

Eco-Rapid Transit, formerly known as the Orangeline Development Authority, is a joint powers authority (JPA) created to pursue development of a transit system that moves as rapidly as possible, uses grade separation as appropriate, and is environmentally friendly and energy efficient. The system is designed to enhance and increase transportation options for riders of this region utilizing safe, advanced transit technology to expand economic growth that maximizes ridership in Southern California. The Authority is composed of the following public agencies:

City of Artesia

City of Bell

City of Bell Gardens

City of Bellflower

City of Cudahy

City of Downey

City of Glendale

City of Huntington Park

City of Maywood

City of Paramount

City of South Gate

City of Vernon

Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena
Airport Authority

Chair

Maria Davila
Council Member
City of South Gate

Vice Chairman

Zareh Sinanyan
Mayor
City of Glendale

Secretary

Cristian Markovich
Mayor
City of Cudahy

Treasurer

Michael McCormick
Mayor
City of Vernon

Internal Auditor

Ali Sajjad Taj
Council Member
City of Artesia

Executive Director

Michael R. Kodama

General Counsel

Teresa L. Highsmith

Ex-Officio

Rene Bobadilla
City Manager Representative

AGENDA REPORT

TO: Members of Eco-Rapid Transit

FROM: Michael Kodama, Executive Director

DATE: January 13, 2016

SUBJECT: **UPDATE AND/OR ACTION REGARDING DEVELOPMENT OF METRO BALLOT MEASURE PRIORITIES AND GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES**

ISSUE

Staff will provide an update regarding Metro Ballot Measure and Gateway Cities Council of Governments Priorities (see attached).

BACKGROUND

The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has identified over \$273 billion in transportation needs for Los Angeles County. This need, along with the identified financial demand from Measure R projects and initiatives (including the West Santa Ana Branch project) has resulted in Metro seeking to augment and extend Measure R. This includes extending the Measure R tax beyond 2039 through 2057 resulting in \$46 billion in additional revenue and may include an additional 40 year ½ cent sales tax that would bring in another \$74 billion in revenues.

Total new and augmented sales tax revenue is estimated to be \$120 billion.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Board:

1. Discuss information presented and offer action items; and/or
2. Receive and file the report.

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Diane Dubois, MTA Director

BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy

SUBJECT: MTA Long Range Transportation/Ballot Measure Project Prioritization

Issue

What's happened to date:

- Working with Los Angeles County subregions, MTA identified over ***\$273 billion in transportation needs*** for Los Angeles County.
- This need, along with the identified financial demand from Measure R initiatives, has resulted in MTA seeking to augment (extend Measure R) as well as layer an additional ½ cent sales tax, bringing the transportation sales tax levy in Los Angeles County to 2 cents.
- The anticipated tax package to be sent to the voters will most likely be an extension of Measure R, extending the tax beyond 2039 through 2057, yielding an additional 18 years' worth of tax for a total of \$46 billion. On top of this MTA is thinking about layering an additional ½ cent sales tax for 40 years to accumulate an additional \$74 billion in revenue.
- Total new and augmented sales tax revenue is estimated to be \$120 billion.
- For planning purposes the \$120 billion was divided into halves - \$60 billion major capital and \$60 billion state of good repair, transit operations, local return, etc. Using a formula based upon population and employment the major capital funding was divided by subregion, Gateway Cities is estimated to receive \$4.1 billion (2014 \$) in support of major subregional transportation priorities.
- Gateway Cities, along with the other subregional councils of governments submitted a list of transportation priorities. These lists were submitted to the MTA on September 1, 2015; these lists comprise the \$273 billion in identified need.
- On September 15th, the governor signed SB 767 (De Leon) into law that allows the MTA to seek additional taxation. This Bill requires the MTA to submit an expenditure plan for the new tax revenues as well as completion dates for some of the existing Measure R initiatives.
- At the December MTA Board Meeting, the Board was presented with the subregional lists and the Board adopted Performance Measures for Major projects that will be used to prioritize major transportation projects.

Gateway Cities' priorities:

Gateway Cities submitted the following projects as priorities for the subregional major project funding anticipated with the new tax measure.

