Los Angeles County
Metropolitan Transportation
Authority
One Gateway Plaza
3rd Floor Board Room
Los Angeles, CA

Metro

Board Report

File #: 2026-0786, **File Type:** Plan **Agenda Number:** 7.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 18, 2026
EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 19, 2026

SUBJECT: MEASURE M 10-YEAR COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK, METRICS, AND WEIGHTING

ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE the project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics and weighting, for the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment (Attachment A).

ISSUE

Section 7(g) of the Measure M Ordinance requires that, beginning in Fiscal Year 2027, Metro conduct a comprehensive assessment of the projects and programs in the Measure M Expenditure Plan that are completed or anticipated to be completed during the next ten-year period. Measure M Guidelines further establish that the assessments are to be coordinated with Metro's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) updates, including LRTP performance metrics, and provide a comprehensive review to assess changes in circumstances affecting the delivery of projects and programs within their schedules as identified in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.

A project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics and weighting, is an effective tool for preparing a specific evaluation in the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment (Assessment), which assesses the performance of Measure M's Expenditure Plan major capital projects and Multiyear Subregional Programs (MSP). The complete list of Measure M projects and programs that will and will not be evaluated using this Project Evaluation Framework is included in Attachment B per the ordinance.

Staff presented the draft project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics and weighting, to the Executive Management Committee on October 15, 2026, which is now submitted to the Board for final consideration. Responses to questions regarding SGV Forward from the October 2026 Executive Management Committee meeting are addressed in Attachment C.

BACKGROUND

The Measure M Ordinance establishes an ongoing framework for oversight and accountability of all projects and programs funded through Measure M. At five-year intervals, Metro prepares a comprehensive assessment of all implemented projects and programs to evaluate overall program performance and identify opportunities to improve coordination, delivery, and effectiveness, informed by current practices, best practices, and organizational changes.

The first Measure M Five-Year Comprehensive Assessment and Equity Report was completed in 2023 and evaluated the initial five years of Measure M implementation, from July 2017 through June 2022. The current Assessment will build upon that effort by incorporating both a retrospective evaluation of Measure M program performance and an assessment of Measure M projects and programs completed or anticipated to be completed over the next ten-year period.

At its July 2026 meeting, the Board approved the Assessment objectives and criteria that describe the entirety of the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment, including the retrospective examination of the Measure M program achievements. In October 2026, staff presented the draft project evaluation framework to the Executive Management Committee to receive feedback.. The project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics and weighting, provides complementary tools for evaluating Expenditure Plan major projects and programs anticipated to be completed over the next 10-year period.

DISCUSSION

The Project Evaluation Framework establishes a consistent approach for evaluating the performance and potential benefits of Measure M-funded projects and programs. The framework is designed to support a transparent, data-driven, and policy-aligned evaluation that considers both project delivery and the broader transportation outcomes that Measure M investments intend to advance. The framework will complement the broader Assessment by providing a structured approach to evaluating future major projects, while the Assessment also considers the historical performance and implementation of the Measure M program as a whole.

Measure M Expenditure Plan projects with an Expected Opening Date of 2037 or earlier will be evaluated using this framework. Similarly, MSPs expected to deliver one or more projects or programs in 2037 or earlier will also be evaluated using this framework, consistent with the Measure M Ordinance and as identified in Attachment B.

The framework was developed to be consistent with the original goals in Measure M and best practices established in prior Metro evaluation approaches. The Project Evaluation Framework consists of three primary elements: Performance Metrics, Evaluation Categories, and Evaluation Category Weights.

Performance Metrics

The Measure M 10-Year Assessment takes place within a transportation landscape that has evolved since Measure M's adoption in 2016. Changes in travel behavior (largely influenced by the pandemic), emerging technologies, shifting economic conditions, demographic trends, and evolving policy priorities underscore the need to periodically reassess the Measure M investment plan. In

developing the performance metrics list for this evaluation, staff have aimed to be consistent with previous frameworks while recognizing that changing conditions and priorities should be taken into consideration when evaluating future projects.

