

# San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

## AGENDA AND NOTICE OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE – NOVEMBER 16, 2017 – 4:00 PM

Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District Office

(602 E. Huntington Drive, Suite B, Monrovia, California, 91016)

The Transportation Committee encourages public participation and invites you to share your views on agenda items.

### Chair

John Fasana, Duarte

### Vice-Chair

Sam Pedroza, Claremont

### Members

Alhambra

Claremont

Diamond Bar

Duarte

El Monte

Glendora

La Cañada Flintridge

San Gabriel

South Pasadena

Temple City

Walnut

First District, LA County

Unincorporated  
Communities

Fifth District, LA County

Unincorporated  
Communities

**MEETINGS:** *Regular Meetings of the Transportation Committee are held on the third Thursday of each month at 4:00 PM at the Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District Office (602 E. Huntington Drive, Suite B, Monrovia, California, 91016).* The Transportation Committee agenda packet is available at the San Gabriel Valley Council of Government's (SGVCOG) Office, 1000 South Fremont Avenue, Suite 10210, Alhambra, CA, and on the website, [www.sgvkog.org](http://www.sgvkog.org). Copies are available via email upon request ([sgv@sgvcog.org](mailto:sgv@sgvcog.org)). Documents distributed to a majority of the Committee after the posting will be available for review in the SGVCOG office and on the SGVCOG website. Your attendance at this public meeting may result in the recording of your voice.

**CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:** Your participation is welcomed and invited at all Transportation Committee meetings. Time is reserved at each regular meeting for those who wish to address the Committee. SGVCOG requests that persons addressing the Committee refrain from making personal, slanderous, profane or disruptive remarks.

**TO ADDRESS THE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE:** At a regular meeting, the public may comment on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee during the public comment period and may also comment on any agenda item at the time it is discussed. At a special meeting, the public may only comment on items that are on the agenda. Members of the public wishing to speak are asked to complete a comment card or simply rise to be recognized when the Chair asks for public comments to speak. We ask that members of the public state their name for the record and keep their remarks brief. If several persons wish to address the Committee on a single item, the Chair may impose a time limit on individual remarks at the beginning of discussion. **The Transportation Committee may not discuss or vote on items not on the agenda.**

**AGENDA ITEMS:** The Agenda contains the regular order of business of the Transportation Committee. Items on the Agenda have generally been reviewed and investigated by the staff in advance of the meeting so that the Transportation Committee can be fully informed about a matter before making its decision.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:** Items listed on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and will be acted upon by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Committee member or citizen so requests. In this event, the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered after the Consent Calendar. If you would like an item on the Consent Calendar discussed, simply tell Staff or a member of the Committee.



In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the SGVCOG office at (626) 457-1800. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the SGVCOG to make reasonable arrangement to ensure accessibility to this meeting.



**PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call
4. Public Comment (*If necessary, the Chair may place reasonable time limits on all comments*)
5. Changes to Agenda Order: Identify emergency items arising after agenda posting and requiring action prior to next regular meeting

**CONSENT CALENDAR** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

6. Transportation Meeting Minutes -- Page 1  
*Recommended Action: Approve Transportation Committee minutes.*

**PRESENTATIONS** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

**ACTION ITEMS** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

7. Metro Measure M Subregional Program Funds -- Page 5  
*Recommended Action: Discuss and provide direction to staff.*
8. Metro Measure M Subregional Administrative Funds -- Page 9  
*Recommended Action: Discuss and provide direction to staff.*

**DISCUSSION ITEMS** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA) REPORT** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

9. Oral Report  
*Recommended Action: For information only.*

**UPDATE ITEMS**

10. Metrolink Update  
*Recommended Action: For information only.*
11. Update on Active Transportation Planning Efforts  
*Recommended Action: For information only.*

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT** (*It is anticipated that the Transportation Committee may take action on the following matters*)