Target (2015\$)	Project		Cost Assumption	Draft Subregional	Difference
Gateway Cities					
	Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase II - Washington Blvd.	f, j	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 543,000	\$ 957,000
	Green Line Eastern Extension (Norwalk)	j	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ -50,000
	Corridor Improvements (I-605 to I-710)		\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,059,000	\$ 41,000
	I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements	j	\$ 850,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 550,000
	I-710 South Corridor Project	g, j	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 3,500,000
	SR 60/I-605 Interchange HOV Direct Connectors	h	\$ 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	j	TBD		
	Gateway Cities Subtotal		\$ 10,210,000	\$ 4,137,000	\$ 6,073,000

The projects highlighted in yellow are "new" initiatives not included in Measure R although they are included in the financially constrained element of the MTA 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). In addition to these major project nominations, the COG made the following recommendations:

- *Given the financial uncertainties and challenges facing the MTA and the funding gaps identified for major COG Measure R transportation initiatives, the Gateway Cities COG Board recommends that the transportation projects identified in the Measure R Expenditure Plan be given first priority for any new tax revenue – making the completion of Measure R the highest priority.*
- *The COG Board also unanimously voted to make a policy recommendation for the Local Return Element of any new Measure be a minimum of 25% and that active transportation be a priority.*

The first policy recommendation recognizes that of all of the Measure R initiatives in the Gateway Cities subregional only the I-5 is under construction – and this project was funded before the passage of Measure R. In the six years since the passage of Measure R, the other two Gateway Cities highway initiatives are still undergoing the necessary planning and development studies. This is not unexpected as the lead time for highway projects is longer than transit projects. Furthermore there is an acknowledgement that mega-projects such as the I-710 Corridor cannot be funded from a single source and that a collaboration of funds and agency participants will be required to make this multi-billion project work.

The two Gateway Cities transit initiatives; West Santa Ana Branch (Eco-Rapid) and the Metro Gold Line Eastern Extension Phase II (Gold Line II) have made significant progress and are in the technical refinement and environmental clearance phase. Both projects cannot proceed much further until there are funding plans. Any funding plans for either alignment is largely contingent upon new revenues generated from the augmented and enhanced sales tax.

Looking at the bottom line, the Gateway Cities subregional transportation priorities exceeds the amount determined to be due the subregion out of the new tax; Cost Assumption (\$10.2 billion) compared with Draft Subregional Target (\$4.1 billion). This leaves a delta of over \$6 billion. Other subregions ran into this dilemma as well although not to the extreme estimated by Gateway Cities. Project costs were determined along the following funding assumptions as specified in attachment "A". The funding assumptions for the I-5 Corridor differ from the I-710 in that the I-5 is assumed to be wholly funded from the Gateway Cities subregional allocation. Given the state and national importance of the I-5, this project's assumptions should include state and federal allocations in addition to some subregional funds.

The STP has identified between \$34 and \$51 billion worth of transportation infrastructure needs divided into the following modes:

Mode	Total Projects	Cost Estimate
Arterial Improvements	328	\$1.1- \$2 billion
Goods Movement	23	\$7 – 11. billion
Highway	102	\$14.6 – 22.5 billion
Active Transportation	109	\$225 – 471 million
Transit	55	\$8.6 - \$13.1 billion
Other	32	\$2.3 – 3.6 billion
TOTAL	649	\$33.9 - \$51.5 billion

If the GCCOG assigns a dollar amount to active transportation programs it will be setting a funding priority for these projects over the other modes assuming alternative funds can be identified for meeting subregional priorities for the new sales tax. The above needs assessment includes the major subregional and regional initiatives.

A more viable approach is to work with the MTA to assign project funding for interstate projects such as the I-5 Corridor (I-605 to I-710) as a regional project fitting the I-710 role in establishing the Interstate projects. Applying the formula to the I-5 Corridor Project would free up \$825 million in subregional funds to support STP projects. Gateway Cities may also wish to assume that some portion (\$250 million) of the Metro Green Line Norwalk Extension is covered by other agencies. Reducing the commitment of the Gateway Cities capital allocation will provide funding for active transportation and other modes as identified in the STP.

