Presentation
a) Introduction
   • Purpose is to align MAT Program funding opportunity with Board directed policies, PAC input, and community needs.
b) MAT Program Structure/Basic
   • Prioritization could be revisited each cycle
   • Questions:
     i. Is there a way to include a layer for strategic priorities to leverage existing Metro efforts (e.g. NextGen)? To leverage other jurisdictions’ efforts and funds?
     ii. Could expected service increase be included as a prioritization criterion (e.g. results from NextGen)?
        a. Answer: Suggest consideration in future cycles (NextGen will still be a work in progress while cycle one is developed).
c) Administrative Procedures
   • 30-day formal commenting period ends 4/19/19
   • Structured to be evergreen but could be revisited as appropriate
d) Cycle One Concept Proposal
   • Staff proposes to split cycle one funding 50/50 between first/last mile priority network (FLMPN) and regional active transportation corridors (RATC), and define activities that catalyze the Active Transportation Strategic Plan (ATSP) defined network.
   • Questions:
     i. If there are RATC that are not currently on the project list, could they be added?
        a. Answer: The presented project list is defined by ATSP and is the final list of projects for consideration.
     ii. Could projects much less than $2-5M be considered (e.g. upgrading pedestrian crossing intervals)?
        a. Answer: We are open to that. Exact scope and scale of projects is subject to on-going input and coordination with cities.

Discussion
• Questions:
  i. How will this program address existing corridor projects that already have some level of collaboration underway?
     a. Answer: When we issue the solicitation for Letters of Interest, we will request information regarding any current collaboration or partnerships. We do not anticipate this information will be a part of the screening or prioritization criteria/evaluation.
ii. Could each City apply to both pots of funds, or just one?
   a. Answer: Cities could apply to both programs; however, it is anticipated that there will be a cap in the number of FLMPN projects that a single City could be awarded in Cycle 1.

iii. Could the financial need assessment in the ATSP be a part of the Administrative Procedures? Instead of 50/50, how could the existing financial assessment shape the funding allocation of the program?
   a. Answer (inclusive of post-meeting follow up): Draft Admin Procedures will be revised to reflect financial need assessment as a factor for consideration in funding allocations. For Cycle 1, staff continues to recommend a 50/50 funding split to jumpstart both categories of critical active transportation investments. As this is the first round of a 40 year program, there will be additional opportunity to revisit allocations with each cycle. Staff further suggests focus on project screening and prioritization criteria to ensure that projects are targeted to highest need locations.

iv. How will outside entities be involved on reviews?
   a. Answer: The approved project screening and prioritization methodology will be used to identify a list of project priorities. Metro grant program evaluation panels typically consist of Metro staff, however we will explore the feasibility of including an external representative. Additionally, all projects will need a public engagement component. Should the solicitation process require a detailed review/evaluation, we are open to including external reviewers.

v. Should the mobility criteria be separate or distinct for the two pots?
   a. Answer: The specific factors considered differ due to the different programs and project types (e.g., not all regional corridors intersect with transit/rail stations, so considering transit ridership numbers would not be helpful).

vi. How do the dollars get split?
   a. Answer: Based on the approved screening and prioritization methodology, a list of priority projects will be identified. The 50/50 funding split is a target for Cycle 1 and can be revisited in subsequent cycles (see “iii” above).

vii. How does HIN get factored into projects that are off street?
   a. Answer: We depended on statewide data (TIMS/SWITRS). We considered safety issues occurring within a buffered area along the corridors. Specifically, to calculate the safety score for each ATSP corridor, we created a three-mile buffer around each corridor and identified the census tracts that were within or that intersected within the buffer. We summed the safety statistics for the census tracts and divided by the total population (i.e., normalized by population).

viii. Why are daily boardings a factor for FLM but not for AT corridors?
   a. Answer: Daily boardings was a critical factor in developing the ATSP that subsequently led to Board policies which guided
first/last mile planning and implementation activities around these stations. However, not all regional corridors intersect with transit/rail stations, so considering transit ridership numbers could not be consistently evaluated.

ix. Is there a projected use of the corridors for total daily estimated users? Annual estimated users?
   a. Answer: Our focus is on prioritizing projects based on need, especially equity and safety. Staff suggests an emphasis on utilization as an evaluation metric following cycle implementation.

x. Concern that cities may gear up for an application process for which they may not be competitive.
   a. Answer: We’re trying to do the opposite of this, by screening to a limited list of high-need project locations and seeking an expression of interest as an initial step which is anticipated to be far less burdensome than a traditional application. This is a direct response to the idea of not requiring applicants throughout the County to invest significant staff resources for a relatively modest amount of funding in the cycle in which a limited number of projects will be funded.

xi. Happy that equity indices are present. Would like to see these given the greatest weight, in case that the connectivity and equity indices are opposed to one another. Low ridership might mean that the infrastructure is already poor, so it might be a reason to rank higher among the universe of projects.
   a. Answer: Comment noted.

xii. Hard to comment on the screening and relative weighting without seeing the underlying methodology. Perhaps the methodology could be released without being attached to an actual list, to avoid the impulse to tweak it to support certain projects.
   a. Answer: Comment noted. Staff to circulate methodology and allow for questions/comments and responses in advance of presenting program recommendations to the full PAC.

xiii. Are there other guiding policies for allocating funding with MAT, including particularly SBE requirements? Could these be integrated into MAT?
   a. Answer: To the extent projects are procured by Metro, the projects will follow Metro procurement policies, including SBE requirements.

xiv. LADOT: Methodology questions are only thing that might be a question before bringing it to the PAC in June.
   a. Answer: Comment noted. Staff to circulate methodology and allow for questions/comments and responses in advance of presenting program recommendations to the full PAC.
**Next Steps/Action Items**

- Metro to seek feedback on program approach from jurisdictions and to provide orientation for potential high-need project locations.
- Allow working group to review methodology and provide feedback before bringing it to the PAC in June.