

Historical Perspective

The Metro Board of Directors established a vision for enhanced station access and safety by enacting First/Last Mile (FLM) policies. Specifically, Motion 14.1 in May 2016, followed by Motion 14.2 in June 2016, directed activities to facilitate and implement FLM networks around transit stations and stops countywide. Taken together, these policies envision a network of routes extending out from transit stations that are designed to meet the needs of transit riders and improve the customer experience. As most transit riders walk, bike, or roll to and from stations, the focus of FLM access is on optimizing connectivity and safety for active modes of travel.

The full set of policy directives in Motions 14.1 and 14.2 are summarized in (Figure E-1). Among those activities is specific direction focused on new Metro transit projects, stating **“Incorporate Countywide First-Last Mile Priority Network project delivery into the planning, design, and construction of all MTA transit projects. These Countywide First-Last Mile Priority Network elements shall not be value engineered out of any project.”**

First/Last Mile Guidelines




Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1 Introduction	7
A. What is First/Last Mile?	7
B. Goals and Objectives of the Guidelines	8
C. Integration with Transit Projects	8
D. Who Should Use the Guidelines	12
2 Project Development Phases	13
A. First/Last Mile Planning	13
I. Planning Steps	14
II. Project Prioritization and Selection	18
III. Key Work Products	19
IV. Critical Actions	19
B. First/Last Mile Environmental Clearance	21
I. Process and Sequencing	21
II. Roles and Responsibilities	23
III. Key Work Products	24
IV. Critical Actions	24
C. First/Last Mile Preliminary Engineering	25
I. Objectives	25
II. Process and Sequencing	27
III. Roles and Responsibilities	27
IV. Key Work Products	30
D. First/Last Mile Implementation	31
I. Final Design	31
II. Funding	32
III. Construction	32
IV. Maintenance	32
3 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)	35
A. Project Scope	35
B. Sequencing	35
C. Roles and Responsibilities	35
4 FLM Guidelines Implementation	37

Appendices	39
Appendix A: Applicable Metro Policies, Plans, and Guidance Documents	41
Appendix B: Glossary of Terms	43
Appendix C: Table of Roles and Responsibilities	45
Appendix D: Community Engagement Examples from FLM Plans	47
Appendix E: Sample Scope of Work for Preliminary Engineering	49
Appendix F: First/Last Mile Methodology Update (2020)	51
Appendix G: FLM Program Commitments by Transit Project	57
Box 1: First/Last Mile Planning Experience To-Date	9
Box 2: Preliminary Transit Oriented Communities - First/Last Mile Assessment	13
Box 3: Consultant Contracting, Team Composition, and Management	15
Box 4: Legislative Updates to Environmental Standards	23
Box 5: 3% Contribution Agreement Terms	24
Box 6: Cooperative Agreement Terms Between Local Jurisdiction and Metro	26
Box 7: First/Last Mile Project Limits	28
Box 8: First/Last Mile Projects Associated with Public Private Partnership (P3) Transit Corridor Projects	30
Box 9: Funding Mechanisms	33

Executive Summary

Overview

The Metro Board of Directors established a vision for enhanced station access and safety by enacting First/Last Mile (FLM) policies. Specifically, Motion 14.1 in May 2016, followed by Motion 14.2 in June 2016, directed activities to facilitate and implement FLM networks around transit stations and stops countywide. Taken together, these policies envision a network of routes extending out from transit stations that are designed to meet the needs of transit riders and improve the customer experience. As most transit riders walk, bike, or roll to and from stations, the focus of FLM access is on optimizing connectivity and safety for active modes of travel.

The full set of policy directives in Motions 14.1 and 14.2 are summarized in (Figure E-1). Among those activities is specific direction focused on new Metro transit projects, stating **“Incorporate Countywide First-Last Mile Priority Network project delivery into the planning, design, and construction of all MTA transit projects. These Countywide First-Last Mile Priority Network elements shall not be value engineered out of any project.”**

NEW TRANSIT PROJECTS (SUBJECT TO FLM GUIDELINES)

Incorporate first/last mile improvements into the project delivery process for future transit capital projects

Conduct first/last mile planning for 254 station areas in the county

Incorporate first/last mile improvements with transit capital projects starting with Purple (D Line) Section 2

Facilitate first/last mile improvements initiated by local jurisdictions through technical and grant assistance

Allow local jurisdictions to use first/last mile improvements toward 3% contribution on rail transit projects

Incorporate the newly-designated Countywide First/Last Mile Priority Network into the Long-Range Transportation Plan

OTHER FLM POLICIES & ACTIVITIES

Figure E-1: Metro Board Motion 14.1 and 14.2 Policy Directives

This particular element of the Board motion further articulates the vision that FLM networks become an integral part of Metro’s work on new transit capital projects. The Board’s intent is that FLM networks are in place on the opening day of revenue service. The policy further envisions a partnership between Metro and local jurisdictions hosting stations, specifically by allowing, within Motion 14.2, that the local jurisdiction’s 3% funding contribution for rail projects be directed toward FLM improvements.

The focus of the Guidelines is to describe a consistent, predictable process for this portion of the Board’s larger set of directives. In so doing, the Guidelines describe the sequence of work and delineate roles and responsibilities within Metro and for external partners.

The Guidelines’ Approach to First/Last Mile and Transit Project Integration

The Guidelines describe an approach to achieve the overall vision captured in Board policy based on program experience and within practical constraints. The key elements of the approach are summarized as follows:

> **Metro initiation/facilitation of FLM development process:** Metro will catalyze the creation of FLM networks by playing a lead role through early phases of project development, specifically by advancing projects through Planning. Most FLM improvements will be statutorily exempt from CEQA. However, in some cases, where Environmental Clearance is required, Metro can help prepare this effort. See Section 2B for more detail.

- > **Local jurisdiction implementation/maintenance of FLM improvements:** Local jurisdictions, given their functions as owners of public right-of-way where most FLM improvements are to be located, will lead the design, implementation, and maintenance of FLM improvements within their right-of-way. While this implementation strategy applies to most FLM improvement projects, there may be case-by-case exceptions based on negotiated agreements between Metro and the local jurisdiction. Sections 2C and 2D for more detail.
- > **Cooperation between Metro, local jurisdictions, and other stakeholders:** The Guidelines envision and describe a handoff of lead responsibilities at the conclusion of Planning. Engaged partnership is necessary throughout the process. Figure E-2 below illustrates where this handoff is proposed to occur in the process. The Guidelines describe a number of specific, required partnership terms to ensure consistent, predictable processes, noting that the approach can be tailored to specific project circumstances.




Figure E-2: Metro and Local Jurisdiction FLM Project Delivery Roles

> **Integrated processes for FLM and transit project delivery:**
 The approach integrates FLM project development with the corresponding transit corridor project, beginning with an early, preliminary assessment to inform alignment screening (see Box 2 in Section 2A), and through the planning and environmental review stages. However, at later stages (preliminary engineering, final design, and construction), FLM projects continue as separate parallel efforts. Figure E-3 below illustrates how the project delivery phases align between FLM projects and their associated transit corridor.

This approach requires on-going coordination between transit project and FLM efforts to ensure an effective tie-in between stations, their immediate surrounds, and larger FLM networks. Of particular note, Metro is responsible for delivery of FLM elements within the transit project boundary.

Appendix C also provides an easy-to-reference table identifying the roles of various Metro departments, local jurisdictions, and stakeholders in each stage of the process.




Note: The phase alignment depicted in this graphic was in error in prior draft versions of the Guidelines. The version depicted above reflects the appropriate corrections.

Figure E-3: FLM and Transit Corridor Project Delivery Phases Comparison

> **Prioritized FLM improvements on primary access routes:**
 FLM plan development results in a comprehensive set of access, safety and aesthetic improvements within a half-mile radius for pedestrian focused improvements, and a three-mile radius for bike and other rolling mode connections. These boundaries are defined by the Federal Transit Administration and in the Metro First/Last Mile Strategic Plan.

Depending on existing conditions, the expected ridership of a station, and the density of the street network, among other factors, the estimated cost to deliver FLM improvements can sometimes be as high as \$30 million per station. Therefore, the approach here focuses on advancing high priority improvements (those that improve safety and accessibility) on primary access routes. Specific station amounts will vary due to the vast disparities in infrastructure and suitability for walking and biking within the existing built environments surrounding stations throughout the county.



* NOT TO SCALE

Figure E-4: FLM Improvements Site Definition and Boundaries

> **Negotiation of 3% local contribution agreements to fund FLM projects:** The ability for local jurisdictions to direct their 3% contribution to pay for FLM improvements for non-BRT transit corridor projects, per Motion 14.2, is a key tool enabling FLM project delivery. Therefore, the Guidelines describe a critical path of activities, products, and decision points that facilitate the handoff of FLM projects to local jurisdictions and 3% agreements that will help fund them. The Guidelines describe the necessary elements to be included in 3% agreements, which will be negotiated with local agencies on a project-by-project basis. Figure E-5 also illustrates the critical path items leading to the 3% agreement.

> **FLM 3% availability:** To support equitable use of this policy option for funding FLM improvements, 3% credit will be available for high priority projects as determined in the FLM plan. High priority projects identified within the plan generally focus on safety and accessibility to the station.

These priority projects, if implemented, will result in safe, accessible, and continuous paths of travel on primary routes within each station’s walk-shed, inclusive of sidewalks, crosswalks, lighting, and bike connections as needed (e.g. to close gaps in the bike network). The methodology and criteria for determining high priority projects has been piloted on past FLM plans and will be further developed and applied across all FLM plans, pending further Board direction. While the

focus is on safety and accessibility-related improvements, this methodology will also accommodate some flexibility for each station, with an emphasis on other FLM plan improvements supported by local jurisdiction interest or public feedback received during the plan’s community engagement process.

> **Community engagement and partnership with Community Based Organizations:** Grassroots community engagement and collaboration with Community Based Organizations (CBOs) are critical elements of the FLM program. FLM physical (street and sidewalk improvements) and cultural (community expression) infrastructure is deeply valued at a localized scale. CBO involvement can bridge a frequent disconnect between core transit-dependent riders, who are often low income and people of color and do not have the resources to participate in public processes, and more engaged stakeholders. Metro’s work with CBO partners on FLM projects is linked to the agency’s Equity Platform Framework and is an example of techniques being piloted for Metro’s agency-wide CBO strategy.

> **Metro support for implementation:** For all Metro transit projects, Metro provides a range of support to local agencies for funding and implementation of FLM. This support, such as for competitive grants, are described in Box 9 in Section 2D.




Figure E-5: Critical Path to 3% Agreement

Organization of Document

The Guidelines are organized in sections by FLM project phase and describe FLM project development in relation to typical transit project phases. Coordinating timelines with transit project work is critical; to assist, the relationship of specific transit project and FLM milestones is described throughout the Guidelines. FLM work, as described herein, follows the following project development phases:

- > Planning
- > Environmental Clearance (concurrent with Preliminary Engineering)
- > Preliminary Engineering (concurrent with Environmental Clearance)
- > Implementation

Given the importance of coordination and cooperation, the Guidelines emphasize specific roles and responsibilities throughout each of the project development phases. Figure E-6 outlines the organization of each project development phase section within the Guidelines. Each section details processes and expectations for Metro departments/teams, local agencies, Community Based Organizations, and other participants. Appendix C contains the same information organized by role, and can be referred to by any stakeholder at each stage.




Figure E-6: How to Use the Guidelines

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1. Introduction


The First/Last Mile Guidelines describes the process by which Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) and local jurisdictions partner in the planning, design, and construction of first/last mile (FLM) improvements for new rail transit and bus rapid transit (BRT) corridor projects.

The Guidelines intend to fulfill the Metro Board of Directors' (Board) vision for safe, connected FLM pathways to new transit stations. It builds upon Metro's FLM policies and past experience: the First/Last Mile Strategic Plan (2014) presented methodology for FLM planning; Board Motions 14.1 and 14.2 (2016) directed activities to facilitate and implement FLM networks around transit stations and stops throughout the county; and to-date, the Board has adopted seven FLM plans and several more are in progress (see Box 1).

Ninety percent of transit riders walk, bike, or otherwise roll to and from transit stations and bus stops, highlighting the importance of safe streets to access transit. Through FLM planning, Metro envisions a network of routes extending from transit stations that are designed to meet the needs of transit riders and improve the customer experience.

A. What is First/Last Mile?

An individual's trip is understood as the entire journey from origin to destination. For transit riders, bus and rail services often form the core of a trip, but riders complete the first and last portion on their own using another mode. Typically, they must first use "active transportation" —walking, biking or rolling—to reach the nearest station from their home or workplace. This is referred to as the first and last mile of the user's trip, or first/last mile (FLM) for short. See Figure 1-1 for an illustration.



* NOT TO SCALE

Figure 1-1: What is First/Last Mile?

Actual distances for the FLM trip may vary. However, for pedestrians, the upper boundary is usually understood to be a 15-minute walk, which translates to a half-mile radial distance centered around a transit station or stop. Most bicyclists can travel a mile in four to five minutes. Hence, for bicyclists, due to their higher speeds, this travel distance increases to a three-mile radial distance. Figure 1-2 illustrates these FLM access sheds, the distances people travel in a set duration of time (15 minutes) using different active transportation modes.

FLM improvements incorporate a range of urban design elements that respond to the context of each station. Though the streets that comprise the FLM station planning area typically fall outside the boundaries of Metro's jurisdiction, they remain critical components of an effective public transportation system. The easier it is to access a transit system, the more likely people are to use it.

Some examples of FLM improvements include:

- > Infrastructure for walking, biking, and rolling (e.g. sidewalks, crosswalks, bike lanes, bike parking)
- > Shared use services (e.g. scooters, bike share, and car share)
- > Facilities to transfer or connect to a different mode of transportation (e.g. passenger drop-off areas and bus/rail interface improvements)
- > Information that simplifies travel, including signage, wayfinding, and technology (e.g. information kiosks and mobile apps)




Figure 1-2: FLM Access Shed Distances by Mode

Why is First/Last Mile Important?

FLM improvements are important for three core reasons:

1. First/last mile expands the reach of transit. It recognizes that the built environment surrounding and connecting to transit is a factor in an individual's propensity to take transit.
2. First/last mile improves safety. Well-designed crosswalks, effective lighting, bike lanes, and other improvements help protect the most vulnerable users of the street and encourage transit ridership.
3. First/last mile enhances the customer experience for transit riders. Well-maintained sidewalks, clear and easy to understand signage and wayfinding, landscaping, and other visual enhancements like public art can all contribute to a more pleasant travel experience for current and future riders.

B. Goals and Objectives of the Guidelines

The goal of the First/Last Mile Guidelines is to ensure the comprehensive integration of FLM improvements into existing and future transit capital projects.

Specific objectives include:

- > Formalizing Metro's approach to implementing Board direction to incorporate FLM project delivery into the planning, design, and construction of all Metro transit projects.
- > Defining Metro's role and responsibility in the planning, design, and implementation of FLM improvements for transit capital projects.

- > Establishing the cooperative terms by which Metro and local jurisdictions will work together during the FLM planning and design process.
- > Identifying how the FLM planning and design process is integrated in the transit corridor project planning and design process.
- > Defining the approach to funding and implementing FLM projects identified during the planning and design process.

C. Integration with Transit Projects

To reach its goal, the Guidelines serve as a roadmap for Metro project managers and external agencies. It outlines applicable transit projects, the footprint for FLM improvements, and the FLM project development process, including the roles, responsibilities, and required coordination among Metro departments, external agencies, and other stakeholders.