12. Oral Report  
*Recommended Action: For information only.*

**COMMITTEE MEMBER ITEMS**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**ADJOURN**



**SGVCOG Transportation Committee Unapproved Minutes**

Date: October 19, 2017  
 Time: 4:00 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 4:15 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Roll Call

**Members Present**

Alhambra B. Messina  
 Claremont S. Pedroza  
 Diamond Bar D. Liu  
 Duarte J. Fasana  
 South El Monte J. Gonzales  
 South Pasadena D. Mahmud  
 LA County District 1 J. Hernandez

**Members Absent**

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

**Staff**

M. Creter  
 M. Christoffels  
 C. Cruz  
 K. Ward  
 P. Duyshart

4. Public Comment

**M. Creter & P. Duyshart:** M. Creter introduced P. Duyshart to the committee, and indicated that he will be assisting with the Transportation Committee.

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

No changes.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

6. Transportation Meeting Minutes: 7/20/2017

**There was a motion to approve the consent calendar (M/S: S. Pedroza/ D. Liu).**

**[MOTION PASSED]**

<b>AYES:</b>	Alhambra, Claremont, Diamond Bar, Duarte, South El Monte, LA County District 1
<b>NOES:</b>	
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	South Pasadena
<b>ABSENT:</b>	El Monte, Glendora, La Cañada Flintridge, San Gabriel, Temple City, Walnut, LA County District 5

## PRESENTATIONS

### 7. *San Gabriel Valley Regional Bike Share Expansion*

D. Roybal (Metro) presented on this item, and provided an overview of Metro's Bike Share System, including fares, regulatory issues, equity issues, and the program's business model. She also discussed the \$4.55 million grant that the SGVCOG has received to expand Bike Share throughout the San Gabriel Valley.

M. Creter indicated that the SGVCOG will be implementing the "Smart Bike" technology.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- Issues that might arise as a result of different service areas utilizing different Bike Share infrastructure.
- Flexibility of bike-use pricing.
- Helmet use for "Smart Bike" users
  - Partnerships with bike shops to provide helmets for Bike Share users.
- O&M of the Bike Share program.
- Municipal billing rates.
- Law enforcement's role in handling Bike Share theft incidents and accidents.
- Possible addition of Cities not currently participating in the Bike Share expansion study.
- Allocation of Bike Share bikes.

### 8. *Metro LRTP and Measure M Update*

M. Ranu (Metro) presented on this item. Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) needs an update because of the passage of Measure M, a measure which raises revenue that will be allocated toward a plethora of new public transportation projects and transportation infrastructure upgrades. M. Ranu went over a variety of aspects of the LRTP, including the Modular Approach, Dynamic Approach, Comprehensive Approach, Metro's new Strategic Plan, and a Policy Advisory Council which has a role in the LRTP update, and had a key role in developing Measure M guidelines.

In addition, M. Ranu also gave a presentation on the *Measure M Project Acceleration/Deceleration Factors and Evaluation Process*. The main idea of this topic is that, according to Measure M, no project can be accelerated if it negatively impacts or slows down another Measure M project. The Metro Board is looking to adopt a new accel./decel. policy in November.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- Impact of State grants or funding on accel./decel. policies.
- How strictly a final accel./decel. policy would be followed and applied.
- How much input the COG can have when it comes to TOD standards along planned Metro Rail lines
- Funding formulas and possible imbalances.

## ACTION ITEMS

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

## METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (MTA) REPORT

### 9. Oral Report

The Chair, J. Fasana, dispensed this item.

## UPDATE ITEMS

### 10. Metrolink Update

J. Gonzales (South El Monte, Metrolink Board of Directors Alternate) provided updates for this item. J. Gonzales reminded members of the Transportation Committee that Metrolink's 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration is coming up and will be at Track 15. He also provided an update on Metrolink's acquisition of 30 Tier 4 locomotives, and about the development of a local ticket application.

11. Update on Active Transportation Planning Efforts

M. Creter (SGVCOG) provided updates pertaining to this item. M. Creter gave quick updates on a network feasibility study, a recent Bike Share workshop, and outreach to five local Cities for the development of active transportation plans.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

12. Oral Report

There was no report on this item.

