



SPECIAL SGVCOG Transportation Committee Approved Minutes

Date: March 15, 2018
 Time: **4:30 PM**
 Location: Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
 602 E. Huntington Dr., Suite B, Monrovia, CA 91016

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order
 The meeting was called to order at 4:44 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

Members Present

Alhambra
 Claremont
 Diamond Bar
 Duarte
 El Monte
 South El Monte
 South Pasadena
 LA County District 1

B. Messina
 S. Pedroza
 C. Herrera / D. Liu
 J. Fasana
 J. Velasco
 G. Olmos, J. Vasquez
 D. Mahmud
 W. Rehman

Members Absent

Glendora
 La Cañada Flintridge
 San Gabriel
 Temple City
 Walnut
 LA County District 5

SGVCOG Staff

M. Creter
 M. Christoffels
 E. Wolf
 C. Cruz
 P. Duyshart
 S. Hernandez

4. Public Comment

No public comment.

5. Changes to Agenda Order: Identify emergency items arising after agenda posting and requiring action prior to next regular meeting

No changes to the agenda order.

CONSENT CALENDAR

6. Transportation Meeting Minutes: 02/15/2018

There was a motion to approve the consent calendar (M/S: C. Herrera / D. Mahmud).

[MOTION PASSED]

AYES:	Claremont, Diamond Bar, Duarte, El Monte, South El Monte, South Pasadena
NOES:	
ABSTAIN:	

ABSENT:	Alhambra, Glendora, La Cañada Flintridge, San Gabriel, Temple City, Walnut, LA County District 1, LA County District 5
----------------	--

ACTION ITEMS

- 7. California Proposition 69: ACA 5, Frazier. Motor vehicle fees and taxes: restriction on expenditures: appropriations limit.

P. Duyshart presented on this item. He began his presentation on this item by providing background on SB 1 (Beall), which is a major transportation funding bill which increased taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel, increased vehicle registration fees, and established a new Road Improvement Fee. He also discussed how the SB 1 transportation taxes and fees will raise \$5 billion per year when all fees are in effect, and he also outlined what the tax increases will consist of, and when each specific tax and fee will go into effect.

Additionally, Mr. Duyshart also described how the State Legislature included provisions in SB 1 which dedicate all of the SB 1 revenues to transportation expenditures. However, while the California State Constitution mandates that revenues from the gasoline excise tax, diesel excise tax, and the Road Improvement/Zero-Emission Vehicle Fee must be restricted to transportation expenditures, the State Constitution does not require revenues from the Transportation Improvement Fee or the Diesel Sales Tax to be spent for transportation purposes. This means that, in the future, the Legislature would be able to change the current law to allow the California Government to spend some of the revenues from these SB 1 taxes and fees on non-transportation purposes.

P. Duyshart also pointed out how the California Constitution requires that the state government keeps its annual spending at or below a certain level. However, the State Constitution does exempt most spending from gasoline and diesel excise tax revenues and capital projects from counting toward this spending cap. The way the pertinent clauses of the Constitution are written and structured, only about one-tenth of the spending from SB 1 revenues counts toward this mandated limit.

Duyshart then discussed how Assembly Constitutional Amendment (ACA) No. 5, which was drafted by Asm. Frazier, addresses the two issues which are described above: the issues pertaining to *restrictions on revenues* and *spending limits*. ACA 5 addresses the restrictions on revenues issue by amending the State Constitution to require that ALL SB 1 revenues be spent on transportation purposes only. Additionally, ACA 5 also prohibits the State from loaning out SB 1 revenues and from using transportation improvement fee revenues to repay state transportation bonds. Moreover, ACA 5 addresses the spending limits issue by amending the State Constitution to exempt ALL revenues (instead of 90% of the revenues) raised from SB 1 from counting toward state and local spending limits.

ACA 5 will appear on the California ballot as Proposition 69, a legislatively referred constitutional amendment, on June 5, 2018. P. Duyshart then stated that SGVCOG Staff recommends that the Transportation Committee recommend that the Governing Board adopt a resolution to support ACA 5.

Questions/Discussion: There were no questions from the Committee.