The MTA Board adopted the modified Performance Metrics (Attachment "B") These were modified by the Motion included as Attachment "C"). The performance metrics will be used to evaluate projects for inclusion in the ballot measure and will be used to sequence projects in the Long Range Transportation Plan.

NEXT STEPS

Work with the MTA to revise the funding scenarios to accommodate additional capital for financing additional STP projects from all modes.

Attachment

Attachment A - Gateway Cities Major Capital Funding Assumptions

Attachment B – Performance Metrics Framework

Attachment C – Motion by: Ridley – Thomas, Garcetti, Butts and DuBois

Attachment "A"

Gateway Cities Major Capital Funding Assumptions

1. The Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase II - Washington Blvd. is assumed to be funded partially from Measure R and other LRTP resources and split between the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities based upon a Board decision to adopt both Washington Blvd and SR-60 alignments.
2. The Green Line Eastern Extension (to Norwalk) is assumed to be funded from the subregional allocation.
3. The I-5 Corridor improvements (I-605 to I-710) are assumed to be funded entirely from the subregional allocation unlike other major highway initiatives. This consumes over \$1 billion of the \$4.1 billion.
4. I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements are assumed to require \$300 million from the subregional allocation.
5. The I-710 project is assumed to be divided into four funding areas:
 - 12.5% from existing resources,
 - 12.5% from the State, 12.5% from federal resources,
 - 12.5% from the subregional target (\$500 million as part of the \$4.1 billion)
 - 50% from tolls or fees levied on freight
6. The SR 60/I-605 Interchange HOV Direct Connectors is assumed to be split into thirds with 1/3 being charged to the SGVCOG and 2/3rds charged to GCCOG
7. The West Santa Ana Branch (Eco Rapid Transit Project) Light Rail Project is assumed to be funded with ½ from the subregional allocation and ½ from other sources (presumably state and federal funds)
8. Active Transportation is treated as a subregional priority although no dollar amount has been designated to specifically allocate to this program. The Gateway Cities AT program needs total between \$225 and \$471 million per the Gateway Cities Strategic Transportation Plan (STP).

Attachment A

2017 LRTP Update Proposed Performance Metrics Framework for Major Projects

Metro Theme	Goals and Objectives	System Performance Measures	Weight (%)	Highway Project Performance Measures	Transit Project Performance Measures
Mobility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Relieve</u> Ease congestion • Increase travel by transit, bicycle, and pedestrians • Improve travel times • Improve system connectivity • Increase person throughput • Improve effectiveness & reliability for core riders • <u>Address operating & life cycle costs</u> • <u>Extend life of facility & equipment</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced person hours of delay • Increased person throughput • Reduced single-occupant vehicle mode share • Increased annual boardings per mile • Increased annual hours of delay savings/mile • <u>Improve roadway condition rating</u> • <u>Reduced portion of transit assets past useful life</u> 	<p>35% <u>45%</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased person throughput • Reduced person hours of delay² 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased transit ridership • Increased person throughput • Improved <u>system travel time</u> reliability • Improved service frequency
Economy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase economic output • Support job creation & retention • Support goods movement • Invest in disadvantaged communities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved linkages to major employment/activity centers¹ • Increased number of jobs • Improved REMI Model economic benefit results • Reduced vehicle hours of delay for trucks • Dollars invested in <u>transportation projects in disadvantaged communities</u> 	<p>45% <u>12.5%</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced truck vehicle hours of delay² • Improved job access • Dollars invested in <u>transportation projects in disadvantaged communities</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased transit oriented development • Improved job access • Dollars invested in <u>transportation projects in disadvantaged communities</u>

¹ Employment/activity centers include major employment centers, retail centers, education facilities, and healthcare facilities

² Reduced person and truck hours will serve as the best proxy available for person and truck travel time reliability for Highway projects.

