <p>Page 16 – 2nd paragraph from the bottom –Metro should request notice from the responsible sub-regional entity which will compile the 5-year MSPs on behalf of the project sponsors. Sponsors should not be allowed to bypass the sub-regional planning process where there is one.</p> <p>Page 17 – MSP borrowing needs to be approved by the sub-regional entity.</p> <p>Page 26 – Metro allowed .5% of the annual cost of the sub-regional programs to be drawn from the MSP.</p> <p>Sub-regional entities and local jurisdictions should be explicitly eligible for these funds.</p> <p>Page 26 – Parameters from the Mobility Matrices should be developed with concurrence of sub-regional entities. In the 2nd sentence referring to the Mobility Matrices, the word ‘using’ should be replaced with the word ‘considering’.</p> <p>Page 30, 31, 33, 34 – Highway Operational Improvement project funding begins with the Project Identification Document rather than program development. To be consistent with Page 29, this guideline should not preclude use of funding from this category to prepare the project development matrix described on page 26.</p> <p>Page 30, 31, 33, 34 – Metro added a provision that is in Measure R SBHP guidelines that requires Intersection or street widening/improvements to be “on a State Conventional Highway or within one mile of a state highway.” This restriction should be eliminated from the Measure M guidelines to allow projects to be implemented in areas like the Palos Verdes Peninsula that are not within 1 mile of a state highway and yet have major arterials.</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
					<p>Page 30, 31, 33, 34 – Signal synchronization and other intelligent transportation system improvements are not included as eligible projects in any of the Highway MSP categories. They should be explicitly included in the respective lists even though they are generally eligible in their own section beginning on page 37.</p> <p>Page 37 – The guidelines do not currently include broadband or fiber-optic projects as eligible expenditures. Inter-city, sub-regional fiber-optic and broadband projects should be included in the ITS section and justified as a TSM strategy.</p> <p>Page 42 – 1st/last mile should acknowledge eliminating travel through travel demand management strategies or projects. These types of projects should be eligible in the ITS section. The Greenway project category should be broadened slow speed electric transportation.</p> <p>Page 44, 55 – BRT Capital improvements – Metro staff told the PAC that municipal operators would be included, but the guidelines do not yet reflect the change. Included and Municipal Operators and Metro should be explicitly eligible as lead agencies for BRT funded projects within a BRT program coordinated by Metro.</p> <p>Page 48 – Allocation Methodology – It is unclear whether Metro taking an additional .5% here for administration from subregional programs over and above what they are already getting off the top. To avoid Metro double dipping, it should be clarified that Metro's administrative costs do not exceed the %0.05 that taken off the top.</p> <p>Page 53 – Visionary Seed Funding eligibility is still restricted to transit in the revised guidelines. It should be available for other mobility and sustainability ideas beyond transit. The eligible applicants should include</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
					<p>transit operators and other entities rather than relegating others to "partners" for visionary seed funding applications that do not include transit operators.</p> <p>Page 79 – Fiber optic installations are limited to "signal-related electrical system and/or fiber-optic in the roadway." Consistent with the comments on page 37, fiber-optic and broadband programs should be eligible as a transportation demand management projects and should not be limited to installations in the roadway since use of existing utility poles and underground conduits outside the roadway might be more cost-effective.</p> <p>Page 102, 103 – Refocused Taxi Element – Although the guidelines are more inclusive in earlier sections of the document, this section should be expanded to include options to taxi operators such as car sharing and ride sharing providers and autonomous vehicle fleets.</p> <p>Page 103 – Implementation Timeline – On the 4th line, in addition to taxi service, the timeline should include comparable options that exist or may emerge.</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
28	Moises Cisneros	Los Angeles Latino Chamber of Commerce	Consumer		<p>Pulling from the business and small business recommendations, I am concerned that our recommended Business Interruption Fund for small businesses was not addressed. Small businesses in the path of construction have been known to go bankrupt due to the loss of pedestrians and foot traffic caused by construction chokeholds. Find below our original recommendation: INCREASE LOCAL JOB AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP OPPORTUNITIES, AND MITIGATE TRANSIT CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS "We also recommend that the Business Interruption Fund, to assist businesses impacted due to Metro construction, be implemented for all transit, major highway and arterial projects. Beyond the Business Interruption Fund, Metro should provide small businesses with economic tools to help offset economic losses or assist in overcoming loss of clientele due to construction obstructions. These tools can be provided by Jurisdictions or third party providers of small business advisory services"</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
29	Moises Cisneros	Los Angeles Latino Chamber of Commerce	Consumer		<p>Two major issues that are of concern include: 1. No procurement goals or statement for a specific minimum is highlighted for Small Business Enterprises, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises. It's not enough to simply say there will be a goal. That goal needs to be reflective of the surrounding community and capacity for providing a service. 2. Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises are not mentioned at all for procurement goals. We strongly recommend Metro considers the following statement from both the business and small business community represented: "Measure M can be a turning point for the economic empowerment of small business in Los Angeles County. Metro has done a very good job of inviting small and local businesses to do business with Metro but more can be done to expand small business opportunities in Measure M. We recommend that Metro follow the example of the Port of LA to include local businesses in all projects, and report to the Metro Board regularly as to how those goals are being met. For Major projects and Local Return funds, we recommend guidelines of: 25% SBE, 17% DBE/MBE/WBE and 10% DVBE. We recommend prioritizing local small business and retail entrepreneurship opportunities in each Transit Oriented Community/Development, including support and preservation of businesses impacted by Metro project construction. In cases where jurisdictions do not have the capacity to implement the above percentage goals, we recommend that Metro administers the program on behalf of the jurisdiction."</p>