**COMMITTEE MEMBER ITEMS**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

In the near future, M. Christoffels and M. Creter will provide an update on revenue forecast for the next five (5) years.

Also, there was a reminder that the Metro Board will be on "Holiday Schedule" in November, meaning that Metro Board's committees will meet on November 15-16, and the Metro Board meeting will be held on November 30<sup>th</sup>.

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:39 p.m.



# REPORT

DATE: November 16, 2017

TO: Transportation Committee

FROM: Marisa Creter, Interim Executive Director

VIA: Mark Christoffels, CEO, ACE Construction Authority

**RE: MEASURE M SUBREGIONAL FUNDS; INITIAL FIVE-YEAR PROGRAMMING PLAN**

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

Staff recommends the Transportation Committee concur with proposed programming of the initial five-year Measure M Subregional funds and direct staff to initiate the project selection process to create a full five-year project specific plan for Metro Board approval in accordance with the adopted Measure M Guidelines.

## BACKGROUND

In June, the Metro Board of Directors adopted the Measure M guidelines establishing a process by which subregional funds under Measure M will be programmed by the subregional entities, including the SGVCOG, through the development of five-year subregional fund programming plans. In accordance with these guidelines, five-year project specific programming plans will have to be submitted to the Metro Board of Directors for adoption, which will subsequently guide the flow of funding to various specific projects that fall within each program. Last month staff received from Metro the projected initial five-year cash flow for each subregional fund in the San Gabriel Valley subregion. The funds that would be available for programming are referenced in Table 1.

Program	Sub-region	Funding Dates	FY 2017 FY 2018	FY 2018 FY 2019	FY 2019 FY 2020	FY 2020 FY 2021	FY 2021 FY 2022	5-Year Total	40-Year Fund Total	5-Year Percentage of Total
Active Transportation Prog. (Including Greenway Proj.)	sg	FY 2018-57	\$ 2.30	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.60	\$ 12.20	\$ 231.00	5.28%
Bus System Improvement Program	sg	FY 2018-57	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.60	\$ 0.60	\$ 3.00	\$ 55.00	5.45%
First/Last Mile and Complete Streets	sg	FY 2018-57	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.10	\$ 2.20	\$ 10.40	\$ 198.00	5.25%
Highway Demand Based Prog. (HOV Ext. & Connect.)	sg	FY 2018-57	\$ 2.30	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.40	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.60	\$ 12.20	\$ 231.00	5.28%
Goods Movement (Improvements & RR Xing Elim.)	sg	FY 2048-57							\$ 33.00	0.00%
Highway Efficiency Program	sg	FY 2048-57							\$ 534.00	0.00%
ITS-Technology Program (Advanced Signal Tech.)	sg	FY 2048-57							\$ 66.00	0.00%
<b>San Gabriel Valley MY Subregion Total</b>								<b>\$ 37.8</b>	<b>\$ 1,348.00</b>	<b>2.80%</b>
Gold Line Foothill Extension to Claremont	sg	FY 2019-25			?	?	?		\$ 1,019.00	
SR-71 Gap	sg	FY 2022-26							\$ 248.00	
SR-57/60	sg	FY 2025-31							\$ 205.00	
Gold Line Eastside Extension	sg	FY 2029-35							\$ 543.00	
I-605/10 Interchange	sg	FY 2043-47							\$ 126.00	
SR-60/605 Interchange	sg	FY 2043-47							\$ 130.00	
<b>Major Projects San Gabriel Valley Total</b>									<b>\$ 2,271.00</b>	
<b>Overall Total</b>									<b>\$ 3,619.00</b>	

**Table 1.**  
**Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program 5-Year Cashflows (\$ in millions).**

The cash flow table indicates that for the first five years, the amount of funding available for the subregional programs designated to receive funds in the early years is minimal (roughly 2.8% of the total designated for the 40-year programming period). Staff is assuming that funds are limited for the subregional programs because a significant amount of the early revenues will be allocated to the Foothill Gold Line Extension though the exact amounts are unknown and shown as “?” in the table.