The evaluation Performance Metrics, highlighted in Table 1 below, aim to be consistent with five previously approved Metro frameworks and guiding documents. These include:

- **Measure M Pre-Evaluation (2015)**: These metrics, approved in 2015 by the Board, were used to evaluate projects for inclusion in the 2016 Measure M ballot measure
- **Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) (2020)**: The 2020 LRTP calculated the existing and future performance of the LA County transportation system across a range of metrics, many of which are applicable for project performance evaluations
- **Measure M Five-Year Comprehensive Assessment and Equity Report (2023)**: The first five-year assessment focused on past project performance, and quantified system-wide performance for many metrics that are meaningful project evaluation metrics
- **Board Amendments**: Amendments adopted by the Board with the approval of the Measure M Five-Year Comprehensive Assessment and Equity Report (2023)
- **Recommended Goals, Objectives, and Metrics for Metro Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) (2025)**: This Board adopted framework provides a series of metrics that could be used to evaluate the benefits of major capital projects

Table 1 below highlights the proposed Assessment performance metrics and their alignment with previously established frameworks and studies.

Table 1. Proposed Project Evaluation Performance Metrics

Comprehensive Assessment Performance Metric	Measure M Pre-Evaluation (2015)	LRTP (2020)	MM 5yr Report (2023)	Board Amendments (2023)	CBA Goals & Metrics (2025)
Access to Opportunity: All destinations*	x	x	x	x	x
Access to Opportunity: Jobs & Retail*	x	x	x	x	x
Access to Opportunity: Quality of Life (parks, cultural centers, healthcare, schools, senior centers) *	x	x	x		x
Active transportation trips	x				
Average vehicle occupancy	x	x			
Fatal and Severe Injury Collisions	x	x		x	x
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		x		x	x
Gross regional product		x			x
Improved travel time reliability	x	x		x	x
Increased system-wide connectivity			x	x	
Increased person throughput		x		x	x
Investment in Equity Focus Communities	x	x	x	x	
Jobs/job years created	x	x			x
Non-SOV Mode Share	x	x			x
Reduced conflict points	x				x
System redundancy for emergency					x
Transit oriented development potential	x				x
Transit ridership	x	x	x	x	
Travel time improvement	x	x			x
Vehicle Hours of Delay		x		x	x
Vehicle Miles Traveled		x		x	x

**Access to Opportunity, including the precise destination definitions, is currently being defined.*

Evaluation Categories

In 2015, Metro established evaluation categories based on the Measure M Ordinance goals. The Assessment evaluation categories mirror the framework previously used to evaluate major capital projects in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.

The proposed evaluation categories include:

- Mobility
- Accessibility
- Transportation Safety
- Sustainability and Quality of Life
- Economy

Table 2 illustrates how the goals established in the Measure M ordinance are consistent with these evaluation categories.

Table 2. Measure M Goals and Project Evaluation Categories

Measure M Goal	Mob[1]	Acc[2]	Saf[3]	Sbl/QoL[4]	Ecn[5]
Improve freeway traffic flow; reduce bottlenecks and ease traffic congestion.	x				
Expand the rail and rapid transit system; accelerate rail construction and build new rail lines; enhance local, regional, and express bus service; and improve system connectivity.	x	x			
Repave local streets, repair potholes, synchronize signals; improve neighborhood streets and intersections, and enhance bike and pedestrian connections.	x	x	x	x	
Keep the transit and highway system safe; earthquake-retrofit bridges, enhance freeway and transit system safety, and keep the transportation system in good working condition.			x		
Make public transportation more accessible, convenient, and affordable for seniors, students, and the disabled and provide better mobility options for our aging population.	x	x			
Embrace technology and innovation; incorporate modern technology, new advancements, and emerging innovations into the local transportation system.	x				x
Create jobs, reduce pollution, and generate local economic benefits; increase personal quality time and overall quality of life.				x	x
Provide accountability and transparency; protect and monitor the public's investments through independent audits and oversight.			x		

(1)Mobility, (2)Accessibility, (3)Transportation Safety, (4)Sustainability and Quality of Life, (5)Economy

Evaluation Category Weights

The proposed evaluation category weights are consistent with previous Metro frameworks, including the Measure M Pre-Evaluation (2015) framework and the more recent CBA methodology. Table 3 shows the two previously adopted weighting frameworks, as well as the proposed weighting for the Assessment.

Table 3. Evaluation Categories and Weights

Measure M Pre-Evaluation Goals (2015)	Weight	CBA Goals (2025)	Weight	MM Comp Assessment	Weight
Mobility	45.0%	Mobility & Accessibility	40%	**Mobility**	**40%**
Accessibility	17.5%			**Accessibility**	**20%**
Economy	12.5%	Economic Impact	15%	**Economy**	**15%**
Safety	12.5%	Safety/Health	15%	**Transportation Safety**	**12.5%**
Sustainability & Quality of Life	12.5%	Environmental Sustainability	15%	**Sustainability & Quality of Life**	**12.5%**
		Operational Sustainability	15%		
TOTAL	100.0%	TOTAL	100.0%	**TOTAL**	**100.0%**

Attachment A shows the complete evaluation framework, which ties together the performance metrics, evaluation categories, and category weights. The proposed weighting is consistent with the previous frameworks, prioritizing Mobility and Accessibility the most and maintaining the importance of the other categories.