30	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
	Bryn Lindblad	Climate Resolve	Consumer	<p>1.) Administrative development for multi-year subregional programs -- especially highway subfunds - needs to include performance criteria that ensure investments are in alignment with climate goals, multi-modal safety and equitable accessibility priorities. This important process can go a long way in preventing Measure M dollars from doing more harm than good to EJ communities in particular, and should not be rushed through in a non-meaningful way. The 6-month timeline that is currently proposed may be too rushed and should potentially be lengthened to 12 months to create more of an opportunity for developing performance criteria mechanisms that ensure Measure M dollars achieve results that are better than the historical business as usual.</p> <p>2.) Will the supplemental funds provision trigger the State ATP restrictions that do not allow urban greenery to be funded in active transportation projects? If so, this remains a critical gap, that instead Measure M funds should try to fill.</p>	<p>1.) In defining eligible expenditures in the highway subfund, (on pg. 35) the 'Traffic Congestion Relief Investments' program description should not include the outdated level of service (LOS) metric nor misguided road widening as a method to relieve congestion. Instead, it should be replaced with a VMT-reduction metric, as instructed by SB743.</p> <p>2.) "Green", as referred to in the terms 'green infrastructure' and 'green streets' (on pgs. 42 and 78), should not be limited to only describing the stormwater management benefits that come from natural project elements. The definition should be expanded to include urban heat island mitigation / cooling benefits brought about by shade and innovative materials that radiate less heat.</p> <p>Incorporating cooling into transportation infrastructure not only delivers public health benefits, but it also makes active transportation and waiting for the bus more viable options for people who are otherwise deterred from doing so.</p> <p>3.) Operations subfunds (including Metro Rail Operations, pgs. 63-5 and Transit Operations, pgs. 66-9) should include eligibility for: a.) maintenance of green infrastructure, to ensure full life-cycle benefits are achieved. (Often funding for this maintenance piece is overlooked, and doing so in Measure M guidelines could similarly prevent intended environmental and community outcomes.) b) recreational transit service to open space. (This is an important social determinant of health, which Metro is currently studying, and should have an opportunity to receive adequate Measure M funding.) Currently, this is only listed as an eligible expense in the Local Return section, but it should also be in these other categories that support transit service expansion.</p>

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
31	Thomas Yee	LA THRIVES/ Low Income Investment Fund	Consumer	<p>Section 3: The addition of performance metrics is a good step, however the timing of the approval of metrics (as well as evaluation areas and criteria) need to be adopted in advance of the new MSP project development process, and the timeline should be specified in Section 3.</p> <p>Section 8. The Consumer perspective should be explicitly referenced in the introduction. The rationale for the contribution should include language setting forth a goal to maximize multimodal access to all transit stations in every jurisdiction.</p> <p>Section 14. The reference to Vision Zero in Section 14 (page 46) already states "Projects funded with Measure M funds, including Active Transportation 2%. should support the protection of pedestrian and bicycle safety in line with "Vision Zero" or equivalent policies. Since this is to be globally applied, it is more appropriate to be placed in either Section 1, 3, or 9 so that it is clearly a global policy goal, and not just limited to 2% ATP. In addition, in the absence of a Metro Vision Zero policy, the guidelines should allow for the development of Metro Vision Zero guidance as part of administrative and performance procedures. 25.</p> <p>pg 85 - The revision to TOC needs some additional clean-up language. The memo to the PAC refers to a "TOC manual", whereas the revised guidelines refer to the Transit Oriented Communities Program". Neither of these are discrete Metro policy documents. We recommend language that clarifies this reference, and suggest the following: "as described in Metro's Transit Oriented Communities Policy. In the absence of official Policy, jurisdictions should refer to the TOC Demonstration Program." Additionally, the revised guidelines introduce new language on page 93 requiring adherence to expend funds "for</p>	<p>Section 10. The Policy Considerations listed in Section 12, which have been revised to "shall comply with the" ATSP, Complete Streets Policy, CSPP, First/Last Mile Strategic Plan , etc, is more appropriate to be placed in Section 10 covering all of the MSP programs, and should be either moved in entirety into that section. All of the approved MSP categories would include relevant infrastructure improvements that should comply, not just the programs listed in section 12.</p>