Reviewing the subregional program project lists that were included in the base study for the regions (the adopted Mobility Matrix), it is apparent that the \$12 million to be allocated in the first five years under the Highway Demand Based Program, which is primarily HOV extensions and connections, is insufficient to initiate any projects. In addition, the \$3 million to be allocated under the Bus System Improvement Program, which is primarily for infrastructure improvements related to the express bus system, is also insufficient to initiate any projects.

Rather than have these funds remain in the these subregional programs as accumulated cash with no prospect for expenditures during that period, staff is recommending that these funds be “loaned” to the First/Last Mile and Complete Streets Program and the Active Transportation Program to accelerate projects within the programs. In addition, the SGVCOG earlier this year had issued a Letter of No Prejudice to advance \$5.2 million in Measure M funds to fully fund the Lemon Ave Ramps at the 60 freeway that are currently under construction, and staff is recommending that a portion of the funds available in the Highway Demand Based Program be “loaned” to the Highway Efficiency Program to cover these costs. These “loaned” funds would then be reimbursed when sufficient funding is available to initiate projects under the Highway Demand Based Program and the Bus System Improvement Program.

Based on the above, staff is recommending that \$5.2 million from the Highway Demand Based Program be “loaned” to the Highway Efficiency Program to cover the current Lemon LONP, which is a project that will ultimately get funded under the Highway Efficiency Program. The remainder of the Highway Demand Based Program would be “loaned” to the First and Last Mile Program. \$2.5 million of the Bus System Improvement Programs would be “loaned” to the Active Transportation Program, with \$500,000 to remain in the Bus System Improvement Program to fund specific project planning and conceptual design work. Table 2 shows the funding by program based on the recommended loans between programs:

# REPORT

Program	Sub-region	Funding Dates	FY 2017 FY 2018	FY 2018 FY 2019	FY 2019 FY 2020	FY 2020 FY 2021	FY 2021 FY 2022	5-Year Total	40-Year Fund Total	5-Year Percentage of Total
Active Transportation Prog. (Including Greenway Proj.)	sg	FY 2018-57	\$ 2.40	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.10	\$ 3.20	\$ 14.70	\$ 231.00	6.36%
Bus System Improvement Program	sg	FY 2018-57	\$ 0.50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.50	\$ 55.00	0.91%
First/Last Mile and Complete Streets	sg	FY 2018-57	\$ 2.00	\$ 2.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.60	\$ 4.80	\$ 17.40	\$ 198.00	8.79%
Highway Demand Based Prog. (HOV Ext. & Connect.)	sg	FY 2018-57	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 231.00	0.00%
Goods Movement (Improvements & RR Xing Elim.)	sg	FY 2048-57						\$ -	\$ 33.00	0.00%
Highway Efficiency Program	sg	FY 2048-57	\$ 2.30	\$ 2.40	\$ 0.50			\$ 5.20	\$ 534.00	0.97%
ITS-Technology Program (Advanced Signal Tech.)	sg	FY 2048-57						\$ -	\$ 66.00	0.00%
<b>San Gabriel Valley MY Subregion Total</b>								\$ 37.80	\$ 1,348.00	2.80%
Gold Line Foothill Extension to Claremont	sg	FY 2019-25			?	?	?		\$ 1,019.00	
SR-71 Gap	sg	FY 2022-26							\$ 248.00	
SR-57/60	sg	FY 2025-31							\$ 205.00	
Gold Line Eastside Extension	sg	FY 2029-35							\$ 543.00	
I-605/10 Interchange	sg	FY 2043-47							\$ 126.00	
SR-60/605 Interchange	sg	FY 2043-47							\$ 130.00	
<b>Major Projects San Gabriel Valley Total</b>									\$ 2,271.00	
<b>Overall Total</b>									\$ 3,619.00	

**Table 2.**

**Proposed Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program 5-Year (\$ in millions).**

## NEXT STEPS

Based on direction from the Transportation Committee, this item will be presented to the Planning and Public Works Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) for concurrence and initial project selection for each of the five-year program plans. After input from the TACs, the recommended project specific five-year plans will be brought back to the Transportation Committee for final review before being forwarded to the Governing Board for approval.