There was a motion made to recommend that the SGVCOG Governing Board formally support ACA 5 / Proposition 69 (M/S: D. Mahmud / C. Herrera)

[MOTION PASSED]

AYES:	Alhambra, Claremont, Diamond Bar, Duarte, El Monte, South El Monte, South Pasadena
--------------	--

NOES:	
ABSTAIN:	
ABSENT:	Glendora, La Cañada Flintridge, San Gabriel, Temple City, Walnut, LA County District 1, LA County District 5

PRESENTATIONS

8. San Gabriel Valley Bike Share Expansion Update

M. Creter, the Interim Executive Director of the SGVCOG, presented this item to the Transportation Committee. She began the presentation by providing background about the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds (GGRF) grant from the California Transportation Commission (CTC). In August 2017, the CTC awarded the COG with \$4.554 million in GGRF funds for a Bike Share Expansion Program in 14 SGV cities. This grant money is to fund 840 Bike Share Bicycles. While the grant provides sufficient funding to purchase and order the bicycles, the SGVCOG would have to identify additional funds to pay for Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds for the daily upkeep and operation of the SGV Metro Bike Share System. Ms. Creter then listed the 14 SGV cities which have chosen to participate in the in bike share grant.

Additionally, since 2015, the SGVCOG has been working with Metro to conduct studies to determine where Bike Share stations should be located in each of the participating cities. These studies would project practical station locations, estimated bike share ridership, and system costs.

M. Creter continued her presentation by going over the components, structure, and elements of LA Metro’s current bike share system. LA Metro currently employs a Bike Share technology known as “Station-Based.” With Station-Based Bike Share systems, there are established, permanent stations at which the bikes are attached to “docks” which lock the bikes when they’re at rest. Station-Based stations consist of bikes, docks, a system map, and a pay kiosk. Additionally, while there is some system compatibility and consistency right now between Metro Bike Share and the Metro Transit system, there is the potential for full TAP Card integration by Late Fall 2018. Also, Metro is looking at adding two new Bike Share technologies to its system: “Smart Bike” technology and “Pedal Assist” technology. M. Creter then discussed the current fare structure of Metro Bike share.

Creter transitioned to going more in-depth regarding Metro Bike Share’s system and benefits. With Metro’s Bike Share system, Metro provides a plethora of useful services for the planning stages, including, but not limited to: technical assistance, conducting of feasibility studies, environmental clearances, and demonstrations. Additionally, when a Station-Based Bike Share system is operational, Metro provides services such as: bicycle and station maintenance, vehicles for minor repairs and rebalancing of bikes, customer service and support, marketing, and monthly reporting. However, M. Creter explained that Metro Bike Share has some concerning challenges. First, ridership is inconsistent, underperforming, and difficult to project. The City of Pasadena has seen ridership plummet in recent months, for example. Metro Bike Share is also incredibly costly for cities to operate. Cities would be responsible for up to \$3,666,000 of total O&M costs. As a result, some individual SGV cities are starting to look at cheaper dockless bike companies to provide bike share services in their respective cities.

Given the current landscape, M. Creter explained to the Committee that the SGVCOG needs to reevaluate Bike Share options, and likely should not consider Metro’s station-based bike system anymore. The SGVCOG wants to work with participating member cities and provide a broad range of possible options and technologies, so that participating member cities can determine which technology is most practical and feasible.

M. Creter then presented three possible Bike Share technologies that the SGVCOG wants participating cities to now consider. The first two systems are systems that Metro is currently developing: the Smart Bike (DASH) and Pedal-Assist (DASH+). The third new technology for consideration is dockless bike share, which is not offered by Metro and is instead offered by multiple third party companies. Ms. Creter provided the Committee with an overview of each system technology, as well as the pros and cons of each. After providing the Committee with detailed information about each system for consideration, she pointed out that COG staff has concluded that it would be most affordable and practical for cities to employ dockless bike share programs. However, COG staff advises that participating member cities should meet with the COG to develop a consensus on the preferred Bike Share fleet for a City to employ, whether it consists of entirely of one bike share technology, or a combination of multiple new technologies.