		Commenter Name		Organization		Role on the PAC		MINOR Concern	<p>transportation purposes, as defined by these guidelines." Because TOC by definition extends the definition of traditional transportation purposes, this creates uncertainty around expending funds for TOC activities. Clarifying language should be included on either page 85 or 93 clearly stating that all TOC activities described by TOC policy (or Demonstration Program) are included in the definition of transportation purposes. Attachment D. The phrase "including performance metrics" in Section XVIII should be mirrored in other MSP sections, specifically IX-XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, and XIX</p>	MAJOR CONCERN	

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
32	Jessica Meaney	Investing in Place	Consumer		<p>The revised guidelines still lack an affirmative statement that Metro's Complete Streets Policy applies to all funding programs. This leaves project sponsors and stakeholders uncertain as to which policies will apply to what projects, with differing interpretations potentially subjecting projects to administrative and political delays unless the issue is resolved. Metro's Complete Streets Policy itself is clear about its application to all projects and all programs, yet the guidelines only reference the policy under the active transportation programs, which are--by definition--in compliance with complete streets. The revised guidelines include a Metro-administered eligibility screen for all projects funded by the Multiyear Subregional Programs. This is the appropriate place for Metro to evaluate each project's compliance with its Complete Streets Policy, including the local jurisdiction mandate. The final guidelines should be revised to include this requirement unambiguously. The revised guidelines did not change the objectives for any of the highway programs. Traffic safety is still not integrated into the core purpose of investments in the street and freeway system and no specific procedures are proposed to make safety analysis a routine part of highway program administration.</p> <p>The revised guidelines continue to consider state of good repair, maintenance, and beautification projects ineligible for highway program funding, without clearly defining these terms to ensure that complete streets improvements are not inadvertently excluded. The revised guidelines continue to hold projects on city streets to the same objectives as freeway projects. The application of Metro's Complete Streets Policy to these programs remains unclear, despite these programs being the one of the primary funding programs for</p>

		Commenter Name		Organization		Role on the PAC		MINOR Concern		MAJOR CONCERN	
										street improvements in Los Angeles County moving forward.	

	Commenter Name	Organization	Role on the PAC	MINOR Concern	MAJOR CONCERN
33	Joana Hankamer	City of West Hollywood	Jurisdiction (City or COG)	<p>The voters approved Measure M based on promoted programs and projects to be funded by the sales tax; however, many capital projects listed on the Expenditure Plan are not fully funded and many projects were also under-estimated for probable cost*. Metro is therefore urged to engage the Policy Advisory Council (PAC) in discussions about filling the funding gaps in Measure M in order to fulfil the promises of Measure M; and engage the PAC in the development of a comprehensive action plan focused on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. updating the Expenditure Plan based on accurate cost assumptions, 2. competing effectively and successfully in Sacramento for SB 1 funds, and 3. accessing other non-Measure M revenue sources, including federal funds and private sector revenues <p>*For example, the Northern Extension of the Crenshaw/LAX Line was assigned a project cost of \$2.3 billion in the Expenditure Plan based the shortest alignment only, thereby under-estimating all but one alternative before any study has been done to identify a locally preferred alignment. Such insufficient cost estimate assumptions in Measure M create unanticipated budget shortfalls and unrealistic expectations for projects approved by the voters in Measure M. (In 2010 Metro identified more than four possible alignments for the Northern Extension of the Crenshaw/LAX Line, varying in length between 6 and 10 miles).</p> <p>The Draft Guidelines contain many references to the necessity to leverage the revenues generated from the Measure M program. One of the significant leveraging opportunities available to Metro is the recent</p>	

		Commenter Name		Organization		Role on the PAC		MINOR Concern	<p>enactment of "The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017", SB 1 (Beall, Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017). The State has projected that over the next 10 years this new funding program will provide an estimated \$50.0 billion supporting both competitive and formula based transportation programs. Eligible expenditures include, among other activities, transit development, intercity rail, active transportation, local streets, freight projects, local planning, and work force development. For example, Metro has projected that approximately \$260.0 million annually will be available to Los Angeles County jurisdictions for improvements to local streets including "complete streets." One of the key objectives in pursuing SB 1 generated funds is to access the maximum of new state funds to leverage Measure M revenues and accelerate the implementation of "Shovel Ready Projects."</p>	MAJOR CONCERN	