Applicable Transit Projects

Board Motion 14.1 states that FLM planning is to be integrated in "all Metro transit projects." The Guidelines define applicable Metro transit projects as:

- > Core Capacity Improvement projects, including:
 - New or replacement transit stations (e.g. Orange (G Line) Sepulveda Station)
- > Transit Fixed Guideway projects including:
 - Extensions of existing rail lines (e.g. Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2)
 - New rail lines (e.g. East San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor, Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor, West Santa Ana Branch). A table in Appendix G shows FLM program commitments and applicability for each transit project.

- > Transit Fixed Guideway or Corridor-based bus projects, including:
 - BRT projects (e.g. North Hollywood to Pasadena Transit Corridor). Specific obligations and terms for FLM implementation related to BRT projects are discussed in Chapter 3 of this document¹.

Policy Context

The Board established a vision for enhanced station access and safety by enacting FLM policies. Specifically, Motion 14.1 in May 2016, followed by Motion 14.2 in June 2016, directed activities to facilitate and implement FLM networks around transit stations and stops countywide.

¹ 3% contribution is only applicable to new fixed guideway rail projects.

Motion 14.1 calls for Metro to:

Incorporate Countywide First-Last Mile Priority Network project delivery into the planning, design, and construction of all MTA transit projects. These Countywide First-Last Mile Priority Network elements shall not be value engineered out of any project.

Box 1: First/Last Mile Planning Experience To-Date

Since the 2016 FLM Board motions, Metro staff, working together with local jurisdictions, has undertaken a substantial body of work to advance the FLM program. This includes the completion and adoption of FLM plans for new transit projects, as well as existing and under-construction stations. These are listed below, noting highlights and three key takeaways:

- > **Blue (A Line) First/Last Mile Plan** (adopted April 2018, 22 stations)
- > **Inglewood First/Last Mile Plan** (adopted February 2019, 4 stations)
- > **Foothill Gold (L Line) Extension Phase 2B First/Last Mile Plan** (adopted June 2019, 5 stations)
- > **Aviation/96th (Airport Metro Connector) First/Last Mile Plan** (adopted June 2019, 1 station)
- > **Purple (D Line) Extension Sections 2 and 3 First/Last Mile Plan** (adopted May 2020, 4 stations)
- > **East San Fernando Valley Corridor Project First/Last Mile Plan** (adopted December 2020, 14 stations)
- > **Orange (G Line) Sepulveda Station First/Last Mile Plan** (adopted February 2021, 1 station)
- > **Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 First/Last Mile Plan** (in progress, 3 stations)

Community Engagement: Metro has engaged Community Based Organizations (CBOs) on the Blue (A Line), Foothill Gold (L Line), East San Fernando Valley, and Purple (D Line) Extension Section 1 FLM projects. These partnerships have served as opportunities for Metro to pilot techniques being developed for the agency-wide CBO strategy. FLM staff's growing body of experience with CBOs has highlighted the importance of integrating grassroots community engagement in the FLM planning process. CBO collaboration has helped reach core transit-dependent riders, who are often low-income and people of color who traditionally, have not had access to meaningfully engage in Metro planning processes, and revealed that FLM infrastructure (streets and sidewalks) are deeply valued at a very local scale.

Prioritization of Improvements: Metro's initial round of FLM projects has highlighted the complexity and cost of delivering the envisioned full FLM plans for transit stations. Each station area plan within the transit project boundary should be viewed on its own as a medium-to-large-scale active transportation project. Depending on existing conditions, the expected ridership of a station, and the density of the street network, among other factors, early FLM plans estimated the cost to deliver FLM improvements to be as high as \$30 million per station. As a result, more recent plans and the Guidelines suggest focusing on high priority improvements on primary access routes.


The Guidelines and the Board’s FLM vision are contextualized by the 2014 First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, as well as other Metro policies and plans, including the Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Policy and Implementation Plan. Metro’s TOC Policy sets the direction for how Metro plans and implements new and existing transit corridor projects. The five goals of the TOC Policy aim to:

1. Increase transportation ridership and choice
2. Stabilize and enhance communities surrounding transit
3. Engage organizations, jurisdictions, and the public
4. Distribute transit benefits to all
5. Capture value created by transit

These goals provide a framework within which FLM planning may be incorporated for transit corridor projects. Other relevant Metro policies and plans include the Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit, the Vision 2028 Strategic Plan, the Equity Framework and Platform, the Active Transportation Strategic Plan, the TOC Implementation Plan, and the Metro Transfers Design Guide. More information about these policies and plans is available in Appendix A.

Footprint for FLM Improvements

Most FLM improvements are located on property/land controlled by local jurisdictions, not Metro. This is because FLM improvements are planned outside Metro’s transit project boundary, but within a half-mile radial distance centered around a transit station. Sometimes this radial distance extends to three miles for bicyclists or other wheeled active transportation users as illustrated in Figure 1-2.



* NOT TO SCALE


Figure 1-2: Site Definition and Project Boundary

However, Metro historically is responsible for the design and implementation of FLM improvements within the transit project boundary, which is intended to house Metro station plazas and construction staging. There are a variety of FLM improvements that would fall within this boundary including, but not limited to, signage, lighting, and sidewalks. The Guidelines describe Metro’s responsibility to deliver these FLM improvements within the transit project boundary and the application of Board policy that these elements not be subject to reduction or elimination through value engineering.

Importantly, Metro and local jurisdictions must coordinate and align FLM projects outside of the transit project boundary to ensure the core goals of FLM are met and transit riders experience benefit. For example, the pedestrian travel paths to station portal entrances (within Metro’s transit project boundary) should align with crosswalk and sidewalk improvements delivered by local jurisdictions.

Overview of the First/Last Mile Project Development Process

The Guidelines approach the development of FLM improvements as parallel, complementary projects that are coordinated with transit project delivery at key, identified touchpoints. Metro launches FLM planning work in coordination with the larger transit corridor project. Subsequently, Metro hands-off the FLM planning process to local jurisdictions for completion of design, construction, and maintenance. Local jurisdictions are able to count FLM investments toward the Measure M 3% contribution requirement for rail transit projects, and the facilitation of FLM delivery through this 3% mechanism is a key focus of the Guidelines.



Note: The phase alignment depicted in this graphic was in error in prior draft versions of the Guidelines. The version depicted above reflects the appropriate corrections.

Figure 1-3: FLM and Transit Corridor Project Delivery Phases Comparison

While a preliminary FLM assessment should be conducted during a transit corridor’s early planning/alternatives analysis and environmental clearance, the formal FLM planning typically begins in earnest upon selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) for the transit corridor.

The Guidelines are organized according to the phases of FLM project development: planning, environmental clearance, preliminary engineering, and implementation. They reference when and how the FLM planning integrates with the transit corridor’s planning and construction. Figure 1-3 outlines the alignment of and key deliverables associated with the transit corridor and FLM project development processes, and thus, the organization of the Guidelines. Each FLM development phase culminates in a set of products and critical actions. These critical actions, such as agreement between Metro and local agencies on cooperative terms at the conclusion of the Planning phase, are necessary to proceed to ensuing phases of work.

D. Who Should Use the Guidelines

FLM planning is an inherently collaborative, cross-jurisdictional, and nuanced process. Thus, the Guidelines serve a variety of audiences, outlined below, from transportation planners working on Metro projects to community groups seeking to advocate for and engage with communities.

- > **Planners** – Urban and transportation planners working for Metro and local jurisdictions can use the Guidelines to streamline the incorporation of FLM planning into transportation projects. In particular, planners working for other agencies and local jurisdictions can use the Guidelines to better synchronize independent development of active transportation projects with adjacent or nearby Metro projects.
- > **Policy Makers** – Policy makers can reference the Guidelines to determine how to coordinate their local and regional policies with Metro’s. Similarly, the Guidelines can be used to facilitate the adoption of local or regional FLM policies.
- > **Local Jurisdictions** – As partners in the funding and delivery of transit projects, as well as the agencies leading implementation of many FLM improvements, local jurisdictions will need to comply with Metro requirements to receive technical and grant writing support from the agency.
- > **Consultants** – Transit agencies and local jurisdictions employ consultant teams to augment their in-house staffing and capabilities. The Guidelines can familiarize consultants with Metro policy and reduce uncertainty about the planning processes related to FLM.

- > **Community Based Organizations (CBOs)**– As experts with unique and granular knowledge of local conditions and needs, these organizations are encouraged to be involved in the FLM planning process, particularly in community engagement efforts and in the identification of FLM access routes and improvements.

- > **Community Members** – Community input is vital to FLM project success. As everyday users of streets, sidewalks, and infrastructure in station areas, community members can provide relevant insights to challenges, opportunities, and safety concerns related to FLM mobility.

Roles and Responsibilities

Metro’s core function in FLM implementation is to oversee the planning and development of FLM projects, in partnership with local jurisdictions, that will then be handed off to the local jurisdictions to design and implement. Additionally, Metro is responsible for coordinating FLM functions with the transit project, including delivery of FLM components within the footprint of transit stations. The FLM planning and project development process requires leadership and participation from a range of Metro departments including Metro Countywide Planning and Development – First/Last Mile Team (Metro FLM Team) and Mobility Corridors Team (Metro Mobility Corridors Team); Metro Program Management; Metro Community Relations; and Metro Arts & Design.

FLM improvements are intended to be constructed and maintained by local jurisdictions, therefore it is important that local jurisdiction staff are involved in the FLM planning led by Metro. Generally, the following local departments are anticipated to participate: Planning, Public Works/ Engineering, Transportation, Street Lighting, Cultural Affairs, and City Manager.

Metro partners with local CBOs to engage the community and transit riders on their needs and interests related to FLM improvements. CBOs are most commonly involved in the FLM planning process, focusing on enhancing community engagement efforts led by Metro and its consultant teams.

Roles, timing, and level of participation from these different stakeholders are explained in the Guidelines’ description of each project development phase. The table in Appendix C summarizes the roles during each FLM project development phase.

2 Project Development Phases

This section outlines the critical path for FLM activities at each stage of project development: Planning, Environmental Clearance, Preliminary Engineering, and Implementation. Each project stage outlines the FLM scope of work, along with the roles and responsibilities for Metro, local jurisdictions, and other key stakeholders.

FLM project development coordinates with and occurs in parallel to transit project delivery. The following sections also describe when and how FLM activities integrate with the Metro transit corridor planning phases described in the Guidelines' introduction.

A. First/Last Mile Planning (Lead: Metro FLM)

Led by Metro, the FLM planning phase is based on a methodology established in the First/Last Mile Strategic Plan and subsequent experience with the methodology's implementation. In addition, a 2020 First/Last Mile Methodology Update (see Appendix F) provides up-to-date refinements of the approach. While a preliminary FLM assessment should be conducted during the transit corridor's early planning/alternatives analysis and environmental analysis phases (see Box 2), **the formal FLM planning begins in earnest upon selection of an LPA for the transit corridor.**

FLM planning steps are described below along with roles for Metro and its external partners. It is followed by a section explaining how a subset of projects are selected to advance to the next project development phases. The section concludes with a summary of key work products and critical questions to ask before continuing to FLM environmental clearance and preliminary engineering.

Box 2: Preliminary Transit Oriented Communities - First/Last Mile Assessment

The transit corridor's early planning work should include a high-level, preliminary TOC-FLM assessment which can inform alignment screening. This early assessment of FLM conditions should inform the preparation of the draft EIS/EIR for the transit corridor. TOC-FLM preliminary assessments should be scoped and developed in consultation between the Metro Mobility Corridors and Metro FLM Teams. Two recent transit corridors undertook a preliminary TOC-FLM assessment and are described with key takeaways below.

- > **Eastside Transit Corridor Project** – The preliminary FLM assessment evaluated both qualitative and quantitative factors of potential station areas including street networks at station locations, specifically intersection density, the quality of sidewalks, crosswalks, street furniture amenities such as lighting and bus shelters, pedestrian and bicycle safety statistics, and existing and planned active transportation infrastructure. The assessment scored each factor on a scale of 1 to 3 for each station area, which resulted in a total score for each alignment option, supported by narrative discussion. The character of the alignment options were very different, which resulted in notable differences in FLM scores especially as one alignment option would run along a freeway. The preliminary FLM assessment helped inform the elimination of one alignment from the project scope. <https://www.metro.net/projects/eastside/goldline-eastside-access/>
- > **Crenshaw Northern Extension Project** – The preliminary FLM assessment evaluated and scored station areas based on qualitative and quantitative criteria, similar to those used for the Eastside Gold Line but with some variation due to differing physical urban conditions and connectivity needs and resulting in the use of a different scoring system. The existing conditions in the project study area are similar among the alignment options, resulting in smaller deviations in the total FLM score for each alignment. This assessment helped identify the range of FLM issues for the project and the magnitude of FLM improvements that are likely needed in future phases. <https://www.metro.net/projects/crenshaw-northern-extension/>

I. Planning Steps

Upon selection of an LPA, or when the number of stations and their locations are otherwise determined, the FLM planning begins to conduct the following steps:

1. **Existing Conditions Analysis**
2. **Technical Walk Audit**
3. **Draft Pathway Network**
4. **Community Engagement (occurs at multiple points)**
5. **Final Pathway Network and Project Ideas**
6. **Project Scoring and Cost Estimates**

Typically, this work occurs during environmental clearance for the transit project concurrent with the completion of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), working with a FLM consultant team assigned to the transit project.

Each step is described below with a brief description, lessons learned from past experience, and a summary of roles. Definitions of these roles include the following:

- > Lead: The Metro department or local jurisdiction that is responsible for preparing the product in this phase
- > Support: Metro department(s) or local jurisdiction(s) that contribute staff time and effort to preparing the activity, writing portions of reports or documents, or other similar contributions to the product in this phase
- > Participation: Metro department(s), local jurisdiction(s), and other community stakeholders that participate in this phase by attending activities and/or reviewing work products

For more detailed descriptions of these steps, please reference the First/Last Mile Strategic Plan and completed FLM Plans online, along with the 2020 First/Last Mile Methodology Update in Appendix F.

1. Existing Conditions Analysis

Description: The existing conditions analysis is the first step of the FLM planning process after the LPA of a transit corridor has been selected. The objective of the analysis is to understand the local environment around each station including land use, key destinations, existing and locally planned bicycle facilities, and collisions, among other data points.

Lessons Learned: Project engineering/design drawings for the transit corridor - at whatever level of detail is available - should

be shared with the FLM Team to ensure that the resulting FLM projects are consistent with the corridor project at the time the FLM Plan is developed. For example, drawings that show the location of station entrances are of particular importance for the development of the FLM improvements and should be communicated with the FLM consultant at this beginning step. To ensure consistency with local efforts, local jurisdictions should provide all relevant plans and projects during this step.

Roles:

- > Lead: Metro FLM Team
- > Support: N/A
- > Participation: Metro Mobility Corridors Team and local jurisdiction(s)

2. FLM Technical Walk Audit

Description: During walk audits, technical staff and consultants collect data on strengths, barriers and observed behaviors related to the walking and bicycling environment around the station. This step is a key component of FLM planning because it gives the project team on-the-ground, experiential knowledge about the station area. Walk audits are conducted using Metro's web-based data collection tool, which allows participants to document specific locations with comments and photos about conditions. Some walk audits may also be conducted by community members as an introduction to other subsequent community engagement described below.

Lessons Learned: Walk audits should be conducted at different times and days of the week, with a focus on peak travel times and potentially after dark. Additionally, it is helpful to have local jurisdiction staff participate in the walk audit because of their granular knowledge about how the community utilizes the area. Other key aspects of walk audits, such as team size, whether pre-set routes are assigned, and the potential to conduct audits using multiple mobility devices (e.g. bicycles, wheelchairs, and scooters) are to be determined based on consultation between the FLM Team lead and other team members.