Prepared by:   
 Mark Christoffels  
 Chief Executive Officer, ACE

Approved by:   
 Marisa Creter  
 Interim Executive Director



# REPORT

DATE: November 16, 2017  
TO: Transportation Committee  
FROM: Marisa Creter, Interim Executive Director  
RE: **SUBREGIONAL PLANNING FUNDS**

## **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Discuss and provide direction to staff.

## **BACKGROUND**

In February, the Governing Board directed staff to develop a Transportation Planner/Program Manager position and secure Measure M dollars to fund this position. Since that time, SGVCOG staff has participated in the Measure M Policy Advisory Council (PAC) to provide comment on the draft Measure M Guidelines. One objective of this participation was to secure this funding.

In June, the Metro Board of Directors adopted the Measure M guidelines at their June 22 meeting, and these guidelines identify a process by which these funds will be programmed by the subregional entities, including the SGVCOG, through the development of five-year subregional fund programming plans. These plans will be submitted to the Metro Board of Directors for adoption and will then guide the flow of funding to various specific projects that fall within each program. The guidelines also allow for up to 0.5% of the funding from each program to be used to for the development of these five-year programming plans, including conducting the necessary public outreach and coordination with jurisdictions and other stakeholders. As shown in Table 1 below, for the programs in the San Gabriel Valley, this 0.5% cap averages to \$185,125 annually.

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Funding (in millions)</b>	<b>Average Funding Per Year (in millions)</b>	<b>0.5% (per year)</b>
Active Transportation	\$231	\$5.78	\$28,875
Bus System Improvement	\$55	\$1.38	\$6,875
First/last mile & Complete Streets	\$198	\$4.95	\$24,750
Highway Demand	\$231	\$5.78	\$28,875
Goods Movement	\$33	\$0.83	\$4,125
Highway Efficiency	\$534	\$13.35	\$66,750
Subregional Equity	\$199	\$4.98	\$24,875
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,481</b>	<b>\$37</b>	<b>\$185,125</b>

**Table 1.**  
**SGVCOG Subregional Program Funding.**

In October, Metro staff released the draft revenue forecasts for the first five years of Measure M. These revenue forecasts are shown in Table 2, as well as the 0.5% available for administration for each of the funded programs.

Program	Total Funding (in millions) FY 17-22	Percent of 40-year Total	0.5% (total) FY 17-22
Active Transportation	\$12.2	5.3%	\$61,000
Bus System Improvement	\$2.9	5.3%	\$14,500
First/last mile & Complete Streets	\$10.4	5.3%	\$52,000
Highway Demand	\$12.2	5.3%	\$61,000
Goods Movement	-	-	-
Highway Efficiency	-	-	-
Subregional Equity	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$37.7</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>\$188,000</b>

**Table 2.**  
**FY 2017-22 SGVCOG Programmatic Funds**

As shown in Table 2, the SGVCOG’s programs are essentially “underfunded” in the first five years. That is, given the 40-year time frame of the programmatic funds, the baseline assumption would be that subregions would receive 12.5% of its programmatic funds in each of the 8 five-year programming periods. There are several reasons for this assumption. First, the SGVCOG, as well as some other subregions, have large capital projects, such as the Gold Line Phase 2B, programmed in the initial five-year period. Second, some of the SGVCOG’s programs (notably the highway programs) were not scheduled to receive funding until the final 10 years of the initial 40-year plan. Finally, Metro staff indicated that they were conservative with revenue estimates during the initial years of Measure M.