- **Mobility (40%)**: This category evaluates how effectively a project improves the movement of people and goods throughout the transportation system. Metrics such as average vehicle occupancy, travel time reliability, person throughput, travel time improvements, and reductions in vehicle hours of delay measure whether investments increase system efficiency, reduce time spent traveling, and maximize the use of available transportation capacity.

- **Accessibility (20%)**: This category assesses how well the transportation system connects people to destinations, services, and travel options. The included metrics measure access to opportunities, active transportation usage, system connectivity, non-single-occupancy vehicle mode share, and transit ridership to determine whether a project expands mobility choices and improves access for a broad range of users.

- **Economy (15%):** This category evaluates a project's contribution to regional economic vitality and prosperity. Through metrics that measure impacts on gross regional product and job creation, as well as access to employment and shopping centers, this category assesses how projects support workforce access and economic growth.

- **Transportation Safety (12.5%)**: This category focuses on reducing the risk and consequences of transportation-related incidents for all users. Metrics related to fatal and severe-injury collisions, conflict point reduction, and emergency system redundancy evaluate how projects enhance safety, improve network resilience, and provide reliable transportation access during emergencies.

- **Sustainability and Quality of Life (12.5%)**: This category explores the extent to which projects support environmental goals, equitable outcomes, and livable communities. Metrics such as access to destinations that enhance everyday life, investment in Equity Focus

Communities, potential for transit-oriented development, greenhouse gas emissions, and vehicle miles traveled assess how projects contribute to healthier, more sustainable, and more inclusive communities.

Results from the project evaluations, together with data gathered through the Assessment and stakeholder engagement, will inform staff recommendations, including any proposed amendments to the Measure M Ordinance and Expenditure Plan.

DETERMINATION OF SAFETY IMPACT

There is no safety impact associated with the information contained in this report. This action would establish the evaluation framework, metrics, and weighting to guide the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment, including criteria to evaluate transportation safety.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Approval of the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment evaluation framework, metrics, and weighting does not directly impact the agency's finances.

EQUITY PLATFORM

The proposed evaluation framework, metrics, and weighting for the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment will guide a broad analysis of Measure M's impacts through Metro's Equity Platform framework. Metro serves riders throughout the Los Angeles region. The Assessment will consider the impacts of Metro's investments on the people of Los Angeles County by analyzing demographic disparities in ridership, mobility choices, and investments. Work on the Assessment also includes the development of an Access to Opportunity tool that will be used to deepen understanding of how Measure M investments have shaped access to opportunity in Los Angeles County.

Findings from the Assessment will be shared widely with stakeholders across the region to validate and contextualize the quantitative analyses. Through this engagement process, stakeholders will have the opportunity to provide perspectives on how the findings reflect or differ from their experiences with the Metro system. This input will help ground the data in the lived experiences of our riders and strengthen the overall assessment.

VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED OUTCOME

VMT and VMT per capita in Los Angeles County are lower than national averages, the lowest in the SCAG region, and on the lower end of VMT per capita statewide, with these declining VMT trends due in part to Metro's significant investment in rail and bus transit.* Metro's Board-adopted VMT reduction targets align with California's statewide climate goals, including achieving carbon neutrality by 2045. To ensure continued progress, all Board items are assessed for their potential impact on VMT.

As part of these ongoing efforts, this item is expected to contribute to further reductions in VMT. This

item supports Metro's systemwide strategy to reduce VMT through comprehensive planning activities that establish a consistent evaluation framework to evaluate Measure M projects that may benefit and further encourage transit ridership, ridesharing, and active transportation. This aligns with Metro's Board-adopted VMT reduction targets, which build on the success of existing investments.

*Based on population estimates from the United States Census and VMT estimates from Caltrans' Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data between 2001-2019.

IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The Assessment supports Strategic Plan Goal #5, which seeks to "Provide responsive, accountable, and trustworthy governance within Metro." The Assessment will provide transparency and accountability in the delivery of the Measure M program and seek to ensure its effective delivery over the next decade.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The Board may choose not to proceed with the recommended evaluation framework, metrics, and weighting; however, the proposed evaluation framework maintains continuity with the frameworks used to develop Measure M and aligns with more recent Board actions to establish a standard evaluation process.