Roles:

- > Lead: Metro FLM Team (with FLM consultant team part of the transit corridor project team)
- > Support: Metro Mobility Corridors Team; Metro Community Relations
- > Participation: Local jurisdiction(s) and CBOs, depending on project needs

3. FLM Draft Pathway Network

Description: The development of the Pathway Network (key routes to walk, bike, or roll to the station) is based on research of local plans, existing conditions and facilities, and data collected during the walk audits. This step ensures a clear nexus between FLM improvements and the transit riders' experience. Additionally, the inclusion of local plans and existing facilities avoids duplicating or getting ahead of local efforts to improve their city streets.

Lessons Learned: Once drafted and prior to the community engagement activities (see next step below), local jurisdictions and the CBO partner should review and provide comments on the Pathway Network.

Roles:

- > Lead: Metro FLM Team
- > Support: N/A
- > Participation: Metro Mobility Corridors Team, Local Jurisdiction(s), and CBOs

Box 3: Consultant Contracting, Team Composition, and Management

Collaboration is needed among Metro teams to help guide the consultant's work efforts and deliverables. This collaboration starts when a scope of work is developed and continues through the duration of the contract. The development of a FLM plan is typically part of the scope of work for the environmental consultant selected for the transit corridor project, noting that FLM projects will be environmentally cleared separately from the corridor project as described in Section 2B. This approach allows for consolidation of the contracting process and ensures that the FLM planning schedule will align with the schedule for the transit corridor project.

The Metro Countywide Planning & Development - FLM Team lead for the project will coordinate with the Mobility Corridors Project Manager on scope language and the anticipated budget. Upon procurement, the Mobility Corridors Project Manager is responsible for the entirety of transit corridor contracted work, but the FLM Team will provide an assigned staff lead to the project to substantially guide and co-lead the FLM planning tasks. The Community Relations Team leads outreach efforts for the transit corridor planning studies often under a separate outreach-specific contract. The Community Relations Team partners with the FLM Team on community engagement for the FLM plan and the contracting model varies. A key distinction is that community engagement, primarily informed by CBOs and supported by the local jurisdiction, would be an integral part of the technical FLM planning work. Metro is preparing an agency-wide CBO partnering strategy, which will provide further guidance on CBO engagement.

As of the writing of these guidelines, a few models have been deployed to collaborate and manage consultant teams. No one approach has been decided, however, a few important lessons have been learned, resulting in the following recommendations:

- > Specify the desired composition of the consultant team in the scope of work (e.g. including a consultant with expertise in FLM/active transportation network planning or design).
- > Prior to consultants beginning FLM work, discuss the approach to FLM and tailor it to the corridor's unique needs, establish expectations on level of effort, and discuss if and how the work will be shared with CBOs.
- > Define the approach and coordination process with local jurisdictions and what roles and responsibilities the consultant team will have versus Metro staff.
- > Ensure direct communication between Metro's FLM Team and the FLM consultant, which may be a subconsultant under the early planning or environmental clearance contracts.
- > Hold regular meetings specific to FLM planning with key Metro departments - Mobility Corridors, FLM, Community Relations, Construction Relations, Marketing, and Design Studio - and consultant team members to surface issues of communal interest.

4. Community Engagement

Description: Community engagement is a critical component due to the detailed and highly localized nature of FLM projects. As a consequence, it occurs at multiple points in the process. Typically, FLM efforts include a range of community engagement methods including workshops, stakeholder interviews, walk-audits, and surveys (online or intercept). The purpose of these participatory activities is two-fold: 1) to collect data/feedback to inform FLM planning and 2) to bring general awareness of FLM issues to communities. These outreach activities need to be coordinated with the overall community engagement approach (led by Community Relations) for the transit corridor project to align project messaging to community and stakeholder groups. FLM improvements provide an opportunity to build good will with the community and support for the overall transit project.

Lessons Learned: Many specific lessons about community engagement and partnering with CBOs have been documented in past FLM plans. Importantly, the approach to community engagement (i.e. engagement format, materials, location, languages, methods, etc.) should be a collaboration among the Metro FLM Team, the Metro Community Relations Team, and partner CBOs. To support the FLM Team's community engagement activities, Metro Community Relations helps to develop and manage stakeholder contact lists and promotional materials; it may also serve as frontline communication with political offices and other local stakeholders. Partner CBOs support outreach strategy and participant recruitment through their organizing expertise and knowledge of local networks. To date, FLM planning efforts have generally been organized around a two-stage community engagement effort. The first stage involves outreach to community stakeholders through one-on-one meetings and conversations, inviting them to then also participate in the walk audits. The second stage focuses on pop-up workshops in the local community to broaden opportunities for public input. This process should be reviewed and refined on a project-by-project basis. For examples of community engagement models from past FLM plans, see Appendix D.

As described in Box 3, local jurisdictions should decide to what extent they will be involved in the engagement, from publicizing the event (less involved) to co-presenting information (highly involved). FLM terminology, graphic representation of FLM ideas, and community presentations should be discussed early with the contractor, as well as core Metro departments to make sure materials are easy-to-read for the general public.

Roles:

- > Lead: Metro FLM and Community Relations Teams
- > Support: Metro FLM Team or Community Relations, depending on project needs, and CBOs
- > Participation: Local Jurisdiction(s), CBOs, and general public

5. Final Pathway Network and Project Ideas

Description: Collected community feedback (e.g. from stakeholder interviews, walk-audits, and other community engagement activities) is used to validate or correct the draft Pathway Network, as well as reflect the project ideas and priorities of the community. At this stage, review of the Pathway Network and project ideas by the local jurisdictions and CBO is requested before finalization.

Lessons Learned: Including documentation on the origin of individual projects allows decision makers and the community to clearly understand how a given improvement originated. For example, past plans have documented whether an idea was proposed by the project team following the walk audits, requested by a community member, or recommended in a current local plan.

Roles:

- > Lead: Metro FLM Team
- > Support: Metro Mobility Corridors Team
- > Participation: Metro Arts & Design, Local Jurisdiction(s) and CBOs

6. Project Scoring and Cost Estimates

Description: FLM projects included in the Pathway Network are categorized by type and location, and are subsequently scored on a number of variables. The variables, for both pedestrian and wheel projects, may fall within weighted categories of safety, comfort, community input, and connectivity. An example of scoring variables is provided below in Figures 2-1 and 2-2 from the Purple (D Line) Extension Sections 2&3 FLM Plan.

Individual projects may use different weighting or additional criteria as relevant to the conditions along the study corridor, but each should at a minimum include these larger categories of safety, community input, and connectivity for walking and rolling to the station.

At this stage, Metro will develop rough order of magnitude (ROM) cost estimates for the FLM projects included in the Pathway Networks for each station with input from the local jurisdictions. ROM cost estimates utilize recent unit cost information obtained from Metro Cost Estimating and the respective local jurisdictions where projects are located. These unit costs are then used to develop the ROM costs based on the basic FLM project information available at this stage of project development. This includes general information like the distance of linear improvements (bicycle lanes, new sidewalk) and initial counts for location-specific improvements (street trees, lighting, street furniture).

engineering phase led by local jurisdictions. The Metro FLM Team will also establish a process to collect final cost information for completed projects to better understand final costs and inform the development of future cost estimates.

Roles:

- > Lead: Metro FLM Team
- > Support: N/A
- > Participation: Local Jurisdiction(s) and Metro Program Management

Lessons Learned: Recent bids for construction projects that local jurisdictions have received, along with the final costs for FLM projects once construction is complete, are helpful to inform the cost estimates for walking and biking infrastructure projects in the respective jurisdiction. Metro Program Management guidance on format and content is typically provided to the consultant by the Metro FLM Team lead. These cost estimates will be refined later in the project development process following 30% Design completion in the preliminary




Figure 2-1: Purple (D Line) Sections 2/3 FLM Plan Pedestrian Project Scoring Factors




Figure 2-2: Purple (D Line) Sections 2/3 FLM Plan Bicycle Project Scoring Factors

II. Project Prioritization and Selection

Given the menu of projects that emerge from the FLM plan, a narrower set of high priority investments advance to the next stages of preliminary engineering and environmental clearance (if needed). While prioritization can be flexibly applied to account for the specific needs of each project/station, the intent of delineating priority projects is to focus on pedestrian related projects on primary pathways that provide improved safety and accessibility, and bicycle related projects that improve safety and connectivity to the station and the rest of the bicycle route network.

There is a key distinction between projects located within the transit project boundary and those located outside of this area. The FLM Planning effort is focused on identifying and defining FLM projects located outside of the transit project boundary, as illustrated previously in Figure 1-2. Transit project boundary projects typically include the following:

- > Sidewalk improvements and/or additions directly adjacent to the station or providing direct access to the station
- > Lighting and landscaping improvements in the station area, at station access points, and directly adjacent to the station
- > Bike racks and lockers at the transit station, located in Metro right-of-way
- > Pick-up and drop-off areas serving the station
- > Multi-use pathways located parallel to the transit corridor and in Metro right-of-way

Other improvements may also fall into this category, with the general guideline being that these projects are located directly adjacent to the station and/or in Metro right-of-way.

Walk projects in the half-mile radius of the station typically include the following:

- > Sidewalk improvements and/or additions
- > Lighting and landscaping improvements along streets
- > Wayfinding signage directing people to the transit station
- > New and improved crosswalks at street intersections
- > New and improved bus stops
- > Curb extensions at street intersections

Wheel projects in the half-mile or three-mile radius of the station typically include:

- > New or enhanced bicycle lanes
- > New Bicycle Boulevards
- > New multi-use pathways
- > Enhanced intersections for bicycles

Project prioritization and selection advance a list of high priority projects that lie outside the transit project boundary. Qualifying local jurisdictions can implement these in order to help meet their 3% contribution requirement. The list of priority projects is shared with jurisdictions whose feedback can further adjust project selection to account for local

priorities. Furthermore, some projects (e.g. those that are not directly related to safety, accessibility, or that are on secondary walk pathways) may be considered for the prioritized projects list if they demonstrate strong public support through the plan's community engagement process. This flexibility can extend to substituting projects during the preliminary engineering stage should projects be unable to proceed on feasibility or other considerations. Substitute projects should be of the same project type and provide equivalent benefit to the project being replaced. Project partners should therefore also consult with the Metro FLM Project Manager to understand how this step is applied for a given project.

The specific methodology for project prioritization and selection may incorporate elements from the project scoring process described above, again emphasizing safety and accessibility (e.g. improved sidewalks, crosswalks, lighting, and bicycle connections). **Such a methodology has been piloted on past FLM plans and will be further developed and applied across all FLM plans, pending further Board direction.**

III. Key Work Products

The following deliverables, prepared under Metro's lead, are required at the completion of FLM Planning:

- > **Pathway Network** – map indicating primary and secondary pathways to the station and FLM project locations within the half-mile radius of the station.
- > **Project List** – project list corresponding to the Pathway Network maps that includes additional detail about the project (e.g. description, extent, and location).
- > **Rough Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates** – cost estimates for all FLM projects using best cost estimating practices and recent cost examples; previous FLM Planning efforts have highlighted the benefit of greater levels of cost certainty for FLM projects. This is particularly valuable for the pursuit of grant funding opportunities or with overly complex corridors or projects.
- > **Prioritized Projects List** – Prioritized and selected projects that have received local jurisdiction concurrence to advance to the next project phase. The prioritized projects list establishes eligible projects for 3% credit and is intended to allow for safe, accessible, and continuous pathways on primary access routes.
- > **Potential Letter of No Prejudice (LONP)** – a LONP is optional and would allow the regional or local jurisdiction to expend its own funds and incur reimbursable expenses prior to actual allocation; it would be possible only after Metro Board adoption of the FLM Plan.

The intent of the FLM Plan is to arrive at a project list that has cleared likely feasibility issues and fatal flaws to project delivery by assessing roadway fit and local street design standards. In order to satisfy this intent, Metro may revisit the scope of planning phase work and products to add more detailed analysis of Plan projects as needed.

IV. Critical Actions

For FLM projects to advance from plan completion to the next phase of preliminary engineering, key questions need to be answered. These questions center around initial written commitment by the jurisdiction for 1) implementation of selected projects in advance of a 3% agreement (negotiated at the conclusion of preliminary engineering), and 2) cooperation and coordination between Metro and local agencies during preliminary engineering.

The criteria below are important for and linked to a major milestone for the transit corridor project: the Life of Project (LOP) budget. Advancing the FLM Prioritized Projects List to the preliminary engineering drawing set and ensuring review and coordination between Metro and the local jurisdiction is necessary so that cost estimates are produced at the same level of detail and at the same time as the preliminary engineering drawings are completed for the new transit corridor project. An adopted FLM plan essentially provides a project list for local jurisdictions to choose from to direct toward their 3% contribution requirement. The 3% agreement is based on the LOP budget and negotiated/executed after the LOP budget is established at the conclusion of preliminary engineering.

In order for FLM to advance to preliminary engineering, the answer to each of these questions should be yes: ✓

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1. | Has the Metro Board approved or adopted the FLM Plan/Prioritized Projects List? | ✓ |
| 2. | Has the local jurisdiction provided preliminary written commitment to design and implement specified improvements from the Prioritized Projects List (see Planning Phase Key Work Products above)? | ✓ |
| 3. | Has Metro Program Management reviewed the FLM Plan and selected projects and determined any effects to the transit project design and to preface the coordination process for future phases? | ✓ |

-
4. Has Metro issued a Letter of No Prejudice allowing, with conditions, work in subsequent phases but in advance of a 3% agreement to be credited toward the 3% contribution requirement? (optional, if requested) ✓
-

5. Has Metro and the local jurisdiction concurred in writing on cooperative terms including the following requirements for the Preliminary Engineering stage? (See Box 6 for full context):
- > A local jurisdiction point of contact ✓
 - > Commitment of local jurisdiction staff time
 - > A streamlined process for review of 30% design drawings including coordinated cross-team reviews for FLM and transit projects
-

6. Has there been commitment to design pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure so as to ensure a seamless connection across the transit project boundary? ✓
-

All the criteria above are necessary for projects proceeding to design to be eligible for 3% contribution. Without these specific terms and concurrences, the local jurisdictions can advance the FLM plan for projects within their right-of-way on their own, managing and funding work to complete preliminary engineering and beyond for construction and implementation of FLM improvements, but would not be able to include FLM improvements within their right-of-way in any 3% agreement.

Although not a requirement to advance FLM projects to the preliminary engineering stage, a critical action at the conclusion of the Planning phase is to ensure that FLM improvements located within the transit project boundary have been integrated into the transit corridor design drawings to be constructed as part of the transit corridor project. Box 7, First/Last Mile Project Limits, describes the transit project boundary and its interface with FLM projects that extend beyond it. This action should also establish points of coordination and review milestones between the transit project engineering and local, separate FLM design efforts. The remaining phases of FLM project delivery described in Sections 2B, 2C, and 2D provide guidance on delivering FLM projects within the local jurisdiction's right-of-way and outside of the transit project boundary.

Each FLM plan is a vision for a continuous network of improvements for accessing the transit stations. Local jurisdictions can incorporate FLM project ideas into their respective capital improvement programs, maintenance programs, and/or seek grant funding for implementation. To that end, Metro provides grant writing assistance focused on active transportation funding sources that is competitively available for cities to complete these projects. Box 9 in Section 2D provides more detail on Metro activities and resources to assist in funding and implementation.

B. First/Last Mile Environmental Clearance

(Lead: Local Jurisdiction, Metro may prepare)

Environmental clearance, if needed, for FLM projects can typically begin following the completion of FLM Planning. For more complex FLM projects, environmental clearance may benefit from running concurrently with the FLM Preliminary Engineering effort. As is the case with preliminary engineering, environmental clearance for FLM projects will proceed as a separate effort from the environmental clearance for the corresponding transit corridor project. The actions and work products described in this section apply only to FLM projects located in local jurisdiction right-of-way outside of the transit project boundary.

The local jurisdiction is considered the lead for environmental review, however, if the local jurisdiction requests, Metro may manage the preparation of environmental documentation. In either case, the local jurisdiction would remain the designated lead agency for the environmental document.