Attachment A

Metro Theme	Goals and Objectives	System Performance Measures	Weight (%)	Highway Project Performance Measures	Transit Project Performance Measures
<p>Accessibility</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase population served by facility • Increase service to transit-dependent, cyclist, pedestrian populations including youth, seniors, and people with disabilities • Improve first-last mile connections • <u>Utilize technology</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job accessibility by population subgroup • Mode choice by income quintile • SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities mapping (CalEnviroScreen) • Increased number of households with access to transit • Increased number of households with access to bicycle infrastructure • Increased number of households with disabled persons with access to transit • <u>Increased access to parks and open space areas</u> 	<p>20% <u>17.5%</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased number of disadvantaged population served • Improved access or system connectivity • <u>Improved access to parks and open space</u> • <u>See note 3</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased number of households population served by frequent transit • Increased number of transit dependent households served • Improved system connectivity • <u>Improved access to parks and open space</u> • <u>See note 3</u>
<p>Safety</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce incidents • Improve personal safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fatalities by mode • Injuries by mode • Fatalities per capita 	<p>45% <u>12.5%</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High fatal and severe injury collision area addressed • Reduced safety conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved transit system safety • High collision area addressed⁴

³ Metro considered measuring “increased network connectivity for walking and biking” and found that while major highway and transit projects may offer accommodations for bicycling and walking, the improvements to bicycle and pedestrian system connectivity will likely be minimal and impossible to compare effectiveness quantitatively from one project to another.

⁴ The Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) is maintained by the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and does not log fatalities and severe injuries on the transit system.

Attachment A

Metro Theme	Goals and Objectives	System Performance Measures	Weight (%)	Highway Project Performance Measures	Transit Project Performance Measures
<p>Sustainability & Quality of Life</p>	<p>Improve environmental quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions • Reduce urban heat island effect • Reduce storm water runoff impacts • Reduce biological and habitat impact <p>Improve public health</p> <p>Improve quality of life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve access to parks and recreation • Reduce noise impacts 	<p>Improve environmental quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced VMT per capita • Reduced GHG per capita • Reduced impact on habitat preservation and open space areas <p>Improve public health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced EPA air quality conformity criteria pollutants • Increased bike, pedestrian, and transit trips <p>Improve quality of life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased access to parks and open space areas 	<p>15% <u>12.5%</u></p>	<p>Reduced impact on environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced GHG emissions • Reduced urban heat island effect • Reduced storm water runoff impact • Reduced impact on habitat preservation and open space areas <p>Improved public health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for active transportation • Improved access to healthcare facilities <p>Improve quality of life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced noise impacts • Improved access to parks and open space 	<p>Reduced impact on environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced GHG emissions • Reduced VMT • Reduced urban heat island effect • Reduced storm water runoff impact • Reduced impact on habitat preservation and open space areas <p>Improved public health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for active transportation • Improved access to healthcare facilities <p>Improve quality of life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced noise impacts • Improved access to parks and open space



Board Report

File #:2015-1704, File Type:Motion / Motion
Response

Agenda Number:17.1

**REGULAR BOARD MEETING
DECEMBER 3, 2015**

Motion by:

Ridley-Thomas, Garcetti, Butts and DuBois

December 3, 2015

**Relating to Item 17, File ID 2015-1608
Prioritizing Mobility through the Long Range Transportation Plan Performance Metrics
Framework**

The next step in developing an updated Long Range Transportation Plan (Plan) will be an analysis of all the major highway and transit projects that have been identified by sub-regional stakeholders following a comprehensive planning process.

The proposed Performance Metrics provide a framework for evaluating these major projects, and incorporates a diverse range of criteria, including mobility, economy, accessibility, safety and sustainability. All of these criteria are critical to consider when designing a balanced transportation system.

However, Metro's primary mission must be to improve commute times, increase public transit options, and enhance the connectivity of our entire transit system. Therefore, the most significant criteria in assessing future regional transportation investments throughout Los Angeles County should be mobility.

AMENDING MOTION by Ridley-Thomas, Garcetti, Butts and DuBois that the Board of Directors revise the Performance Metrics Framework for Major Projects to allocate a 45% weight to the Mobility category and proportionally reduce all other categories equally.