NEXT STEPS

Upon approval of the evaluation framework, metrics, and weighting, staff will begin the technical work to evaluate the Measure M major capital projects and programs completed or anticipated to be completed in the next ten years.

Alongside the technical evaluation, Metro will engage stakeholders to gather input throughout the process. This outreach will help ensure the Assessment and any potential amendments reflect community perspectives. Metro will engage the MMITOC on this project as a standing item at regularly scheduled committee meetings.


In Spring 2027, staff will present a status update of the Assessment to the Board, including a discussion on implications of potential amendments. Based on the feedback received, staff will revise and release the completed Assessment and potential proposed amendments for public review. The Assessment and proposed amendments will subsequently be presented to the Measure M Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (MMITOC) as a standing agenda item for comment on the Assessment and to make requisite findings on amendments in Summer 2027. The final Assessment and recommended amendments will be presented to the Board for consideration in Fall 2027. At that time, if the Assessment is approved by a 2/3 vote, the Board may then consider amendments to the Measure M Ordinance and Expenditure Plan within the parameters established by the Ordinance.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A - Project/Program Evaluation Framework
Attachment B - Projects/Programs assessed and not assessed
Attachment C - SGV Forward

Prepared by: P. Backstrom, Senior Director, Countywide Planning and Development
R. Lum, Deputy Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development
M. Cano, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development
C. Hoshijima, Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development
L. Lombardi, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development
A. Barnea, Senior Executive Officer, Countywide Planning and Development
K. Houston, Deputy Chief Auditor
T. Mengle, Executive Officer, Finance
N. Ferrara, Deputy Chief Planning & Development Officer, Countywide Planning & Development

Reviewed by: R. Sosa, Chief Planning Officer
S. Gookin, Deputy Chief Executive Officer



Stephanie Wiggins
Chief Executive Officer

ATTACHMENT A

Project Evaluation Framework		
Category	**Weighting**	**Performance Metric**
Mobility	40%	Average vehicle occupancy
		Improved travel time reliability
		Increased person throughput
		Travel time improvement
		Vehicle Hours of Delay
Accessibility	15%	Access to Opportunity: All destinations
		Active transportation trips
		Increase system-wide connectivity
		Non-SOV Mode Share
		Transit ridership
Economy	15%	Access to Opportunity: Jobs & Retail
		Gross regional product
		Jobs/job years created
Transportation Safety	12.5%	Fatal and Severe Injury Collisions
		Reduced conflict points
		System redundancy for emergency
Sustainability and Quality of Life	12.5%	Access to Opportunity: Quality of Life (parks, cultural centers, healthcare, schools, senior centers)
		Greenhouse Gas Emissions
		Investment in Equity Focus Communities
		Transit oriented development potential
		Vehicle Miles Traveled

ATTACHMENT B

Table 1. Measure M Expenditure Plan – Projects in Comprehensive Assessment (CA) Analysis

PROJECTS WITH AN EXPECTED OPENING DATE OF 2037 OR EARLIER ARE INCLUDED IN THE CA			
Project Name *(2015 Expenditure Plan Project Name, if different)*	**Expected Opening Date** *(Per Measure M)*	**Subregion*** *(Per Measure M)*	**In Comprehensive Assessment**
LAX/Metro Transit Center *Airport Metro Connect 96th St. Station/Green Line Ext LAX*	CY 2021	sc	***Yes***
D Line Subway Extension Section 3 *Westside Purple Line Extension Section 3*	FY 2024	wc	***Yes***
High Desert Corridor *High Desert Multi-Purpose Corridor (HDMC)*	FY 2021	nc	***Yes***
I-5 N Cap. Enhancements (SR-14 to Lake Hughes Rd)	FY 2023	nc	***Yes***
A Line to Claremont *Gold Line Foothill Extension to Claremont*	FY 2025	sg	***Yes***
G Line Improvements *Orange Line BRT Improvements*	FY 2025	sf	***Yes***
North Hollywood to Pasadena Bus Rapid Transit *BRT Connector Orange/Red Line to Gold Line*	FY 2022	av	***Yes***
		sf	***Yes***
East San Fernando Valley Light Rail Transit *East SF Valley Transit Corridor Project*	FY 2027	sf	***Yes***
Southeast Gateway Line *West Santa Ana Transit Corridor LRT*	FY 2028	gc	***Yes***
Crenshaw/LAX Track Enhancement Project	FY 2026	sc	***Yes***
SR-71 Gap from I-10 to Rio Rancho Rd.	FY 2026	sg	***Yes***
LA River Path *LA River Waterway & System Bikepath*	FY 2025	cc	***Yes***
LA River Path – San Fernando Valley *Complete LA River Bikepath*	FY 2025	sf	***Yes***
I-405 Sepulveda Pass ExpressLanes *Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor (Ph 1)*	FY 2026	sf	***Yes***
		wc	***Yes***
Vermont Transit Corridor	FY 2028	cc	***Yes***
SR-57/SR-60 Interchange Improvements	FY 2031	sg	***Yes***
K Line Extension to Torrance *Green Line Extension to Crenshaw Blvd in Torrance*	FY 2030	sb	***Yes***
Long Beach-East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan *I-710 South Corridor Project (Ph 1)*	FY 2032	gc	***Yes***
I-105 ExpressLanes from I-405 to I-605 *I-105 Express Lane from I-405 to I-605*	FY 2029	sc	***Yes***
Sepulveda Transit Corridor *Sepulveda Pass Transit Corridor (Ph 2)*	FY 2033	sf	***Yes***
		wc	***Yes***
Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 *Gold Line Eastside Extension (One Alignment)*	FY 2035	gc	***Yes***
		sg	***Yes***