This section will discuss how the FLM environmental clearance is sequenced and coordinated with the parallel efforts for the transit corridor project; the approach to preparing separate environmental documents is discussed in more detail. The roles and responsibilities are also discussed.

Because preliminary engineering and environmental clearance can occur in parallel, please refer to the objectives described at the beginning of Section 2C Preliminary Engineering, which also apply to the environmental clearance phase. This section describes the following for environmental clearance:

- > Process and Sequencing
- > Roles and Responsibilities
- > Key work products
- > Critical actions

I. Process and Sequencing

The purpose of the environmental clearance process is to satisfy legal requirements for FLM projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It also provides guidance related to the implementation of transportation projects under recent changes to California state law. The process is designed to ensure consistency across projects and to incorporate lessons from prior projects that will help

streamline future FLM project delivery.

FLM improvements benefit and serve the community as a whole (not just transit users), and they are connected to a larger streetscape with a unique physical context that transcends the transit project itself. Because they lie outside of the immediate station area, FLM improvements are considered separate from the larger transit project, and therefore may require an independent environmental clearance process. There are several justifications for the separate environmental clearance projects:

- > **Separate project footprint** – FLM projects extend beyond the transit project boundary, usually a half-mile from the transit station and in the case of bicycle projects, up to three miles.
- > **Independent utility** – Implementation of the FLM projects is not dependent on the transit corridor project, nor is the transit corridor project dependent on the FLM projects for implementation.
- > **Separate planning efforts** – The planning efforts for transit corridor projects and FLM projects are conducted in parallel, but these are separate processes, with distinct approaches, community engagement efforts, and recommendations.
- > **Separate funding sources** – FLM projects and transit corridor projects are funded separately. Transit corridor projects frequently also have federal funding sources for part of the project cost, requiring clearance under federal environmental regulations. FLM projects are typically funded with local and state sources, therefore only requiring environmental clearance under CEQA guidelines.

How FLM Projects Are Viewed Under CEQA

The local jurisdiction will be the lead agency under CEQA, though Metro can prepare environmental review documentation on a case by case basis. **Most FLM projects are not expected to require environmental clearance at the level of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and instead would fall into one of the first two categories described below: categorical exemption or mitigated negative declaration.**

Categorical Exemption (CE) – Classes of projects that generally are not considered to have potential impacts on the environment. These exemptions are identified by the State Resources Agency and are defined in CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR Section 15300-15331). Examples of Categorical Exemptions include Minor Alterations to Land such as “the creation of bicycle lanes on existing rights-of-way” (Section 15304 (h)). It is

anticipated that a vast majority of FLM projects would qualify for a CE. However, each FLM project or projects will require its own environmental review to confirm this assumption. FLM project types that would typically be anticipated to qualify for a CE include the following:

- > Bike lanes striped or installed within existing street right-of-way
- > Pedestrian and bicycle lighting
- > Landscaping and shade
- > Wayfinding signage
- > Improvements to existing sidewalks within existing public right-of-way
- > New and improved crosswalks

Additionally, many FLM projects are anticipated to be statutorily exempt from CEQA under Senate Bill 288. Beginning January 1, 2021, SB 288 establishes statutory exemptions from CEQA for public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian enhancement projects that significantly enhance service quality, enhance access to transit, reduce pollution, and improve the safety of streets.

Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) – An MND is a negative declaration that incorporates revisions (mitigation measures) in the proposed project such that it will avoid or mitigate impacts to a point where clearly no significant impacts on the environment would occur. A public agency shall prepare or have prepared a proposed negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration when:

- (a) The initial study shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, or
- (b) The initial study identifies potentially significant effects, but:
 - (1) Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by or agreed to by the applicant before a proposed mitigated negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur, and
 - (2) There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.

FLM projects requiring the preparation of an MND would be those with more extensive physical construction that could occur outside of public right-of-way and/or require demolition or removal of existing structures. These types of projects could include:

- > Grade separated pedestrian/bicycle crossings
- > Bicycle lanes or protected bicycle lanes that require street widening

Environmental Impact Report (EIR) – An EIR would be required for FLM projects that result in more substantial construction, require changes to public right-of-way limits, or are adjacent to or impact sensitive resources (natural, historic, cultural). These types of projects could include:

- > New multi-use pathways located within a park, adjacent to flood control channels, or within or adjacent to an active or former railroad corridor
- > New pedestrian/bicycle bridge that may impact visual or natural resources

The discussion above is not intended or anticipated to cover all FLM project types, nor would the projects noted in each list above always qualify for the assigned level of environmental clearance in all cases. Each individual project will need to be evaluated independently based on project-specific conditions.

Application of Local Environmental Standards

State law requires vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as the new standard for identifying and mitigating transportation impacts. Local jurisdictions and agencies are still in the process of implementing the directive, and standards will vary from location to location. If Metro is preparing environmental documents, Metro and its consultant teams will need to identify and confirm that local jurisdictions have updated their guidelines in accordance with state law well in advance of the environmental clearance phase. Where local conditions and requirements vary, the FLM Team will need to obtain any existing study methodology from the local jurisdiction, modify it to the FLM project, and obtain approval that the end result will meet local standards.

II. Roles and Responsibilities

Metro Staff

FLM – If Metro prepares the environmental clearance document, this team will be responsible for managing the process and coordinating it with the design teams and any potential consultant teams. Their responsibilities and time commitment will vary depending on the scope of the project being cleared.

Program Management – Program Management’s primary role is in the successful delivery of capital projects. They may provide review and comment on environmental clearance work products as necessary.

Community Relations – If Metro prepares the environmental clearance document and if community engagement is required (e.g. for an EIR), Metro Community Relations will develop the

outreach strategy for communicating information about the environmental clearance process as part of the project. They will develop public-facing materials in consultation with the Metro FLM and Mobility Corridors teams, as well as outreach consultants.

Other Staff/Stakeholders

Local jurisdiction staff – Depending on roles agreed to on a case by case basis, local jurisdiction staff may manage all work efforts as described above. In the event that Metro prepares environmental review, local staff will provide guidance on local requirements for environmental clearance and review key deliverables. Regardless of who prepares the environmental review, the local jurisdiction will lead this phase and ensure compliance with CEQA guidelines for community communications as well.

Box 4: Legislative Updates to Environmental Standards

Recent changes in California state law may potentially impact FLM projects, the most important of which is the 2018 Senate Bill 743 (§ 15064.3). The bill is of particular interest to transportation project planning, as it required that the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research identify new metrics for identifying and mitigating transportation impacts, and recommended vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a suitable new metric. Automobile delay and other measures of “congestion” (primarily Level of Service or “LOS”) generally will no longer constitute a significant environmental impact under CEQA. The bill stipulates that:

Transportation projects that reduce, or have no impact on, vehicle miles traveled should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. For roadway capacity projects, agencies have discretion to determine the appropriate measure of transportation impact consistent with CEQA and other applicable requirements. To the extent that such impacts have already been adequately addressed at a programmatic level, a lead agency may tier from that analysis as provided in Section 15152.

Metro’s Analysis of VMT Mitigation Pursuant to SB 743 report (February 2018) reviewed the applicability of the new law to several current projects. The Rail to River Active Transportation Corridor was the sole active transportation project analyzed and is the most applicable to FLM planning. The project consists primarily of an active transportation (Walk/Wheel) corridor located on existing underutilized rail right-of-way and connecting multiple existing lines of transit service. Because the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is the federal lead agency for the project and provided federal grants, the project followed clearance guidelines under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

The report found no adverse impacts to intersection delay (LOS) at the 25 study intersections analyzed and no VMT changes under the project’s “no build” or “build” scenarios. At approximately 10 miles long, the Rail to River project is likely at the high end of potential scopes of work that would fall under a FLM project designation, but its implementation along existing and unused right of way likely reduced the need for an MND. The analysis completed for the project analyzed 25 study intersections and found no adverse impacts to intersection delay. As a result, the project was environmentally cleared under a Categorical Exemption.

Box 5: 3% Contribution Agreement Necessary Elements

Metro will develop 3% contribution agreements that will establish the 3% contribution amount and identify eligible funding sources (cash, in-kind, ROW, etc.). The 3% agreements and the associated costs are fixed at the completion of the 30% design phase for the transit project. As FLM projects are eligible sources, their inclusion in an agreement would commit delivery of eligible FLM projects. Agreements will allow for projects to be rescoped or substituted with Metro approval. Such projects changes will require the jurisdiction can establish an equivalent benefit and intent for rescoped improvements. All 3% contribution agreements are subject to terms of the Measure M Ordinance and Measure M Guidelines. If FLM projects are to be used toward the 3% contribution, then FLM program requirements in the FLM Guidelines will apply. This Guidelines section recaps applicable Measure M terms and establishes specific program requirements for FLM projects.

Contribution Amount

The amount of the 3% contribution is based on the combined cost estimates of the transit project and of any FLM projects proposed as part of the contribution. Agreements will specify that the local jurisdiction assumes the risk of FLM project cost increases.

Timing

The cost estimates noted above will be established after the projects have reached 30% design, and both a transit project Life of Project budget and an FLM project budget have been adopted by the Metro Board. In the event either the FLM project or the transit project reaches 30% design significantly in advance of the other, an effort will be made to use a comparable basis for the estimates. All such details will be documented in a 3% contribution agreement between Metro and the local jurisdiction, to be negotiated and executed prior to the project beginning construction. With written approval from Metro, a local jurisdiction may advance an eligible FLM project prior to executing a 3% contribution agreement.

Performance and Reporting

The agreement will specify a date (or dates, where jurisdictions rely on multiple sources to fulfill their 3% contribution) by which the 3% contribution must be satisfied. The agreement will also establish record keeping and progress reporting requirements, as applicable.

III. Key Work Products

Clearance Documentation – The majority of FLM projects will be cleared via a Categorical Exemption document—typically a Notice of Exemption (NOE). Notices of Exemption contain specific details about the project location and the nature, purpose, and beneficiaries of the project and specify the legal justification why the project is exempt. Lead agencies are not required to produce a NOE, but consultation with Metro County Counsel and/or local jurisdiction counsel and Community Relations will provide guidance on when a NOE is recommended.

A MND also includes general information about the project location, as well as proposed findings that the project will not have a specific impact on the environment. An initial study that documents findings related to key resource areas provides additional details, and mitigation measures to avoid potentially significant effects are specified in detail.

Materials for Certification – The local jurisdiction, or Metro, will prepare the appropriate materials for review and certification by the governing body of the local jurisdiction. The materials will depend on the level of effort and scope of the project. The purpose of local action is to publicly communicate the results of the environmental process, provide an additional input method for the local governing body, certify/adopt the results, ensure that local jurisdictions have met matching requirements and publicly support the project, and approve funding for the next phase of the project.

IV. Critical Actions

Because preliminary engineering and environmental clearance can occur in parallel and are required precursors to FLM project implementation, the critical actions below encompass both. In order to move to the next phase of the project, the following thresholds must be met:

- > Local jurisdiction governing body certification of environmental documents if required
- > Local jurisdiction commitment to direct 3% contribution to specific FLM projects, noting 3% agreement process and necessary elements described further in Box 5
- > FLM improvements budget for committed 3% projects, based on refined project costing developed through preliminary engineering

C. First/Last Mile Preliminary Engineering

(Lead: Local Jurisdiction)

Following completion of the FLM planning phase and environmental clearance, the selected FLM projects for each station area will proceed to Preliminary Engineering, resulting in the production of 30%-level design drawings. The actions and work products described in this section would be initiated and prepared by the local jurisdiction and apply only to FLM projects located in local jurisdiction right-of-way outside of the transit project boundary. These projects qualify for funding through the 3% contribution agreement and the local jurisdiction may be eligible to receive a LONP from Metro. More detail regarding the scope of this agreement can be found in Box 5.

It is anticipated that the environmental clearance of majority of FLM projects would involve categorical exemptions, as discussed in Section 2B, which would occur following the completion of FLM Planning. Environmental clearance for more complex FLM projects, if needed, would take place concurrently with preliminary engineering, which will inform the preparation of the environmental document. As noted above, many FLM projects are anticipated to be statutorily exempt from CEQA under Senate Bill 288. Beginning January 1, 2021, SB 288 establishes statutory exemptions from CEQA for public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian enhancement projects that significantly enhance service quality, enhance access to transit, reduce pollution, and improve the safety of streets.

This section describes:

- > Objectives
- > Process and Sequencing
- > Roles and responsibilities
- > Key work products

I. Objectives

The preliminary engineering phase is intended to achieve the following objectives:

- > **Provide an increased level of confidence in cost estimates** – The FLM planning efforts include the development of conceptual-level cost estimates for FLM projects. Advancing the selected FLM projects through preliminary engineering allows for more detailed cost estimates to be prepared, which provides a higher level of confidence in the magnitude of cost for implementation.




Figure 2-3: Critical Path to 3% Agreement

Box 6: Cooperative Agreement Terms Between Local Jurisdiction and Metro

Prior to initiating the Preliminary Engineering phase, Metro and the local jurisdiction will enter into a cooperative agreement, the key elements of which include the following:

- > **Local jurisdiction agreement to deliver specified projects.** These projects will be from the “Prioritized Projects” identified in the Metro Board-adopted FLM Plan. The projects, however, may be further conditioned on unforeseen factors at the time of Plan adoption, including a lack of feasibility determined upon additional design work. Substitute projects must also be among “Prioritized Projects” from the FLM Plan and will require written concurrence from Metro.
- > **Local jurisdiction responsibility for design, construction, and maintenance of all FLM projects.** Related expenditures to design FLM projects for non-BRT transit corridor projects in advance of the 3% contribution agreement can be credited toward fulfilling 3% contribution obligation. For this to occur, the local jurisdiction must request, and Metro must provide, a Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) concurrent with the cooperative agreement. The LONP will include reasonable terms to ensure adherence to a scope of work for advancing specified projects.
- > **Metro review and comment on draft design products.** This activity will happen at 15% and 30% design milestones. These reviews will include an agreed-upon comment resolution process negotiated between Metro and the local jurisdiction prior to the start of preliminary engineering. This process would include a schedule and comment log managed by the designated local jurisdiction liaison. Review by Metro Program Management will ensure that pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure has a seamless connection across the transit project boundary.
- > **Metro review of project costing.** This activity will happen at the completion of the preliminary engineering phase in advance of Metro Board adoption of an FLM project budget. It will include sharing and review of the costing approach and built-in assumptions. Metro must concur on project costs developed through the preliminary engineering process for facilitation of the 3% contribution agreements.

- > **Local jurisdiction and Metro coordination for a seamless transit project interface.** Both parties will agree upon a process for review of the interface between FLM projects and the transit project. This is to ensure a better user (pedestrian/bicyclist) experience.
- > **Timeliness.** Ideally, FLM preliminary engineering will conclude at or near the same time as transit project preliminary engineering. To support this goal, the cooperative agreement will specify a schedule and allow Metro to ultimately disallow 3% match credit in the event of severe delay. Metro will allow flexibility for reasonable delays.
- > **Designation of responsibility for environmental review.** The cooperative terms will specify which entity will prepare environmental review as described below. If Metro prepares environmental clearance, the local jurisdiction will need to provide project descriptions, and careful coordination will be required.

