



City of Culver City

Staff Report

File #: 16-974, **Version:** 1

Item #: A-5.

(1) Discussion of and Comments on Metro's Measure M Draft Guidelines; and (2) Direction to the City Manager as Deemed Appropriate.

Meeting Date: May 8, 2017

Contact Person/Dept: Diana Chang/Transportation
Shelly Wolfberg/City Manager's Office

Phone Number: (310) 253-6566 or (310) 253-6000

Fiscal Impact: Yes No

General Fund: Yes No

Public Hearing: **Action Item:** **Attachments:**

Commission Action Required: Yes No **Date:**

Public Notification: (E-Mail) Meetings and Agendas - City Council (05/02/17);

Department Approval: John M. Nachbar, City Manager (05/02/17)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the City Council (1) discuss and provide comment on Metro's Measure M Draft Guidelines; and (2) provide direction to the City Manager as deemed appropriate.

BACKGROUND

On June 23, 2016, the Metro Board of Directors (Metro Board) approved the Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan Ordinance (#16-01, the "Ordinance"). This Ordinance, known as Measure M, includes funding for the Westside subregion and Culver City. The City Council took a support position on Measure M at its September 12, 2016 City Council Meeting. Measure M, was approved by more than 71% of voters at the November 8, 2016 general election.

As a result, the projects and programs in the Expenditure Plan of the Ordinance have been approved and must now be implemented accordingly. On March 23, 2017, the Metro Board approved the release of the Draft Measure M Guidelines for public comment. The public comment review period is from March 23 through May 26, 2017. More information about Measure M and the complete draft

guidelines can be found by clicking here: <http://theplan.metro.net/#measurem>
<<http://theplan.metro.net/>>.

As part of the public review, the newly formed Policy Advisory Council (PAC) - representing transportation consumers, providers and jurisdictions - will comment and advise the Metro Board on the draft guidelines (Attachment 1). Transportation Director Art Ida serves on the PAC representing Municipal Transit Operators, and Cecilia Estolano, Executive Director of the Westside Cities Council of Governments (WSCCOG), represents the WSCCOG Board on the PAC.

Ms. Estolano and WSCCOG staff have been discussing the Measure M Draft Guidelines. Ultimately, the WSCCOG Board will discuss a WSCCOG comment letter to Metro at its May 18, 2017 Board Meeting to meet the comment deadline of May 26, 2017. City staff will also draft a comment letter comprised of Culver City-specific issues.

Key Issues in the Measure M Guidelines

One project to be funded by Measure M is the Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor project (Sepulveda Pass Project). Metro indicates that Phase 1 of this project could be an Express Lane project on the I-405 Freeway between the US-101 and I-10. Phase 2 of this project is anticipated to be a high capacity transit mode connecting the Orange Line Van Nuys station underneath the Sepulveda Pass, with a station at UCLA, terminating at Wilshire/Westwood Purple Line station. Phase 3 is an approximate 10 mile extension from the Metro Purple Line Wilshire Boulevard/Westwood Station to the Airport Metro Connector Station at 96th Street/Aviation Boulevard at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX). Phase 3 will have direct impacts to Culver City, as its alignment will go through the City. Metro staff indicates that the Sepulveda Pass Corridor - Westwood to LAX project (Phase 3 is shown in the Measure M Expenditure Plan as breaking ground in FY 2048 and opening in FY 2057.

Metro staff indicates that in order to comply with the Metro Board of Directors direction to sequence projects using specified performance criteria, Metro assumed a Sepulveda Boulevard alignment with five new stations for Phase 3 of the Sepulveda Pass Project. A great deal of study and alternatives analysis will need to be considered before any one alignment or number of stations are actually selected, including the mode (like Light Rail Train vs. Heavy Rail Train). The Measure M 3% contribution (detailed below) is to be based on the project's configuration at 30% of design completion in (i.e. no earlier than about FY 2048). Culver City and all other stakeholders will be engaged at the appropriate time. Measure M stipulates that the project eligible for funding from Measure M must be defined by the environmental process.

According to Metro, for the purposes of the performance based analysis directed by the Metro Board, two of the assumed stations in Phase 3 happen to be in Culver City, the first at Washington Boulevard/Sepulveda Boulevard and the second at Slauson Avenue/Sepulveda Boulevard. A third station was assumed at Center Drive/Sepulveda Boulevard (Howard Hughes). This third station is not in Culver City, but is within ½ mile of the Culver City boundary. Metro states that these are just working assumptions for a project whose formal study phase would normally begin about 25 years from now, and many changes could occur during that period of time.