PROJECTS WITH AN EXPECTED OPENING DATE OF 2037 OR LATER ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE CA			
Project Name *(2015 Expenditure Plan Project Name, if different)*	**Expected Opening Date** *(Per Measure M)*	**Subregion*** *(Per Measure M)*	**In Comprehensive Assessment**
Southeast Gateway Line (LAUS Segment) *West Santa Ana Transit Corridor LRT*	FY 2041	cc	**No**
		gc	**No**
Long Beach-East LA Corridor Mobility Investment Plan *I-710 South Corridor Project (Ph 2)*	FY 2041	gc	**No**
I-5 Corridor Improvements (I-605 to I-710)	FY 2042	gc	**No**
K Line Northern Extension *Crenshaw Northern Extension*	FY 2047	cc	**No**
		wc	**No**
I-405/I-110 HOV Connect Ramps & Interchange Improv	FY 2044	sb	**No**
I-605/I-10 Interchange	FY 2047	sg	**No**
SR 60/I-605 Interchange HOV Direct Connectors	FY 2047	sg	**No**
Lincoln Blvd BRT	FY 2047	wc	**No**
I-110 Express Lane Ext South to I-405/I-110 Interchange	FY 2046	sb	**No**
I-405 South Bay Curve Improvements	FY 2047	sb	**No**
Green Line Eastern Extension (Norwalk)	FY 2052	sc	**No**
SF Valley Transportation Improvements	FY 2050	sf	**No**
Sepulveda Pass Westwood to LAX (Ph 3)	FY 2057	sc	**No**
Orange Line Conversion to Light Rail	FY 2057	sf	**No**
City of San Fernando Bike Master Plan	FY 2054	sf	**No**
Historic Downtown Streetcar	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 *Gold Line Eastside Ext. Second Alignment*	FY 2057	sc	**No**
High Desert Corridor *High Desert Multi-Purpose Corridor - LA County Segment*	FY 2067	sc	**No**

***Subregion Abbreviations**

sc = Systemwide Connectivity Projects (no subregion)
av = Arroyo Verdugo
lvm = Las Virgenes Malibu
cc = Central City Area
sg = San Gabriel Valley
nc = North County
sb = South Bay
w = Westside
gc = Gateway Cities
sf = San Fernando Valley

Table 2. Measure M Expenditure Plan – Multi-Year Subregional Programs (MSPs) in CA Analysis