- > **Finalize eligibility for 3% contribution** – Increasing confidence in cost estimates for both Metro and local jurisdictions will provide a foundation for negotiations on the local jurisdiction’s 3% contribution per Measure M Guidelines. As 3% arrangements are finalized, Metro will require compliance with program terms as described in the Guidelines. Note that each jurisdiction’s ability to meet the 3% requirement through FLM implementation should include FLM high priority projects (focused on safety and accessibility), as selected in the FLM plan. This step is intended to culminate in Metro Board approval of project costs eligible for the 3% contribution, and serves as the FLM equivalent of establishing a LOP budget for a transit corridor project. Note that in the event of a change in FLM project feasibility or scope change, the project will still be eligible for the 3% contribution if the project is replaced with another project with the same objectives. If the project is abandoned entirely without replacement, then the costs incurred will not be eligible for use toward the 3% contribution.
 - > **Refine and advance project details and reach greater assurance of deliverability** – The preliminary engineering design process should reveal challenges and identify design solutions to deliver projects that are feasible from an engineering and constructibility point of view, thereby reducing risk for cities to implement these projects.
 - > **Improve opportunities for obtaining grant funding for project implementation** – Advancing FLM projects through preliminary engineering and environmental clearance, if required, will assist local jurisdictions in the pursuit of local, state, and federal grant funding opportunities for those projects that are not funded through a jurisdiction’s 3% contribution. Many grant programs require that projects applying for funding be “shovel ready,” with key preliminary work efforts such as environmental clearance completed. Advancing the selected FLM projects in each station area to this level increases the likelihood that these projects will be eligible for a range of available grant funding programs.
 - > Timeline for completion of the FLM Preliminary Engineering work efforts by the local jurisdiction – It is anticipated that the timing for completion of FLM Preliminary Engineering would vary on a station-by-station basis, based on FLM project prioritization, local jurisdiction capacity, and funding availability. Metro and the local jurisdiction will negotiate and agree to a proposed timeline for FLM Preliminary Engineering based on these factors prior to the initiation of work (see Box 6 for details regarding the cooperative agreement).
 - > Consistency between the preliminary engineering designs and the adopted FLM Plan and Pathway Network projects - Metro and local jurisdiction will agree to defined review opportunities for Metro during the FLM Preliminary Engineering process. All FLM Preliminary Engineering designs will follow local jurisdiction design standards, since these improvements would occur within local jurisdiction right-of-way.
 - > Cost reimbursement and cost sharing - Where appropriate, coop agreements will include cost sharing arrangements for inter-agency reviews.
- To facilitate this coordination and review process, a local liaison to Metro from the local jurisdiction would be designated. The local jurisdiction liaison would have the ability to facilitate contacts and ensure that design drawings are made available for review by Metro at the designated time periods to ensure alignment with the transit corridor project. The local jurisdiction liaison would be responsible for monitoring the preliminary engineering design schedule and comment log for the review process based on coordination with the local jurisdiction’s internal departments and Metro. Appendix C provides more detail on the roles and responsibilities through each phase of the FLM process.

II. Process and Sequencing

Preliminary engineering for FLM projects will be led by local agencies and will proceed separately from the preliminary engineering effort undertaken for the transit corridor project. These separate design processes may proceed at different paces and/or the initiation of design may occur at different times for different transit corridor projects. However, both should be coordinated by sharing plans, CAD files, station designs, and improvements to ensure consistency and timeliness. The local jurisdiction and Metro will coordinate on FLM Preliminary Engineering led by the local jurisdiction. The key elements of this coordination involve the following:

III. Roles and Responsibilities

The key players involved in preliminary engineering are local jurisdictions, Metro staff, and other stakeholders including Community-Based Organizations. The local jurisdiction will manage and oversee a consultant selected to complete preliminary engineering, which may be funded by the various funding mechanisms described in Box 9.

Local jurisdictions will lead the FLM Preliminary Engineering work providing consistent practice with local active transportation and streetscape project delivery. This locally led work will require close coordination with Metro in order to arrive at refined project costing concurrence to facilitate 3% contribution agreements, and to facilitate an effective interface with transit station(s) delivered as part of the transit project.

Box 7: First/Last Mile Project Limits

FLM planning efforts are focused on the half-mile radius around each transit station for walking and wheel projects and may for special cases extend out to a three-mile radius for wheel projects, consistent with Federal Transit Administration guidelines for station access sheds by mode.


The transit project boundary is intended to house the Metro station, station plazas, and construction staging. All elements inside the transit project boundary are considered part of the transit project and delivery of these elements are Metro’s responsibility. All improvements outside the boundary are considered FLM projects for local delivery. FLM Planning may result in identified FLM project needs within project boundaries, e.g. multi-use pathways along Metro ROW. These would be considered as FLM projects in limited circumstances where they do not impair feasibility of the transit project, and where local agencies and Metro specifically agree on approach for funding, delivery and maintenance. Common transit project/station elements (e.g. bike parking) that serve an FLM related function are delivered by Metro according to existing practice and are not considered local FLM projects for purpose of these Guidelines.

In these cases where streetscape and related improvements occur within the transit project boundary, the FLM 30% design effort will need to be closely coordinated with the transit corridor project 30% design effort to ensure that FLM design elements are seamless across the transit project boundary. The

FLM 30% design effort for walking projects would focus on the project limits located between the transit project boundary and a half-mile from the stations.

Coordination should include meetings between the transit corridor design/build contractor and the FLM 30% design team at major design milestones - 15% and 30% design - to ensure improvements are timely and aligned. Metro may also consider adding minimum FLM improvement design criteria to the Metro Rail Design Criteria (MRDC) to ensure consistency across projects.

The FLM project selection process may result in different types and lengths of wheel projects that advance to 30% design. Generally, 30% design efforts for wheel projects would also be focused in the area between the transit project boundary and the half-mile radius from each station. However, there may be longer wheel projects that extend beyond the half-mile radius, while remaining within the three-mile radius. The three-mile radius represents the maximum distance away from the station that a wheel project could extend. Projects considered for extension beyond the half-mile must provide connectivity to existing regional bicycle infrastructure and/or a major destination that would not otherwise be served by rail transit.



* NOT TO SCALE

Site Definition/Project Boundary

Metro strongly encourages that CBOs continue to play a role during preliminary engineering, as well, by advising on trade-offs in street space allocation (e.g. to remove parking to accommodate a bike facility) that surface during this phase. More details about each player's roles and responsibilities follow.

To ensure a seamless experience for transit riders walking or bicycling to the station, it is important that the walking and bicycle infrastructure is connected and comparable when traversing the transit project boundary. This will require that Metro and the local jurisdiction work together on design on both sides of the transit project boundary. To achieve this coordination, the following steps should be taken:

1. Metro should update the MRDC to describe the necessity of an effective FLM interface at the transit project boundary to ensure continuity of access between FLM projects that lie within the transit project boundary and those that are within the local jurisdiction's right-of-way.
2. New Master Cooperative Agreements (post-FLM Guidelines adoption) should include special reference to the importance of the cross-boundary pedestrian interface and require coordination meetings, design review, and comment resolution / consensus between Metro and the local jurisdiction on design for pedestrian and bicycle improvements. Review and comment should occur at the same level of design as is typical.
3. Local jurisdiction-designed FLM improvements shall be reviewed by the Metro Program Management Team overseeing engineering and design of the transit project to ensure pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure has a seamless connection across the transit project boundary.

In the absence of local jurisdiction-led FLM project(s) and formal coordination required under cooperative terms, Metro will identify any significant discontinuity of pedestrian and rolling mode infrastructure (e.g. missing sidewalks, significant sidewalk width change, etc.) and ensure that the design and implementation of the transit project will remedy the discontinuity issue and ensure effective interface between the station and its surrounds. Per Motion 14.1 any such remedies for discontinuity may not be eliminated from the scope of the project through value engineering. Further, Metro will consider updates to the MRDC to further define and formalize this expectation. Pending MRDC updates, it is generally expected that FLM Team will review station designs during preliminary engineering to assist in this effort.

Metro Staff

FLM – The Metro FLM Team will lead overall coordination with the local jurisdiction managing preliminary engineering. This coordination will be focused on review of interim and final work product as described further below and ensuring adherence to cooperative terms (see Box 6) preceding the development of a 3% contribution agreement.

Mobility Corridors – The Metro Mobility Corridors Team may assist in general coordination and review of work product. Note that Mobility Corridors staff will likely have concluded their lead efforts on the transit project prior to the preliminary engineering stage for FLM.

Program Management – Metro Program Management oversees design (all stages beyond conceptual) and construction of transit projects. During preliminary engineering, staff from Program Management will serve as a support department and provide technical review of 15% and 30% design drawings. As part of this review, staff will look closely at FLM projects within the transit project boundary to ensure they are coordinated with the engineering and design of the corresponding transit project. Program Management will also ensure that these FLM improvements are not value engineered out of the corridor project, consistent with Metro Board direction.

Community Relations - The Metro Community Relations Team may assist in coordination with local stakeholders and assist local jurisdictions for any stakeholder coordination during FLM Preliminary Engineering or transit project engineering design.

Arts & Design - Metro Arts & Design will assist in review of work products, specifically focusing on review of wayfinding and trailblazing signs to ensure consistency with Metro design standards.

Local Jurisdictions

Local jurisdictions will lead the development of preliminary engineering for FLM projects, ensuring a design and project delivery approach that mirrors other local active transportation and streetscape work. This locally-led effort will require coordination with Metro, and specifically adherence to cooperative terms described in Box 6. These cooperative terms outline project commitments as well as interagency review processes. This coordination is necessary both to facilitate subsequent 3% contribution agreements and to ensure that projects have an effective and cohesive interface with transit stations designed and constructed by Metro.

Box 8: First/Last Mile Projects Associated with Public Private Partnership (P3) Transit Corridor Projects

For transit corridor projects proposed by Metro to be delivered through a P3 project delivery model, the FLM planning and design processes would continue on a parallel, but separate, track to the transit corridor project or concurrent activities. FLM projects would occur outside of the transit project boundary of the P3 project. A key difference in P3 projects is the timing of the establishment of the LOP budget. As part of the typical standard project delivery process, Metro would establish the LOP at the completion of preliminary engineering. Under a P3 delivery model, the LOP (or its equivalent) is established at a stage called Financial Closeout, which typically corresponds to about 15% design level.

In the P3 project delivery approach, Metro would typically first conduct a procurement process focused around issuance of a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for contractor/project delivery teams. Following completion of the RFQ stage, shortlisted project teams are typically provided a design stipend and invited to participate in a Request for Proposals (RFP) stage. The completion of this stage results in each contractor/project delivery team submitting a proposed price and design to construct the proposed transit corridor project.

Under the P3 project delivery scenario, FLM planning should be performed concurrent with or prior to the initiation of the RFQ stage. FLM planning efforts may occur as part of the P3 design effort, or as a separate process. In either case, once the FLM planning work is complete, FLM Preliminary Engineering would occur on a separate track from the RFQ stage. The end objective is to time the completion of the preliminary engineering phase for the FLM projects with the selection of the preferred contractor/project delivery team for the transit corridor project. This approach ensures that the FLM improvements located within the transit project boundary for proposed stations would be accounted for the P3 project delivery.

It is strongly encouraged that local jurisdictions use “complete street” design standards that reflect the prioritization of pedestrians, bicyclists, and other active transportation users. In the case that the local jurisdiction is not using these design standards, established third party design guidelines may be used, such as those provided in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) design guidelines, or other recognized resources.

Other Stakeholders

Community Based Organizations – Metro strongly encourages that CBOs continue to support community engagement efforts necessary for the FLM projects during the preliminary engineering and environmental clearance stages.

IV. Key Work Products

The overall timeline for completion of the preliminary engineering process will vary depending on the size, scope, and complexity of the FLM projects proposed, as well as the timelines for Metro review and coordination. Typically, the duration of preliminary engineering would be about 12 to 15 months after initiating consultant work.

Based on the milestones identified above, the engineering consultant team would be expected to submit the deliverables below. Individual stations and projects will have unique conditions that will result in likely variations and possible exclusions for some of these work elements. However, these work elements represent the common steps involved in the design scope for FLM improvements.

- > Project Administration and Management Plan
- > Quality Assurance / Quality Control (QA/QC) Plan
- > Project Schedule
- > Plan sets with base mapping for 15% and 30% design submittals
- > Updated project cost estimates based on 30% design submittals
- > Final FLM budget

More detail on typical scope of work for FLM Preliminary Engineering is available in Appendix E. As FLM projects proceed, it is recommended that summary lessons are documented to explain how FLM improvements within transit project boundaries connect to FLM improvements that lie within the local jurisdiction's right-of-way.

D. First/Last Mile Implementation

(Lead: Local Jurisdiction)

This section describes the steps that follow the preliminary engineering, environmental clearance, execution of 3% contribution agreements, and completion of preliminary engineering design packages for FLM projects located outside of the transit project boundary. Three-percent (3%) agreements will be negotiated on a case by case basis, and are subject to terms specified in Measure M Guidelines as well as FLM-specific elements included in Box 5. From this point, local jurisdictions are responsible for the remaining design work and all necessary steps for construction, which should follow the local jurisdiction's own process for delivery of streetscape and active transportation projects. Metro will provide assistance and support for local efforts to secure funding. Further, Metro will ensure effective alignment of FLM elements at stations and the broader Pathway Network projects.

It is Metro's goal that FLM projects identified in the 3% agreement would be completed by the local jurisdiction prior to the opening day of the transit project. However, it is acknowledged the each project will be unique due to a variety of factors, including the need to manage construction coordination between FLM and the transit project. Each 3% agreement will specify the expenditure deadline terms on a project-by-project basis.

Each step of FLM implementation is described below with a brief description and a summary of roles. Definitions of these roles include the following:

- > **Lead:** The agency that is responsible for preparing the product in this phase. The lead is always the local jurisdiction in this phase.
- > **Support:** Metro department(s) that will contribute or provide input to the preparation of a specific product in this phase, such as a competitive funding grant application.
- > **Coordination:** Metro department(s) whose objectives overlap with this phase and require alignment with the FLM project.

I. Final Design

Description - Upon completion of the preliminary engineering design package by the local jurisdiction, completion of an FLM project budget, local jurisdictions are responsible to complete the final design of all FLM projects committed through the 3% contribution agreement. As part of the progress reporting requirement described in the 3% Contribution Agreement, the

local jurisdiction will keep Metro apprised of any significant changes in projects as design is finalized and will coordinate with Metro staff to ensure integration of Pathway Network projects with stations.

There are several different ways that local jurisdictions may approach the final design and implementation of the FLM improvements:

- > Implement the FLM improvements as a **single project or package of projects**, where multiple improvements are designed and constructed under a single contract.
- > Advance each FLM project or project corridor **individually**, depending on a variety of factors, including funding availability, sequencing of construction and implementation of improvements, and coordination with construction of nearby transit corridor project improvements.
- > Design and implement **“walk projects” separate from “wheel projects”** or signage and landscape projects separate from projects occurring within the roadway, as the construction of these different improvements may involve different contractors, or selected types of improvements may be implemented by local jurisdiction public works crews as opposed to private construction contractors.

Given the variability in the approaches available to design and implement the proposed FLM improvements, it will be important for Metro to specify schedule commitments for construction and implementation of FLM improvements as part of the 3% contribution negotiations.

Roles

- > **Lead:** Local jurisdiction
- > **Support:** N/A
- > **Coordination:** Metro FLM and Metro Program Management with regard to on-going progress reporting; coordination on FLM pathway elements with final station design and construction. The FLM Team will review transit project construction drawings from Program Management through final design on the transit project for the purpose of ensuring alignment between station design and the FLM Plan.

II. Funding

Description – Local agencies are responsible for securing funding to deliver committed FLM projects, from any of a variety of sources. These Guidelines provide an overall funding strategy to facilitate FLM project delivery to the greatest extent possible; different funding mechanisms are described in Box 9.

Roles

- > Lead: Local jurisdiction
- > Support: Metro Strategic Financial Planning to provide priority access to Grant Writing Assistance, subject to periodic authorization. Metro FLM would provide background materials and supporting information for grant applications prepared by local jurisdictions.
- > Coordination: N/A

III. Construction

Description – Local jurisdictions are responsible for constructing all FLM improvements committed in the 3% contribution agreement. Subject to necessary elements of 3% contribution agreements, local agencies will be required to provide regular progress reports, and notify Metro of any material changes. Local agencies will also continue coordination with Metro on integration of FLM pathway projects within stations and immediate surrounds.