M. Creter concluded her presentation by providing a bike share deliverables timeline and by asking the Transportation Committee for direction and feedback about how to proceed.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- The need to look at other technologies due to the demands of the market.
- Since there are now new and invasive Bike Share technologies in the market, is it possible to change the GGRF grant guidelines, and agreements with Metro pertaining to this grant?
- How can we set up policy related to encouraging user to put dockless bikes away “properly” in designated Bike Share spaces, rather than just left around in an unorganized manner? How can we do this though with impeding the marketplace?
- How can the SGVCOG and its participating bike share cities provide better public engagement and education about how residents can utilize any current or future Bike Share system?
- M. Creter said that the SGVCOG has a sample MOU for dockless bike share on file.
- Someone on the Committee brought up helmets. He asked what regulation or enforcement of helmets there would be, and another Committee member remarked that other Bike Share systems have had problems with head lice on communal helmets.
- One Committee member described how Ofo came to his City and did a demonstration event. They do have restricted rules regarding helmets. His City offers a monthly bike ride for education, and he encouraged residents of surrounding cities to join in on these education rides. Additionally, he thinks that more Bike Share information should be posted on social media. Advocates for Dockless. As far as moving bikes around in an organized way, he thinks that a city’s law enforcement group should move the bikes around.
- One member of the Committee who had already spoken pointed out that the CicLAvia Open Streets event in San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, and Claremont is a great marketing opportunity.
- Have any cities in the SGV subregion pioneered a franchise agreement?
- One Committee member expressed concern that a proliferation of competing bikes will cause compatibility problems across city lines.
- Will there be any enforcement mechanisms for leaving bikes around in an unordered manner, either for the user or the bike company?
- There was concern expressed about the battery technology, the charging, and the exorbitant costs of the pedal assist bikes.
- Is it possible to ask the CTC for an extension on this grant so that agencies such as the COG can be more deliberate in choosing technologies?
- The matter of possible TAP integration with any of Metro’s bike share technologies was brought up.
- All committee members pointed out that we need to make a smart, reasoned comprehensive decision.

- A Committee member argued that Metro’s current Bike Share model works in DTLA, but not in other non-dense places.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

9. Update on Measure M Subregional Fund Programming

M. Christoffels, the Chief Engineer of the SGVCOG and ACE, provided this update. He reminded Committee members that Metro’s Measure M guidelines require each subregional entity, including the COG, to submit an MSP 5-Year Plan to the Metro Board of Directors for adoption. He then went over the funding that would be available for each subregional sub-program, as adopted by the Governing Board. Based on the funding allocation for each sub-program, SGVCOG staff will assign funding for the highest priority projects, mainly for active transportation projects, first/last mile projects, and highway efficiency projects. COG staff will identify the most important and highest-priority projects by consulting the COG’s adopted Mobility Matrix. Mr. Christoffels alerted the Committee that COG staff will likely present a draft list of selected projects for Measure M funding at the Committee’s May meeting, and that this draft list will first be presented to the Public Works and Planners’ TACs in April.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA) REPORT

10. Oral Report

The Chair, J. Fasana, provided the MTA Report.

- FYI: Metro’s big item on March 1 was what to do with the 710 Freeway. There was an option to widen the 710 South. There is not much appetite to widen the footprint. This would also be expensive.
 - W. Rehman commented that Options 7 and 5c pertaining to the 710 freeway have moved forward, and that an Early Action Program and Community Improvement Packages (sound walls, active transportation infrastructure, etc.) are also moving forward, but that loans for these project would be in the \$2 billion range.
- Fasana said there’s also a plan to have a zero emissions lane on the 710 Freeway.
- Fasana also noted that he was contacted by South Pasadena about having Security on the Gold Line. Another Committee member added that there is a lot of security on the Red Line now, but Security staff talks to each other instead of fanning out to provide more coverage and presence.

UPDATE ITEMS

11. Metrolink Update

S. Pedroza reported that Metrolink is targeting to have new meetings to talk about funding mechanisms for line and system upgrades.

12. Update on Active Transportation Planning Efforts

No update.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

13. Oral Report

There was no report on this item.

COMMITTEE MEMBER ITEMS

No Committee member items.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Transportation Committee permanent time change: the new 4:30 PM start time will be permanent moving forward. P. Duyshart noted that the Governing Board will vote to formally approve this change at tonight's meeting.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.