MSPS EXPECTED TO DELIVER ONE OR MORE PROJECT(S) BEFORE 2037 ARE INCLUDED IN THE CA			
Program Name *(2015 Expenditure Plan Project Name, if different)*	**Expected Opening Date*** *(Per Measure M)*	**Subregion**** *(Per Measure M)*	**In Comprehensive Assessment**
Metro Active Transport, Transit 1st/Last Mile Program	FY 2057	sc	***Yes***
Visionary Project Seed Funding	FY 2057	sc	***Yes***
Street Car and Circulator Projects	FY 2022	sc	***Yes***
Transportation System and Mobility Improve. Program	FY 2032	sb	***Yes***
Active Transportation 1st/Last Mile Connections Prog.	FY 2057	w	***Yes***
Active Transportation Program	FY 2057	nc	***Yes***
Active Transportation Program	FY 2057	gc	***Yes***
Active Transportation Program (Including Greenway Proj.)	FY 2057	sg	***Yes***
Active Transportation, 1st/Last Mile, & Mobility Hubs	FY 2057	cc	***Yes***
Active Transportation, Transit, and Tech. Program	FY 2032	lvm	***Yes***
Highway Efficiency Program	FY 2032	lvm	***Yes***
Bus System Improvement Program	FY 2057	sg	***Yes***
First/Last Mile and Complete Streets	FY 2057	sg	***Yes***
Highway Demand Based Prog. (HOV Ext. & Connect.)	FY 2057	sg	***Yes***
I-605 Corridor "Hot Spot" Interchange Improvements	FY 2057	gc	***Yes***
Modal Connectivity and Complete Streets Projects	FY 2057	av	***Yes***
South Bay Highway Operational Improvements	FY 2057	sb	***Yes***
Transit Program	FY 2057	nc	***Yes***
Transit Projects	FY 2057	av	***Yes***
Transportation System and Mobility Improve. Program	FY 2057	sb	***Yes***
North San Fernando Valley Transit Corridor *North San Fernando Valley Bus Rapid Transit Improvement*	FY 2023	sc	***Yes***
Subregional Equity Program	FY 2057	sc	***Yes***
Countywide BRT Projects Ph 1 (All Subregions)	FY 2022	sc	***Yes***
Countywide BRT Projects Ph 2 (All Subregions)	FY 2030	sc	***Yes***
Active Transportation Projects	FY 2032	av	***Yes***
Los Angeles Safe Routes to School Initiative	FY 2057	cc	***Yes***
Multimodal Connectivity Program	FY 2057	nc	***Yes***

**Expected Opening Dates listed in the Measure M Expenditure Plan consider full completion of all projects within the MSP*

MSPS NOT EXPECTED TO DELIVER ONE OR MORE PROJECT(S) BEFORE 2037 ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE CA			
Program Name *(2015 Expenditure Plan Project Name, if different)*	**Expected Opening Date*** *(Per Measure M)*	**Subregion**** *(Per Measure M)*	**In Comprehensive Assessment**
Countywide BRT Projects Ph 3 (All Subregions)	FY 2042	sc	**No**
Arterial Program	FY 2057	nc	**No**
BRT and 1st/Last Mile Solutions e.g. DASH	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Freeway Interchange and Operational Improvements	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Goods Movement (Improvements & RR Xing Elim.)	FY 2057	sg	**No**
Goods Movement Program	FY 2057	nc	**No**
Goods Movement Projects	FY 2057	av	**No**
Highway Efficiency Program	FY 2057	nc	**No**
Highway Efficiency Program	FY 2057	sg	**No**
Highway Efficiency, Noise Mitig. and Arterial Projects	FY 2057	av	**No**
ITS/Technology Program (Advanced Signal Tech.)	FY 2057	sg	**No**
LA Streetscape Enhance. & Great Streets Program	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Modal Connectivity Program	FY 2057	lvm	**No**
Public Transit State of Good Repair Program	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Traffic Congestion Relief and Improvement Program	FY 2057	lvm	**No**
Traffic Congestion Relief/Signal Synchronization	FY 2057	cc	**No**
Arroyo Verdugo Projects to be Determined	FY 2057	av	**No**
Countywide BRT Projects Ph 4 (All Subregions)	FY 2052	sc	**No**
Countywide BRT Projects Ph 5 (All Subregions)	FY 2062	sc	**No**
**Expected Opening Dates listed in the Measure M Expenditure Plan consider full completion of all projects within the MSP*			

****Subregion Abbreviations**

sc = Systemwide Connectivity Projects (no subregion)
nc = North County
av = Arroyo Verdugo
sb = South Bay
lvm = Las Virgenes Malibu
w = Westside
cc = Central City Area
gc = Gateway Cities
sg = San Gabriel Valley
sf = San Fernando Valley

ATTACHMENT C

SGV Forward: Project History and Funding Strategy

Question from Director Sandoval at the October 2026 Executive Management Committee

Why is SGV Forward not among the projects to be evaluated under the proposed framework?

The Ordinance limits the Assessment to projects and programs in the voter-approved Measure M Expenditure Plan that are completed or anticipated to be completed through 2037, and the framework will be applied only to those projects and programs. SGV Forward is not a line item in the Measure M Expenditure Plan and is therefore outside the scope of the Assessment. There has not been an amendment or request for an amendment to Measures M or R that would provide for Metro to assume SGV Forward met the Ordinance requirements for inclusion in the Assessment.

The following sections describe the history and intent of Measures R and M, as well as next steps for the SGV Forward proposal.