Roles

- > Lead: Local jurisdiction
- > Support: N/A
- > Coordination: Metro FLM, Metro Program Management with regard to on-going progress reporting; coordination on FLM pathway elements with final station design and construction.

IV. Maintenance

Description – Maintenance of all FLM improvements within the local jurisdiction's right-of-way is the responsibility of the local jurisdiction. Metro will not maintain these FLM improvements. Metro is responsible for maintaining its own property, right-of-way, and improvements included within this right-of-way.

Roles

- > Lead: Local jurisdiction
- > Support: N/A
- > Coordination: N/A

Box 9: Funding Mechanisms

The following is provided as general guidance to local jurisdictions on funding FLM projects:

3% Contribution to Major Transit Projects

Local jurisdiction project delivery utilizing the 3% contribution option is anticipated to be the primary mechanism for funding/delivery for FLM projects, noting that directing 3% contribution toward FLM projects is entirely at the discretion of the local jurisdiction, as subject to terms substantially described in these Guidelines including the limitation to allow this option for priority projects in the adopted FLM plan. Each of the following funding mechanisms are eligible for local jurisdiction use toward funding the 3% contribution, except where noted.

Grants

There are a variety of grant funding sources eligible and appropriate for FLM. These notably include:

- > **California Active Transportation Program (ATP)** – primary State funding program for active transportation; typically, available every other year. ATP criteria, while subject to change, are generally advantageous for FLM projects. This program, as of the time of drafting of these Guidelines, is highly competitive across the state and over-subscribed with requested funding exceeding available funding.
- > **Metro Active Transport (MAT) Program*** – Metro Measure M-funded discretionary, competitive active transportation program. This program as currently structured heavily emphasizes FLM and is focused on existing stations. Future cycles may be geared toward new transit corridor projects, subject to further consideration.
- > **Multiyear Subregional Programs** – Measure M funds allocated to projects at the discretion of subregional Councils of Governments. Availability and applicability for FLM projects highly variable depending on the subregion.

Grant Assistance Program

Metro's on-going program to provide grant writing assistance to local jurisdictions; focused on State ATP. Subject to periodic reauthorization of the program, Metro will provide priority access to local jurisdictions seeking to implement FLM plans for new transit corridors.

Sources at Local Jurisdiction Discretion

- > **Local Return** – Substantial, highly flexible funding is available to local agencies through Measure M and prior sales tax measure Local Return programs.
- > **Innovative Local** – Jurisdictions can secure funding through a variety of innovative mechanisms including tax increment and infrastructure financing districts, or through mechanisms to condition development.
- > **Local Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and maintenance budgets** – some FLM project types can be implemented when roads are repaved or otherwise repaired or improved. The local jurisdiction should consider reviewing their existing programs and timelines for opportunistic ways to implement some FLM projects.

* Metro competitive grants are not eligible for use toward the 3% contribution. All other non-MAT grant-funded projects are eligible for use toward the 3% contribution.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Due to differences between bus rapid transit (BRT) and other transit projects (e.g. project delivery scopes and schedules, inability to apply Measure M 3% contribution to FLM), the Guidelines approach FLM for BRT projects with some differences.

A. Project Scope

FLM planning would be conducted for a subset of BRT stations. This subset would be determined first through a technical assessment to identify high priority stops (e.g. highest projected daily boardings, major transfer activity, challenging existing conditions, potential connections to active transportation corridors), and then, based on the relative interest of the local jurisdictions since local jurisdictions would be responsible for preliminary engineering and implementation/capital funding.

FLM planning for the chosen subset of BRT stations would encapsulate the usual half-mile and three-mile radial distances around a station (for pedestrian and bicycle access), but outside the transit project boundary where existing FLM projects are already being considered for delivery with the transit project. The transit project boundary is unique to each station and typically defined through the design process to identify elements necessary for successful functioning of the station and system. The transit project boundary is finalized at the completion of the construction bid documents. FLM planning would coordinate projects to ensure cohesion with these other projects within the transit project boundary.

For BRT, the FLM project list from the Planning phase may prioritize projects closer-in to the station area and/or perpendicular to the BRT corridor. Moreover, center-running operations may prioritize intersection treatments.

B. Sequencing

Formal FLM planning for BRT projects would begin once the locally preferred alternative (LPA) is selected, allowing for more targeted and efficient planning. Similar to other transit projects, though, FLM considerations may be included as part of the alternatives analysis which precedes selection of the LPA.

Since extensive community engagement helps determine the LPA, members of the community should be informed of future FLM planning activities as a way to maintain their continued engagement after LPA selection.

C. Roles and Responsibilities

Metro Mobility Corridors project staff and consultants would lead FLM planning for BRT stations—including community engagement and environmental review. Metro FLM staff would provide day-to-day guidance to the consulting team but the consultants would be contracted directly by the transit project. Preliminary engineering and implementation would be delivered by the local jurisdiction.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

4 FLM Guidelines Implementation

With a focus on delineating and clearly defining the FLM project development process, including the sequencing of individual phases of work and the roles of various Metro departments, local jurisdictions, and CBOs, the FLM Guidelines lay out a path forward for Metro and local jurisdictions to achieve the vision originally set forth by the Metro Board of Directors in Motions 14.1 and 14.2. The Guidelines further establish requirements for Metro and local jurisdiction work efforts and necessary elements for both formal agreements and general coordination between agencies.

The Guidelines achieve the following objectives:

- > Establishment of a consistent sequential FLM project process, including clear identification of the roles filled by Metro and local jurisdictions at each stage.
- > Definition of both the transit project boundary and FLM project area and the responsibilities for Metro and local jurisdictions in each area for FLM projects, including design, construction, and maintenance.
- > Establishment of an average assumed budget allocation process for FLM improvements by station.
- > Definition of how and under what conditions local jurisdictions can apply a portion of their 3% contribution for rail transit projects toward the design and implementation of FLM improvements.
- > Outline how Metro and local jurisdictions will coordinate through each phase of the FLM process.

Key steps and actions associated with the application of the Guidelines include the following:

- > Adoption by the Metro Board of Directors. The adoption action will specify revisions or additions to Metro policies including FLM policies (Motions 14.1 and 14.2) and Measure M Guidelines, specifically as they relate to 3% contribution policy. Once adopted, the necessary elements specified in these Guidelines are binding. More general process description is intended as guidance.

- > The Guidelines may be amended by further action of the Metro Board.
- > The Guidelines will apply to Metro transit projects as described in the Introduction, Section C - Integration with Transit Projects and with detail provided for all projects in Appendix G. Metro staff will provide periodic progress reports to the Metro Board.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendices

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix A: Applicable Metro Policies, Plans, and Guidance Documents

Adopted Policies/Plans

Board Motion 14.1 (2016): The approval of Motion 14.1 established foundational FLM planning and implementation policy. It designated streets within the Active Transportation Strategic Plan's 661 transit station areas as the Countywide First-Last Mile Priority Network and called for support to FLM improvements through funding, technical, and grant-writing support. Specifically, it states that FLM Priority Network project delivery should be incorporated into the planning, design, and construction of all MTA transit projects and that these elements shall not be value engineered out of any project.

Measure M Guidelines (2017): After the approval of Measure M by Los Angeles County voters in 2016, Metro developed a set of guidelines regarding the management and oversight of Measure M and its component elements. The Guidelines outline the program methodology and provide criteria for local jurisdictions to meet all or a portion of their 3% local contribution obligation through active transportation capital improvements and first/last mile improvements.

Board Motion 14.2 (2016): The approval of Motion 14.2 allows required 3% contribution to major transit projects to be achieved through FLM project delivery.

First Last Mile Strategic Plan (2014): This plan established goals and provided a strategy to improve FLM conditions, as well as a toolkit to analyze existing conditions and identify needs in and around transit corridors. The Strategic Plan set the stage for continued development of FLM policy and the updates needed by this Guidelines document. It provides a methodology for the development of FLM plans, which has been used for several completed FLM plans (see Box 1). In

2020, a First/Last Mile Methodology Update was developed to provide recommended additions to the original 2014 plan; it is in Appendix F of the FLM Guidelines.

Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Policy: The Transit Oriented Communities Policy (TOC Policy) establishes Metro's commitment to incorporating equity and community development in how we plan and deliver the transit system. The TOC Policy defines TOCs for Metro, defines where Metro leads and where we support others to realize TOCs, and it defines TOC activities that LA County jurisdictions can implement using Measure M local return.

Vision 2028 Strategic Plan: This plan is Metro's recently adopted 10-year plan, which sets the mission, vision, and performance goals for the agency. Key components of the plan related to FLM include ensuring that all Los Angeles County residents have access to high-quality mobility options within a 10-minute walk or roll from home, delivering outstanding trip experiences for all users, and enhancing communities and lives through mobility and access to opportunity.

Equity Platform Framework: This framework recognized that inequity exists when there are fundamental differences in access to opportunity, and that race, age, gender, physical ability, and residency can expand or constrain opportunities for individuals. As a transportation provider, the agency also recognized its role in connecting people with opportunity such as jobs, education, health care, and other components of vibrant communities. FLM improvements are one lens through which this framework can be applied to transit projects and Metro's work.

Metro also recently developed an Equity Focus Communities (EFC) metric in order to highlight areas where the demographics of residents are correlated with lower access to opportunity. These communities have the highest non-white, low-income, and zero-car populations. This metric can be used to help prioritize the deployment of FLM treatments as a way of addressing historically inequitable investment.

Active Transportation Strategic Plan (ATSP): The ATSP is the agency's overall blueprint for active transportation activities and investment, and established FLM as a twin pillar (along with a network of regional scale corridors) of the envisioned system of active transportation infrastructure serving the region.

Guidance Documents

Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit: The Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit (the Toolkit) is a research based resource that details specific policies and programs that can be used to promote Transit Oriented Communities (TOC). The Toolkit is grounded in 10 characteristics of transit supportive places and provides local governments, advocates, and developers in Los Angeles County (Metro’s service area) with strategies for integrating land use and transportation planning, in order to encourage reduced passenger vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through increased rates of walking, biking, and transit usage. The Toolkit includes a wide range of policy and regulatory tools that have successfully been implemented throughout Southern California and across the State.

Metro Transfers Design Guide: This guide builds upon Metro’s First/Last Mile Strategic Plan and recently funded FLM improvement efforts to improve access to transit and create more seamless trips for customers from start to finish. It provides a user-friendly Design Checklist and flexible Design Toolbox that can be used to assess and develop improvements for a range of transit conditions across Los Angeles County.

Chapter 12.o of Metro Signage & Environmental Graphic Design Standards, Trailblazing: Trailblazing Standards serve as a comprehensive guide for any entity that is implementing wayfinding signage on a non-Metro property that guides customers to and from Metro stations.

Chapter 10.o of Metro Signage & Environmental Graphic Design Standards, Materials & Fabrication: The Materials and Fabrication Graphic Design Standards serve as a comprehensive guide for any entity that is fabricating and/or installing signs that include Metro branding or service information. The document provides guidance on fabrication methods and material applications that maintain the Metro brand identity and quality assurance standards.

Although the First Last Mile Strategic Plan established goals and provided a toolkit to evaluate and recommend FLM treatments, it did not formalize a process for integrating the policy into Metro planning and project delivery. In 2016, the Metro Board gave broad direction on a variety of activities to implement, or facilitate implementation, of FLM projects. The Board motions directed staff to undertake the following actions:




Figure 1-1: Metro Board Motion 14.1 and 14.2 Policy Directives

Appendix B:

Glossary of Terms

- > **Access shed** – An access shed refers to the area surrounding the transit station that a person would reasonably traverse as the “first or last mile” to or from a station. For pedestrians, this access shed is typically within a half-mile radius, or 15-minute walk; for bicycles, this access shed is typically within a three-mile radius due to the faster speeds of a wheeled transportation mode. Related terminology includes walk shed for pedestrians and bike shed for bicycles.
 - > **Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)** – A form of bus service operating in a segregated running ways dedicated to transit for a majority of its route. The service represents a substantial investment in a defined corridor or subarea. Defined stations, traffic signal priority for transit and short headway bidirectional services for a substantial part of weekdays and weekends are included in this service.
 - > **Corridor-based Bus/BRT** – A form of bus service representing a substantial investment in a defined corridor, having defined stations, traffic signal priority for transit and short headway bidirectional services in portions of a segregated fixed-guideway for a substantial part of weekdays.
 - > **California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)** – The state law that guides the environmental clearance process for certain projects.
 - > **Core Capacity Improvement Projects** – Projects that include improvements to capacity to an existing fixed guideway system by at least 10%, as described by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
 - > **Community Based Organizations (CBOs)** – A non-profit group that is representative of a community or a significant segment of the community and works to meet community needs. Members of these organizations are experts in their own communities, typically with unique and granular knowledge of local conditions and needs.
 - > **Corridor Projects** – These projects propose the implementation of high-capacity transit services along a defined or specified corridor, linking together a series of neighborhoods and destinations along the corridor through a network of transit stations or stops. Transit corridor projects may propose either rail or bus service to operate in the corridor.
 - > **Corridor-Based Bus Rapid Transit Projects** – Projects that include improvements to bus rapid transit operating along a specific corridor but not on separated right-of-way, as defined by the FTA.
 - > **Countywide BRT Vision & Principles** – Metro’s current BRT planning study that will establish BRT design guidelines for Los Angeles County and evaluate potential corridors for future BRT investment.
 - > **Environmental Clearance Process** – This process involves the preparation of the appropriate environmental document (i.e. categorical exemption, mitigated negative declaration, or environmental impact report) by the appropriate lead agency, following the guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
 - > **Equity Focus Communities (EFCs)** – Under Metro’s developing equity policy, the EFC metric identifies communities are census tracts where 1) at least 40% of the population is low-income (less than \$35,000 annual income), and 2) at least 80% of the population is Non-White or at least 10% of households do not own a car.
 - > **First/Last Mile (FLM)** – Bus and rail services that frame the core of a transit rider’s trip from origin to destination, but users must complete the first and last portion on their own; they must first walk, drive or roll themselves to the nearest station. This is the first and last mile of the user’s trip, or first/last mile.
 - > **Letter of No Prejudice (LONP)** – For FLM projects committed under 3% agreements, there may be instances where a local jurisdiction would like to start a project prior to the 3% Agreement being executed. A Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) allows a jurisdiction to use local funds to start a specific aspect of their project (a portion of the Scope of Work) for a specified dollar amount and still be credited for that portion of their 3% contribution. However, it offers the jurisdiction no guarantee that the 3% credit will be available in the future and that proceeding with the project is at the local jurisdiction’s sole risk. FLM projects implemented for 3% credit must be included in the adopted FLM plan along with meeting other requirements laid out in these Guidelines.
- The local jurisdiction must request a LONP in writing and provide Metro with a list of tasks desired to be undertaken before the Agreement is executed, the amount to be expended for the specific tasks along with a schedule for completing the work. LONP needs to be signed by the Chief Planning Officer and requires Metro staff to review and approve prior to being transmitted to the Chief Planning Officer.
- Local jurisdiction must submit Quarterly reports if a LONP is approved for the project.