3% Local Contribution to Major Transit Projects

The Measure M Ordinance includes a provision for 3% local contribution to major transit capital

projects. Metro's rationale for the contribution is that local communities with a fixed guideway station receive a direct benefit due to the increased access to high quality transit service that is above and beyond the project's benefit to the County as a whole. Countywide, the 3% local funding contribution represents approximately \$1 billion in funding to support the project delivery identified in the Measure M Expenditure Plan. The 3% local funding contribution is a critical element of a full funding plan for these transit projects. The Ordinance includes provisions that allow development of a mutual agreement between a jurisdiction and Metro, and a default penalty if such an agreement cannot be reached. The agreements shall be in accordance with the Measure M Guidelines.

Opt Out Option

Metro will withhold up to 15 years of Measure M Local Return Funds for local agencies that fail to reach a timely agreement with Metro on their 3% contribution prior to the award of any contract authorizing construction of the project within the borders of that jurisdiction. Local return funds from Proposition A, Proposition C, and Measure R are not subject to withholding. In some cases, principally in smaller cities, the default withholding of 15 years of local return from only Measure M Local Return Funds will be less than a formal 3% contribution. In these cases, the cities which default on making their full 3% contribution will suffer no further impact.

DISCUSSION

The City has an opportunity to provide input on the draft Measure M Guidelines to both the WSCCOG Comment Letter to Metro, and the City will be drafting its own comment letter. Included below are staff's initial recommended comments to the Measure M Draft Guidelines:

1. 3% Local Contribution for Major Transit Capital Projects

- For projects like Phase 2 and 3 of the Sepulveda Pass, where station locations are still quite speculative, and the environmental review process has not yet been done, flexibility should be given to local jurisdictions (that will be subject to the 3% local contribution) to negotiate with Metro on the amount of contribution and types of contribution. This is especially important in cases where a jurisdiction may be required to pay towards more than one station, and the flexibility to negotiate and determine a reasonable way for jurisdictions to contribute toward these rail projects is needed. Jurisdictions should not be penalized (by having up to 15 years of their Measure M local return funding withheld), when they have no control over these rail projects, their costs, and the station locations.
- The guidelines allow for the inclusion of the first/last mile improvements as part of the 3% contribution. However, there should be greater flexibility on what first/last mile improvements can qualify, as Metro rail projects may only contain very basic first/last mile improvements in their base projects, and some first/last mile improvements that the City wants to do may be deemed as betterments. Local jurisdictions should be able to claim all first/last mile improvements as part of their 3% contribution.

2. Definition of Population for the Local Return Allocation

- Culver City supports the inclusion of the daytime population and employment

population in the definition of population for local return allocation. This inclusion of the daytime population and employment population, along with the residential population, would more properly reflect the use of the transportation infrastructure and will more equitably distribute funding based on the use of the infrastructure.

3. The WSCCOG Multi-Year Subregional Program (First/Last Mile Program)

- The guidelines state that the projects in the Mobility Matrix are eligible for funding under this program. However, the subregions should be allowed to add projects to the Mobility Matrix to accommodate for future projects. Under this program, the authority to determine what projects are permitted to be included and/or funded should rest on the subregions.
- The guidelines should also allow for all phases of the project, including planning/project development, to be funded using Measure M funds.
- The guidelines limit this category of funding to capital projects only. Transportation Demand Management programs/strategies should be eligible to be funded under this program. This would allow for innovative mobility strategies and technology applications that are integral to the enhancement of mobility and to encourage/incentivize change in modal choices.
- The I-10/Robertson Multimodal Circulation Improvement Project is under the WSCCOG Multi-Year Subregional Program, and a footnote should be added under the Expenditure Plan and/or the Measure M guidelines so that this project is not bound to only improvements defined in the guidelines under the First/Last Mile Program for the Westside.
- There is no clear, defined process describing how the projects will get selected and funded under this program. Metro needs to provide guidance and support on setting up the process for each subregion.

4. Subregional Equity Fund

- The subregional Equity Funds should be made available to all the subregions when the funding for the San Fernando Valley sub-regional equity project becomes available.
- Projects under this category should be developed by the subregions (COGs). The guidelines should not impose any special project readiness or local contribution requirements for these funds.

5. Other Issues

- The Guidelines allow the Metro Board to change the sub-regional boundaries starting in 2047. The Guidelines should require concurrence from the sub-regions rather than as a unilateral Metro action.

City staff hopes to gain additional City Council direction to share with the WSCCOG and incorporate into the City's comment letter to Metro.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

There is no fiscal impact for the City Council to discuss this item.

ATTACHMENTS

None.

MOTION

That the City Council:

1. Discuss Metro's Measure M Draft Guidelines; and
2. Provide comments on the Measure M Draft Guidelines; and
3. Authorize the City Manager to transmit the City's comments on Metro's Measure M Draft Guidelines; and
4. Provide additional direction to the City Manager as deemed appropriate.