Given this revenue forecast, it is not feasible at this time to fund a transportation program manager using Measure M subregional administrative funds as the sole funding source. Averaged over the five years, the current funding provides for \$37,600 per year. Using the average of the proposed salary range for the position, it is estimated that the annual cost of the position (including salary and benefits) would be approximately \$120,000. Staff is proposing three alternatives for consideration and direction:

- **Option A:** Utilize the available funding to offset the cost of existing staff. Currently, existing SGVCOG staff performs these functions, to the extent possible. Additionally, the SGVCOG contracts with ACE for additional assistance and technical expertise. In FY 2017-18, the MOU with ACE for this work is budgeted at \$25,000.<sup>1</sup> These additional funds could be used to either offset or supplement this funding.
- **Option B:** Utilize the funding to hire a consulting firm to develop a five-year programming plan, conducting outreach to member agencies and other stakeholders. There has been extensive discussion at the Metro Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), led by the transit users group, about the desire to undertake a comprehensive public participation plan in developing the five-year programming plans. The Metro Board of Directors has not yet provided guidance on this subject. However, the SGVCOG could choose to dedicate a significant portion of the administrative funds to this purpose.

<sup>1</sup> While the SGVCOG and ACE are in the process of integrating staff, the SGVCOG would still need sufficient funds to cover the cost of former “ACE staff” working on “SGVCOG activities” regardless of whether these is a single personnel structure.

- **Option C:** Approve a special assessment equal to 0.5% of cities' Measure M local return for this initial five-year period in order to fund this full-time position.<sup>2</sup> This would mirror the 0.5% administrative funding available under the subregional programs. Table 3 shows the cost per city based on the estimated annual local return revenue. Combined with the subregional funds, this would provide a total of \$163,068 annually, which would be sufficient to fully fund the position.

City	Local Return	0.5% (Annual)	0.5% (5 year Total)
Alhambra	\$ 1,215,300	\$ 6,077	\$ 30,383
Arcadia	820,600	4,103	20,515
Azusa	702,200	3,511	17,555
Baldwin Park	1,094,600	5,473	27,365
Bradbury	15,400	77	385
Claremont	515,400	2,577	12,885
Covina	694,400	3,472	17,360
Diamond Bar	805,100	4,026	20,128
Duarte	310,300	1,552	7,758
El Monte	1,644,800	8,224	41,120
Glendora	731,100	3,656	18,278
Industry	6,300	32	158
Irwindale	20,900	105	523
La Puente	578,100	2,891	14,453
La Verne	469,400	2,347	11,735
Monrovia	531,400	2,657	13,285
Montebello	910,700	4,554	22,768
Monterey Park	881,700	4,409	22,043
Pomona	2,165,400	10,827	54,135
Rosemead	781,600	3,908	19,540
San Dimas	493,200	2,466	12,330
San Gabriel	575,600	2,878	14,390
San Marino	190,600	953	4,765
Sierra Madre	158,200	791	3,955
South El Monte	296,100	1,481	7,403
Temple City	515,300	2,577	12,883
Walnut	429,900	2,150	10,748
West Covina	1,540,000	7,700	38,500
LA County <sup>3</sup>	14,943,600	30,000	150,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 34,037,200</b>	<b>\$ 125,468</b>	<b>\$ 627,340</b>

**Table 3.  
Proposed Matching Funds for Subregional Planning.**

<sup>2</sup> This special assessment would only include cities included in the San Gabriel Valley subregion under Measure M, as well as the County.

<sup>3</sup> The annual local return estimate for LA County represents the total funding across the County for all unincorporated communities. Based on estimates of the unincorporated population in the San Gabriel Valley, an assessment of \$10,000 per Supervisorial District was included in this chart.

**NEXT STEPS**

Based on direction from the Transportation Committee, this item will be presented to the Executive Committee and City Managers' Steering Committee for further input before being presented to the Governing Board.

Prepared by: Marisa Creter  
Marisa Creter  
Interim Executive Director