- > **Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)** – The preferred project that emerges from a corridor level analysis which evaluates all reasonable mode and alignment alternatives for addressing a transportation problem.
- > **Local Return** – Metro’s program to formulaically distribute countywide sales tax revenues to local jurisdictions to fund transportation programs in local jurisdictions.
- > **Master Cooperative Agreement (MCA)** – An agreement between Metro and a local jurisdiction to establish cooperative process and terms for delivering Metro projects, and is the typical agreement used for any necessary review and permitting of transit corridor projects.
- > **Measure M** – Los Angeles County’s most recent transit-supportive sales tax measure, adopted by voters in 2016, which adds a half-cent to the sales tax in the county and includes funding for first/last mile improvements. This measure expanded Measure R, which was a half-cent sales tax increase approved in 2008, by adding new transit projects and expediting others previously approved under Measure R.
- > **Metro Active Transport, Transit and First/Last Mile (MAT) Program** – Program established by Measure M which is expected to fund over \$857 million (2015\$) by 2039 in active transportation projects throughout the Los Angeles region.
- > **National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO)** – A coalition of transportation officials that develops best practices for street design and transportation.
- > **National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA)** – The federal law that guides the environmental clearance process for other projects.
- > **NextGen Bus Plan** – Metro’s first system-wide redesign effort in over 25 years, with the goal of increasing ridership and service reliability.
- > **Pathway Network** – A hierarchy of first/last mile routes that extend out from a transit station, that people can use to find and access the transit station. The development of a station-specific Pathway Network is organized around five core values: Safe, Intuitive, Universally Accessible, Efficient, and Fun. Pathways to a station are striated hierarchically into arterials, collectors, and cut-throughs.
- > **Pathway Arterial** – Pathway Arterials are categorized as the main branch lines that extend from stations and function as primary routes used to connect people to and from the Metro Station. Pathway Arterials typically feed directly into and connect to the station.
- > **Pathway Collector** – Pathway Collectors are categorized as secondary feeder routes that provide efficient access to Pathway Arterials and support crossing movements to reduce travel distances for non-motorized users. Pathway Collectors tend to be smaller in scale and character than Pathway Arterials.
- > **Pathway Cut-Throughs** – Pathway Cut-Throughs are categorized as off-street passageway that shorten walking or biking distance and make it easier for a transit rider to get to a transit station.
- > **Public Private Partnership (P3)** – An agreement formed between both private and public-sector partners in an attempt to develop transportation infrastructure, known as P3 projects.
- > **Transit Fixed Guideway projects** – Projects that include improvements to a bus rapid transit route operating within a separated right-of-way, as defined by the FTA.
- > **Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Policy** – Metro policy framework that supports people driving less and using transit more by coordinating community development and land use with transportation planning.
- > **Vision 2028 Strategic Plan** – Metro’s big picture plan to improve mobility in Los Angeles County and explains what the public can expect from Metro over the next ten years.
- > **Walk Audit** – During a walk audit, community members and other stakeholders document what it is like to walk and bike around the station area, taking note of elements that make it easier or harder to access the Metro station. These are typically performed within a half-mile from the Metro station being studied.

Appendix C: Table of Roles and Responsibilities

		Metro FLM Team	Metro Mobility Corridors Team	Metro Community Relations	Metro Program Management	Metro Strategic Financial Planning	Metro Arts and Design	Local Jurisdictions	Community-Based Organizations
FLM PLANNING	Existing Conditions Analysis	Lead	Participate					Participate	
	FLM Technical Walk Audit	Lead	Support	Support				Participate	Participate
	Draft Pathway Network	Lead	Participate					Participate	Participate
	Community Engagement	Lead Support		Lead Support				Participate	Participate Support
	Final Pathway Network and Project Ideas	Lead	Support				Participate	Participate	Participate
	Project Scoring and Cost Estimates	Lead			Participate			Participate	
FLM ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE	Clearance Documentation	Support		Support	Review			Lead	Participate
	Lead Agency Action	Support						Lead	
FLM PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING	Project Administration and Management Plan	Review						Lead	
	QA/QC Plan	Review						Lead	
	Project Schedule	Review						Lead	
	15% and 30% Design Submittals	Review	Review		Review		Review	Lead	Participate
	Updated Cost Estimates	Review	Review		Review			Lead	
	Final FLM Budget	Review	Review		Review			Lead	
FLM IMPLEMENTATION	Final Design	Review			Review		Review	Lead	
	Funding	Support				Support		Lead	
	Construction	Participate			Participate			Lead	
	Maintenance							Lead	

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix D: Community Engagement Examples from FLM Plans

As mentioned in the body of the FLM Guidelines, community engagement is part and parcel of the FLM planning methodology and adds value to the final work products. Below are summaries of the community engagement approach from the Blue Line FLM Plan and the Gold Line 2B FLM Plan as examples for future FLM planning efforts. The goal of community engagement is to tap the community's knowledge to understand details in the existing environment; understand how people currently walk, bike or roll in the station area; educate community members on what FLM is; and ultimately gain support for the Pathway Network and project list by reflecting community desired-project types.

It should be noted that Metro's forthcoming Community-Based Organization Partnering Strategy includes multiple recommendations based on internal Metro department feedback and external input from Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) about how to successfully partner with CBOs. The recommendations are wide-ranging and applicable to different scenarios for working hand-in-hand with CBOs. The recommendations should be reviewed and applied for future projects.

Blue (A Line) FLM Plan Engagement Summary

(excerpted from full plan available here: http://media.metro.net/projects_studies/toc/images/report_toc_MBLFLM_execsummary.pdf)

CBOs were tasked with coordinating a series of activities in 11 of the 22 Blue (A Line) station areas. CBOs collectively decided which of the 11 station areas to focus their public engagement efforts. From the walk audit summaries, the

project team developed a menu of transportation treatments which residents could reference to determine which ones would be most relevant to meet their needs. At each event, these treatments were displayed on large poster boards and residents were given corresponding stickers to place on a large map of the station area where these treatments were needed. Four of the 11 activities featured "pop-up" engagement activities where similar questions were asked about infrastructure treatments, most frequently used pathways to the Blue (A Line) stations, and general feedback about community members' experience using the Blue Line.

At the "pop-up" activities, examples of some infrastructure treatments, such as wayfinding signage and street furniture were temporarily rolled out into the space where they might be recommended in the final Plan. CBOs coordinated these engagement activities by plugging into already planned community activities, such as the Jazz Festival, or locating them near highly populated areas such as a busy transit station or a park. At each event the CBOs created a festive atmosphere to attract residents to participate, including a live DJ, food, giveaways from Metro, community bike rides, tables with community resources, and artists creating artwork inspired by the location and the event in real time. Creating a festive environment brought many people into the engagement process in an inviting manner and CBOs engaged more people and a greater diversity of people than could have been reached through traditional planning methods. Input from the walk audits and the community activities were directly used to inform the Station Area Summaries.

Gold (L Line) 2B FLM Plan Engagement Summary

(excerpted from the appendix to the full plan available here: http://media.metro.net/projects_studies/FLM/images/appendices_FLM_GoldLineFoothillExtension2b.pdf)

Event Types

Stakeholder Interviews

The Arroyo Group conducted one-on-one in-person or telephone stakeholder interviews with representatives of regional institutions. These interviews focused on understanding each institution's background, employee and customer base, and desired or planned improvements relating to first/last mile access.

Community Pop-Up Activities

The Arroyo Group, with Metro staff, set up pop-up booths at existing activities to engage attendees in the first/last mile planning process. Pop-up activities were chosen to engage a broad cross-section of the general public. The main goal was to solicit information on potential pathways and barriers to walking biking as well as engaging attendees in future FLM outreach. The key questions to be answered included:

- > Where do you live/work?
- > Are you familiar with the new Gold Line station?
- > What would encourage you to walk or bike to the new station?
- > What path(s) would you take?

In addition to providing many good input into the process, community pop-up activities served to increase excitement and enthusiasm for Metro and the Gold (L Line) and to answer general questions related to the timing, location and operation of the line.

Public Workshops

Public workshops were stand-alone public meetings focused on presenting and reviewing the draft pathway network. Meetings were noticed by Metro, City staff and The Arroyo Group. Public workshops tended to attract a more interested and knowledgeable public who were able to provide feedback on specific pathways and project ideas identified by the project team.

Focus Group Meetings

Focus group meetings were meetings with members of identified stakeholder groups with a specific focus on youth and active transportation advocates. Meetings were conducted either by using the public workshop format of presenting and reviewing the draft pathway network, or by using the pop-up event format of soliciting input to the plan through a series of stations.

Community Intercepts

Community intercepts were engagement activities set up in public places to solicit input on the FLM process, pathways and project types. Parks, social service centers and existing public transit stops/stations were targeted to incorporate the opinion of existing transit riders, low-income populations and young families. Active SGV led these activities.

Council/Commission Meetings

Metro and The Arroyo Group visited several City Commissions and the Glendora City Council. The purpose of these meetings was to provide information about the project and solicit feedback on key pathways project types, in order to build support for the process in preparation for implementation by cities.

Appendix E: Sample Scope of Work for Preliminary Engineering

The following summary/sample scope is intended to provide general guidance for local agencies on contracting for preliminary engineering:

Project Administration/Project Schedule – The consultant will be required to prepare a project schedule and administration process to track progress and deliverables.

Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QA/QC) – The selected consultant is required to prepare a QA/QC plan for the production and review of design deliverables for the preliminary engineering contract.

Coordination Process – As described in the guidelines above, and established in cooperative terms in Box 6, the consultant will participate and facilitate in the coordination process for the preparation of the design drawings.

Local Planning Documents and Design Standards – The consultant will meet with the relevant local jurisdictions to discuss local plans for the project area, and collect local engineering standard drawings and other relevant documents that should be referenced when preparing preliminary engineering plans (15%, 30% design).

Base Mapping/Project Survey – Consultant shall obtain base mapping for the full extent of the FLM project limits along each project corridor in each station area. Base mapping detail shall be sufficient enough to allow for completion of 30% design and identification of critical design inputs, such as right-of-way limits, location of curb and gutter, and utilities (both above ground and locations for access to below grade utilities).

Utility/As-Built Research – Consultant shall research and obtain readily available utility verification maps and input into the base mapping. Identified utilities should include wet and dry utility types, sizes, materials, and as-built drawing

numbers. Utility research will be limited to areas in which physical FLM improvements are anticipated. The research should include sending out letters to utilities with an interest in the project study area and receiving as-built plans. This research will also include obtaining as-built drawings for the project corridors from appropriate local jurisdictions, and if necessary, Caltrans. Note: For projects that do not include curb modifications or ground disturbance – such as restriping of traffic lanes to provide bicycle lanes, or installation of wayfinding signage – utility investigation may not be necessary.

15% Design Package – The 15% design package typically represents approximately 50% completion of the preliminary engineering (30% design) plans. This submission of these in-process plans allows for review and comment during the design process.

30% Design Package – Contents of the 30% design package will vary among stations and project corridors, depending on the FLM elements proposed. For example, one project corridor may include sidewalk, lighting, and landscaping improvements, while another may be focused on the improvements necessary to implement a protected bicycle lane. These two project types, along with the range of different FLM improvement elements, will result in different packages of required design drawings.

The sheet list provided below is intended to identify a likely range of sheet types that would be required as part of the 30% design.

- > **Title Sheet** – Consultant shall prepare a title sheet on a Metro Title Block that includes an index of sheets, the project description, location map, and limits of work that summarizes the overall project plan set.
- > **Index of Sheets** – Consultant shall prepare a sheet index (table of contents) that identifies the location of each sheet, divided by discipline.
- > **Key Map** – Consultant shall prepare a sheet that includes a key map, sheet map, and the general notes for the overall project plan set.
- > **Legend and Abbreviations** – Consultant shall prepare a sheet legend for the plan symbols and list commonly-used and any specialty abbreviations for the project.
- > **Typical Cross Sections** – Consultant shall prepare typical section sheets for each proposed project corridor depicting the proposed FLM improvements that include existing ground, traveled way, shoulders, cut/fill slopes, retaining walls, existing/proposed fences, and existing/proposed right-of-way, at logical locations.

- > **Roadway Design Sheets** – Consultant shall prepare layout and profile sheets that include horizontal and vertical information for the FLM project design. Vertical data should be labeled in the profile, horizontal data should be labeled in the plan view, and curve data should be organized in data tables. The layout and profile sheets shall reflect existing topography, existing and proposed right-of-way, and existing utilities. The layout and profile sheets should identify the proposed FLM improvements, including drainage modifications, and any existing items that are required to be removed or demolished.
 - > **Signing & Striping Plans** – Consultant should prepare signing and striping plans for bikeway and street traveled way, as appropriate. Sign Plans include providing regulatory signs and directional signs in accordance with CA MUTCD guidelines, and if applicable, with Metro wayfinding signage guidelines. Striping Plans include striping and markings in accordance with CA MUTCD guidelines. Side street intersections that require modifications to signing and striping are included.
 - > **Sign Details** – Consultant shall prepare signing, hardware, and mounting details for signing plans for streets, bikeways, and intersections. Details will be in accordance with appropriate local jurisdiction standards and Chapter 12 of the Metro Signage & Environmental Graphic Design Standard: Trailblazing where applicable.
 - > **Preliminary Drainage Details** – Consultant shall prepare preliminary drainage detail sheets to support the drainage plans shown on the Layout and Profile sheets, where appropriate. Details may include standard headwalls, transitions to/from pipes to ditches, riprap sections, and other drawings needed for the drainage construction. For FLM projects that do not impact the existing drainage patterns on the project streets (i.e. wayfinding, lighting, striped bicycle improvements), drainage plans and details would likely not be required.
 - > **Electrical Plans** – Consultant should prepare sidewalk, bikeway, and street lighting plans, as appropriate based on the proposed FLM improvements for the subject project corridor. The sheets shall include all work necessary to install bikeway and street lighting circuits. Lighting throughout the project corridor shall conform to the appropriate local jurisdiction or Caltrans standards for street lighting.
 - > **Traffic Signal Plans** – As appropriate and if FLM projects require traffic signal modifications, the Consultant should prepare plans to modify traffic signals and upgrade intersection controls, if needed. The plans shall include the work necessary to modify the traffic signals and shall conform to the requirements of the appropriate local jurisdiction. A separate detail sheet should be prepared for each signal.
 - > **Utility Relocation Plans** – As appropriate, the consultant shall prepare plans to indicate which utilities will be relocated as a result of the FLM improvements. Callouts will include but are not limited to “raise manholes, canisters, and facilities to grade” and “protect facilities in place.” All local jurisdiction and franchise utility relocations should be assumed to be performed by the appropriate local jurisdiction or franchise utility company. Plans will indicate utility relocation by others. Consultant will need to coordinate with local jurisdiction and franchise utility companies to identify where relocation of utility infrastructure will be required for the proposed FLM improvements.
 - > **Landscape Plans** – As appropriate, Consultant should provide detailed landscape plans to include:
 - **Plant List Sheet** – A landscape summary sheet that includes an index of landscape sheets, plant list, and landscape legend that summarizes the landscape plan set.
 - **Planting Plans** – Plans for the proposed planting areas along and within project corridors, including planting layout and planting quantities. If appropriate and part of the FLM project list, site furnishings may be added to the planting plans.
 - > **Wayfinding Signage Plans and Details** – Prepare wayfinding signage plans, including layouts showing the locations of FLM wayfinding signs. Consultant should prepare details for wayfinding signage plans providing destination and mileage information. Details will be in accordance with appropriate local jurisdiction standards and Chapter 12 of the Metro Signage & Environmental Graphic Design Standard: Trailblazing where applicable.
- Each project will have variations in the design scope and therefore in terms of the number sheets for completion of the design effort. Sheet count is a function of the number stations involved in the project, the overall length of the project corridors selected for inclusion in preliminary engineering, the extent and variety of FLM improvements proposed along the selected project corridors, local jurisdiction design standards and guidelines.
- Cost Estimates** – These new, refined cost estimates that reflect the design elements proposed in the preliminary engineering design plans and will provide a greater level of cost certainty than the estimates prepared during the FLM planning phase. Cost estimates will be prepared following Metro guidelines and format to the extent required and established in cooperative terms.