Measure R & M Eastside Extension Funding

In 2008, Measure R was approved by the voters and included in the Attachment A Expenditure Plan, a line item for the Gold Line Eastside Extension for an amount of $1.271 billion from Measure R. The 2016 voter-approved Measure M Expenditure Plan identified $4 billion for the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project, with funding structured across two funding cycles for two different alignments. The Measure M funding for the first alignment contemplated transit investments from both the SGV and Gateway Cities subregions. The second alignment was coded as a System Connectivity investment and available beginning in FY53.

SGV Forward

In February 2020, the Board selected, the Washington Alignment and removed SR-60 and Combined Alternatives from further consideration. The Board also approved Metro staff prepare a feasibility study independent from the Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2 project to evaluate other options that better serve the needs of the San Gabriel Valley.

As part of that action, the Board also approved Motion 8.1 which in summary, directed staff as Resolution E of the motion, to “Honor the commitment of $635.5 M made to the San Gabriel Valley subregion as part of the Measure R documentation. This commitment will be

recognized consistent with the funding years in the Measure R Expenditure Plan." Although not specifically identified in the Measure R Ordinance passed by the voters, the amount is equal to the Measure R funding split between the San Gabriel Valley and Gateway Cities subregion. Resolution E also directed Metro staff to include development of a funding plan which could include "any potential inter-fund borrowing between Measure R & M, loan options, or other financial mechanisms necessary to retain overall equity while ensuring financial capacity to move the Gold Line Eastside Extension Phase 2 forward as an accelerated Pillar Project under Metro's Twenty-Eight by '28 initiative." Metro staff were directed to return in May 2020 to report back on a funding plan.

SGV Forward Feasibility and Funding Plan


Per the Board actions in February 2020, Metro staff reported in May 2020 and subsequently partnered with the SGVCOG to conduct the San Gabriel Valley Transit Feasibility Study. Completed in 2024, the study established a phased strategy for advancing transit improvements throughout the subregion, including near-term projects, mid-term investments in the SR-60 corridor, and a longer-term vision for an integrated transit network. This effort became the foundation for SGV Forward. The Board has approved $7,988,838 in funding for the feasibility study, outreach services, project definition, design refinements, cost estimation and environmental clearance of the SGV Forward.

Consistent with Board direction to ensure financial capacity to move the Eastside Extension Phase 2 forward as an accelerated Pillar project, adhere to Measure R & M requirements, and honor funding of a SGV investment during funding years assumed for the Measure R line item, staff returned in May 2020, with a funding plan that assigned all funding to the first alignment per the 2019 LRTP financial forecast to ensure capacity to move the Eastside Extension Phase 2 forward. The plan recommended an amendment to the Measure M ordinance that creates a new project or program for SFV Forward funded by a portion of the second alignment funding.

Metro is supportive of SGVCOG in finalizing engineering and environmental clearance of projects and pursuit of additional grant funding, identification of unallocated subregional, or provision of loans against the second alignment funding to implement SGV transit investments. Measure M includes several sources of funding that could fund SGV Forward. These include the Bus System Improvement program MSP, of which $116 million has yet to be programmed (excluding repayment of a Metro loan to SGVCOG), and a portion of the Bus System Improvement Program and First/Last Mile and Complete Streets MSPs. The cities within the SGVCOG also receive Measure M Local Return, estimated to total $25.6 million in fiscal year (FY) 2027, which could fund a portion of SGV Forward.

Eastside Transit Corridor Phase 2

The initial operating segment (IOS) funding plan for Eastside Phase 2 was last presented to the Board in May 2024 (2024-0190), when the Final EIR was certified. It relies on committed Measure M and Measure R sales tax revenues, other local sales tax sources (Proposition A and Proposition C), secured state funds, and additional state and federal funding to be secured. Groundbreaking of the IOS is assumed in FY 2029 with completion anticipated in 2035-2037. The remaining funding to be secured totals approximately $3,943.0 million for the IOS. The project is now in early construction with $33 million in Measures R and M funding billed to the project to date. The Measure R Transit subfund commits $1.271 billion in 2008 year of expenditure dollars to the Eastside project. At present Measure R 35% actual receipts are down $975 million or 16% under original projections. Total Measure R 35% Transit subfund is underfunded by $3.0 billion or 26%, based on actual revenues with 3% annual growth from 2027-2039 as illustrated in the table below.



- 2010 – 2026 INCEPTION TO DATE (ITD)
Actual receipts are $975M, or 16% under original projections

- 2027 – 2039 FUTURE PROJECTED
Shortfall is $2,022M, or 26% under original projections based on 3% annual growth.