Appendix F: First/Last Mile Methodology Update (2020)

This addendum presents changes to the Metro First/Last Mile (FLM) Planning methods as established in the 2014 First/Last Mile Strategic Plan. Proposed changes are a result of ongoing experience and lessons learned from completed and in progress First/Last Mile plans and is further informed by discussion among the FLM Planning team, Metro Transit Oriented Communities, and Metro consultant teams. Updates focus on how to create more efficient and equitable planning processes and outcomes. The updates are also intended to clarify ambiguities and common divergences in the current methodology, with an eye toward generating clear deliverables and projects that directly reflect community needs.

Each step is described below with a brief description, lessons learned from past experience, and a summary of roles. For more detailed descriptions of these steps, please reference the First/Last Mile Strategic Plan (2014) and completed FLM Plans online, as well as the First/Last Mile Safety Analysis Tool (2020) and First/Last Mile Planning for Micromobility report (2020) that are included as attachments to this methodology update.

I. First/Last Mile Planning Process

1. Existing Conditions Analysis

Description: The existing conditions analysis is the first step to understand the local environment around each station including land use, key destinations, existing and locally planned bicycle facilities, and collisions, among other data points.

Product: A memo detailing existing conditions, with accompanying data source references, maps and narrative.

Update: Existing conditions analysis should include a narrative component that describes how the various data layers (e.g., land use, destinations, existing and planned facilities) inform the overall conditions and needs of the planning area.

This narrative should be digestible to stakeholders and the community, and should be referenced in later tasks in order to create a consistent through-line of data. In other words, these data should be referenced to explain the evidence and logic for proposed pathways and projects that emerge later. The narrative should, for example, describe how key destinations within the land use layer may draw riders from the transit station, potentially serving as a later justification for a Pathway leading to that destination. The existing conditions analysis should also follow the First/Last Mile Safety Analysis Tool (see attachment A) to identify and document key safety “hotspots” in the planning area. The analysis should also identify possible contributing factors, such as street geometry and speed limits, in order to establish project need for later plan development. If the station areas evidence significant micromobility device usage (i.e. shared, electric scooters), this existing conditions analysis should also follow the recommendations in the First/Last Mile Planning for Micromobility report to accommodate the needs of other wheel-based users (see attachment B).

2. Local jurisdiction coordination

Description: Coordination with local agencies occurs through the first/last mile planning process and is key to aligning engagement efforts and planning projects with local plans and priorities. Local agencies also aid in reviewing the final first/last mile plan and project list.

Product: A series of meetings culminating in a review process of final plan products

Update: Coordination with relevant agencies of the local jurisdiction should occur through, at minimum, three meetings over the course of the first/last mile planning process. First, a meeting at the outset of the planning process should seek agency input on engagement in the relevant planning areas and should highlight any other relevant plans or issues. A midpoint meeting should provide local staff with a preview of draft pathway networks. Upon completion of the planning process, a final meeting should be held to review the pathway network and project list with local staff. This meeting will also serve as the kick-off for the formal local jurisdiction review of these planning products. This schedule of meetings should be considered a minimum, as additional meetings with local staff may be held as needed.

3. FLM Technical Walk Audit

Description: During walk audits, technical staff and consultants collect data on strengths, barriers and observed behaviors related to the walking and bicycling environment around the station. This step is a key component of FLM planning because it gives the project team on-the-ground,

experiential knowledge about the station area. Walk audits, unless otherwise directed, are conducted using Metro's web-based data collection tool, which allows participants to document specific locations with comments and photos about conditions. Some walk audits may also be conducted by community members as an introduction to other subsequent community engagement described below.

Product: Walk audit memo documenting process, participants, and insights from walk audits, as well as mapped data layers of identified barriers, strengths, and opportunities.

Update: The project team should conduct technical walk audits for all stations on a given project, oriented towards collecting site-specific data necessary to inform the pathways development. Participants should be FLM and Metro staff and the FLM consultant team, and should also include CBO partners unless not feasible.

Supplemental audits with community members and stakeholders are not required but can be useful for introducing FLM concepts and methods, but should be separated from key data-gathering steps necessary to progress to pathway layout. Community walk audits may be conducted as an orientation to FLM planning concepts. Noting that walk audits with community members and the public can be labor intensive and time consuming to organize, these community focused audits can be sequenced separately from other FLM planning steps (e.g., they can take place later in the process after technical walk audits, or when other community engagement steps are complete/in process). Types of data and input collected from community focused walk audits can be determined on a project-by-project basis, but should generally focus on simple and subjective feedback about street segments and walking routes in the station area (e.g. walking on specific block feels more/less safe and comfortable).

If the station area has significant micromobility device usage, a site visit may also be considered to observe strengths and barriers to these wheeled modes. Again, the First/Last Mile Planning for Micromobility (linked as an attachment at the end of this appendix) report details this activity.

4. FLM Draft Pathway Network

Description: The development of the Pathway Network (key routes to walk, bike, or roll to the station) is based on research of local plans, existing facilities, existing conditions data analysis, and data collected during the walk audit. This step ensures a clear nexus between FLM improvements and the transit riders' experience. Additionally, the inclusion of local plans and existing facilities avoids duplicating or getting ahead of local efforts to improve their city streets.

Product: Set of Draft Pathway Network maps

Update: The Draft FLM Pathway Network should include and reflect narrative elements established in the existing conditions memo, in order to communicate how the proposed pathways address existing conditions and needs, and establish a record and rationale for development of pathway network segments.

5. Community Based Organizations

Description: The regular, integrated involvement of one or more community-based organizations (CBOs) is a key aspect of the FLM planning process. CBOs are regularly integrated into the project team, and fulfill a variety of roles in the outreach and planning processes, depending on exact nature of the project.

Update: It is expected that Community-based organizations (CBOs) are involved throughout the plan development process, with a focus on outreach and community engagement methods and execution. While the contracting mechanism may differ per project, CBOs must be formally integrated into the project team, with documentation of roles and processes among the CBO, Metro, and the project team. Upon entering a contract, a Project Charter or similar must be established to discuss shared goals, values, and key process points. Additionally, it is important to discuss and understand areas where Metro and CBO priorities diverge and determine how the team will resolve and move forward on any disagreements that may arise (see: East San Fernando Valley Transit Project CBO Charter). The Project Charter is developed through a meeting of the full team including Metro Corridors PM, Metro Community Relations lead, Metro FLM PM, and consultant team (technical and outreach).

The exact role a CBO(s) takes on within the project team should be determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on factors such as the unique needs of the project area and the focus and capacity of the CBO(s). However, the ultimate roles should be chosen from a menu of activities, which includes but is not limited to: input on draft and final pathway networks and projects, advice and input on the planning effort overall, outreach event planning and communications assistance, and outreach staffing.

6. Community Engagement

Description: Community engagement is a critical component due to the detailed and highly localized nature of FLM projects. As a consequence, it occurs at multiple points in the process. Typically, FLM efforts include a range of methods to engage the community including public activities, stakeholder

interviews, and surveys (online or intercept). The purpose of these participatory activities is two-fold: 1) to collect data/ feedback to inform FLM planning and 2) to foster general awareness of FLM issues to communities.

Product: A Community Engagement Summary/Results Memo, documenting the engagement formats, who participated, and takeaways from community feedback. The memo, which is distinct from the earlier engagement approach memo, should detail data gathered from the community on prioritizing FLM improvement types and locations.

Update:

- > Audiences: FLM planning outreach shall prioritize engagement with the core audience for FLM improvements: transit riders, especially those who live, work, play, and go to school around the station area. Targeted outreach shall utilize the Metro Equity Platform and tools to ensure racial, gender, and socioeconomic disparities are addressed in the proposed outreach process. Activities that reach riders where they are should be the primary in-person outreach activity (see below).
- > Established stakeholders (local institutions, business improvement districts, local association representatives) should be engaged and informed through structured interviews as part of the engagement process. Neighborhood Councils, or similar localized representative bodies, could be included in the general outreach process, including invites to participate in any applicable community walk audits and broader community engagement activities. Metro staff may accommodate meetings and a staff presentation upon request.
- > CBOs: As detailed above, it is expected that CBOs play a significant role in the engagement process. While exact roles depend on the project and must be outlined in an established Project Charter from a menu of activities, CBO involvement is key for identifying, reaching, and engaging with target audiences in activities and other outreach formats.
- > Engagement activities: The preferred format for in-person outreach are activities that meet target audiences where they are, capitalizing on existing and regular activities and community gatherings and recognizing that they may not be actually residents immediately next to the station areas. Event format should avoid the traditional town hall style and other standalone public meeting formats that can be difficult for key demographics of the public to attend. While there is no specific required format for pop-up activities, the team - consultant(s), staff, CBO(s) - should seek to craft formats

that offer a creative, tactile, and “gamified” engagement that draw in individuals and encourage participation. These should seek to collect data that reflects the improvement types and accompanying locations desired by community members, as well as destinations and key places of interest to which community members travel. In addition, inquiring about travel patterns provides an opportunity to check for discrepancies with the Draft Pathway Network.

7. Final Pathway Network and Project Ideas

Description: Collected community feedback (e.g. from stakeholder interviews, walk-audits, and other community engagement activities) is used to validate or correct the draft Pathway Network, as well as reflect the project ideas and priorities of the community. At this stage, review of the Pathway Network and project ideas by the local jurisdictions and CBO is requested before finalization.

Product: Final Pathway Network maps, illustrations of conditions, and list of projects

Update: Following the updates noted in Step 1, Existing Conditions, and Step 3, FLM Draft Pathway Network, the Final Pathway Network and Project Ideas document should reflect the culmination of existing conditions and community needs/ desires as documented through community engagement.

Accompanying the Final Pathway Network should be high-level conceptual design illustrations of typical proposed project conditions in all Arterial and Collector Pathways. These may consist of plan and/or street cross sections with dimensions, and should reflect rough estimates of the right-of-way impacts of implementing FLM projects. This should serve to highlight any major feasibility issues regarding ROW conflicts and to detail potential reconfiguration tradeoffs.

The Final Pathways should also incorporate and elaborate upon the safety effects, impacts, and purposes of each pathway, per the First/Last Mile Safety Analysis Tool. This also includes noting overlaps with local jurisdiction priority areas such as High Injury Networks.

8. Project Scoring and Cost Estimates

Description: Projects are categorized by type and location, and are subsequently scored on a number of variables. The variables, for both pedestrian and wheel projects, may fall within weighted categories of safety, comfort, community input, and connectivity. An example of scoring variables for pedestrian projects and bicycle projects is provided below from the Purple Line Extension Sections 2&3 FLM Plan.

Individual projects may use different criteria or weighting as relevant to the conditions along the study corridor, but each would include, at minimum, the categories of safety, community input, and connectivity for walking and rolling to the station.

At this stage, Metro will develop rough order of magnitude (ROM) cost estimates for the projects with input from the local jurisdictions.


Product: Selected list of projects, matrix reflecting project weights and scores.

**15%
Connectivity**

Projects that connect to primary streets, major destinations, or cut-throughs

**25%
Community Input**

Projects mentioned during pop-ups, walk audits, and online survey



**30%
Comfort**

Projects that make walking more comfortable and easier to navigate

**30%
Safety**


Collision data

**15%
Connectivity**

Projects that connect to primary streets, the station, the existing or planned bicycle network, or major destinations

**25%
Community Input**

Projects mentioned during pop-ups, walk audits, and online survey



**60%
Safety and Comfort**

Collision data, conformance to NACTO Guidelines, and provision of controlled crossings or bicycle amenities

II. Key Work Products

The following deliverables are required at the completion of FLM Planning:

- > **Pathway Network** – map indicating primary and secondary pathways to the station and FLM project locations with the half-mile radius of the station
 - Update: Plan and/or Cross-section illustrations: Conceptual design illustrations demonstrating feasibility and potential ROW issues for FLM pathway projects
- > **Project List** – project list corresponding to the Pathway Network maps that includes additional detail about the project (e.g. description, extent, and location)
- > **Rough Order of Magnitude Cost Estimates** – cost estimates for all FLM projects using best cost estimating practices and recent cost examples
- > **Prioritized Projects List** – selected projects that have received local jurisdiction concurrence to advance to the next project phase. The method for prioritization will be refined after the completion of First/Last Mile Guidelines.

For next steps in engineering and implementation, refer to the Critical Actions to Advance as listed in Chapter 2, Section A, of the First/Last Mile Planning Guidelines.

III. Attachments

- > **A. First/Last Mile Safety Analysis Tool:** The updated safety analysis and approach presents a more detailed integration of safety data into the Existing Conditions step of FLM planning. The analysis will shed further light onto the contributing factors of unsafe traffic conditions in station areas, and will contribute to the continuity of data-based justifications for improvements throughout the planning process. <http://media.metro.net/2020/First-Last-Mile-Safety-Analysis-Tool.pdf>
- > **B. First/Last Mile Planning for Micromobility Study:** This study presents changes to the FLM planning process and to the FLM toolkit of improvements in order to best plan for the use of new shared, dockless electric micromobility devices as first/last mile modes. The methods included should be considered applicable to the Existing Conditions Analysis, Walk Audit, and Draft and Final Pathways Steps. <http://media.metro.net/2020/Micromobility-FLM.pdf>

Future addendums to the First/Last Mile Strategic Plan and other guiding FLM documents, addressing potential needs such as project feasibility analysis, should be added as the need arises, following input from the FLM, transit project, and consultant teams.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix G:

FLM Program Commitments by Transit Project

The following table lists completed and ongoing Metro transit projects, providing the applicability of FLM program commitments. Each project listed has an associated First/Last Mile Plan. The table also notes whether the transit project received grant/technical assistance and whether the 3% local contribution is applicable to the project. Note that FLM plans for existing stations for new lines or extensions generally do not qualify, but may be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

PROJECT	PROGRAM COMMITMENTS			NOTES
	First/Last Mile Plan	Grant/ Technical Assistance	3% Contribution Credit	
New Rail Line				
East San Fernando Valley Light Rail Transit Corridor	✓	✓	✓	FLM Plan complete
West Santa Ana Branch	✓	✓	✓	
Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor	✓	✓	✓	
Rail Line Extension				
D Line (Westside Purple Line Extension Section 2)	✓	✓	✓	FLM Plan complete
D Line (Westside Purple Line Extension Section 3)	✓	✓	✓	FLM Plan complete
L Line (Gold) Foothill 2B Extension	✓	✓	✓	FLM Plan complete
C Line (Green) Extension to Torrance	✓	✓	✓	
L Line (Gold) Eastside Extension	✓	✓	✓	
Crenshaw North Extension	✓	✓	✓	
Added/Relocated Station				
Aviation/96th Street (Airport Metro Connector) Station	✓	✓	✓	
Added/Relocated Station/BRT Project				
G Line (Orange) BRT Improvements	✓	✓		FLM Plan complete

PROJECT	PROGRAM COMMITMENTS			NOTES
	First/Last Mile Plan	Grant/ Technical Assistance	3% Contribution Credit	
BRT Project				
North Hollywood to Pasadena Corridor	✓	✓		BRT project/FLM plan for selected stations
North San Fernando Valley Corridor*	✓	✓		BRT project/FLM plan for selected stations
Under Construction at Time of Board Policy				
Crenshaw/LAX Transit Corridor	✓	✓	see note	FLM Plan complete for stations in Inglewood Inglewood 3% agreement in place pre-Guidelines; \$6M commitment to FLM implementation
Regional Connector	✓	✓		
D Line (Westside Purple Line Extension Section 1)	✓	✓		
TBD				
Vermont Transit Corridor	✓	✓	tbd	mode undetermined; 3% applicable if rail selected

*The scope of the North San Fernando Valley Corridor project is currently under review and may result in a revision to the applicability of this project.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

213.922.9200 Tel
213.922.5259 Fax
metro.net