- TOTAL MEASURE R 35 REVENUES PROJECTION
Total MR35 subfund is underfunded by $3.0B, or 26%, based on actual revenues with 3% annual growth from 2027 - 2039

In summary, Measure R and Measure M did not provide for splitting the corridor into two concurrent projects. However, Metro continues to support SGV Forward consistent with the Board action in February 2020. Consequently, SGV Forward is not included in the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment, which evaluates Expenditure Plan projects and Multi-Year Subregional Programs (MSP) completed or anticipated to be completed through 2037, consistent with the Measure M Ordinance. Within the San Gabriel Valley subregion, staff will evaluate in the Assessment:

- The A Line Foothill Extension to Claremont, which has a $1 billion Measure M commitment (2015 dollars) and may be under construction during the evaluation period. To date, $1.149 billion has been spent on the A Line Foothill Extension. An additional contract covering construction from Pomona Station to a new Claremont station is still to be finalized.
- Four San Gabriel Valley MSPs, including Active Transportation Program, Bus System Improvement Program, First/Last Mile and Complete Streets, and Highway Demand Based Program totaling $715 million (2015 dollars).

Exclusion from the Assessment does not prevent the Board from advancing SGV Forward. Once the project has a defined scope, schedule, cost estimate, and completed environmental review, the Board may approve the project. Metro continues to support the SGV Forward program, including developing a funding strategy for near-term improvements of the project once schedule and cost estimates are developed.



Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment Project Evaluation Framework, Metrics and Weighting

Planning & Programming Committee
Executive Management Committee

File# 2026-0786
November 18, 2026
November 19, 2026

Metro

Requested Action

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVE the project evaluation framework, inclusive of metrics, and weighting, for the Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment

Measure M 10-Year Comprehensive Assessment Framework

GOALS
Measure M
NOVEMBER 2016

OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA
Comprehensive Assessment
JULY 2026

METRICS & WEIGHTING

MM 5-Year
> State of the System and Quality of Life
> Program Delivery

MM 10-Year
> Capital Project Performance and Delivery Assessment

WE ARE HERE

FY23 — FY27 — FY32 — FY37

Project Evaluation Categories and Weighting

Measure M Evaluation Goals (2015)	Weight	CBA* Goals (2025)	Weight	MM Comp Assessment	Weight
Mobility	45.0%	Mobility & Accessibility	40%	**Mobility**	**40%**
Accessibility	17.5%			**Accessibility**	**20%**
Economy	12.5%	Economic Impact	15%	**Economy**	**15%**
Safety	12.5%	Safety/Health	15%	**Transportation Safety**	**12.5%**
Sustainability & Quality of Life	12.5%	Environmental Sustainability	15%	**Sustainability & Quality of Life**	**12.5%**
		Operational Sustainability	15%		
TOTAL	100.0%	TOTAL	100.0%	**TOTAL**	**100.0%**

**CBA: Cost-Benefit Analysis*

Project Evaluation Metrics

Consistent with past and current Metro frameworks

Mobility

- Average Vehicle Occupancy
- Travel Time Reliability
- Person Throughput
- Vehicle Hours of Delay
- Travel Time

Accessibility

- A2O[1] All Destinations
- Active Transportation Trips
- Systemwide Connectivity
- Mode Share
- Transit Ridership

Economy

- A2O Jobs & Retail
- Gross Regional Product
- Jobs/Job Years

Transportation Safety

- Fatal & Severe Injury Crashes
- Conflict Points
- System Redundancy

Sustainability & Quality of Life

- A2O Quality of Life
- GHG[2] Emissions
- Investment in EFCs[3]
- TOD[4] Potential
- Vehicle Miles Traveled

1. Access to Opportunity; 2. Greenhouse Gas Emissions; 3. Equity Focus Communities; 4. Transit-Oriented Development.

Complete Evaluation Framework

WEIGHTING	METRICS
40% Mobility	Average Vehicle Occupancy; Travel Time Reliability; Person Throughput; Vehicle Hours of Delay; Travel Time
20% Accessibility	A2O[1] All Destinations; Active Transportation Trips; Mode Share; Systemwide Connectivity; Transit Ridership
15% Economy	A2O Jobs & Retail; Gross Regional Product; Jobs/Job Years
12.5% Transportation Safety	Fatal & Severe Injury Crashes; Conflict Points; System Redundancy
12.5% Sustainability & Quality of Life	A2O Quality of Life; GHG[2] Emissions; Investment in EFCs[3]; TOD[4] Potential; Vehicle Miles Traveled

1. Access to Opportunity; 2. Greenhouse Gas Emissions; 3. Equity Focus Communities; 4. Transit-Oriented Development.

Milestone Schedule and Next Steps

