



**SGVCOG Planners TAC Meeting Minutes**

Date: February 22, 2018  
 Time: 12:00 P.M.  
 Location: Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District  
 602 E. Huntington Dr., Monrovia, CA 91016

**PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:00 P.M.
2. Roll Call

**Planners TAC Members Present**

P. Lam; Alhambra  
 L. Flores; Arcadia  
 A. Harbin; Baldwin Park  
 B. Johnson; Claremont  
 B. Lee; Covina  
 M. Nakajima, Diamond Bar  
 C. Hensley, J. Golding; Duarte  
 J. Kugel; Glendora  
 E. Arreola, J. Larreta; Irwindale  
 E. Scherer; La Verne  
 L. Stevens; San Dimas  
 T. Steinkruger, D. Whipple; San Gabriel  
 D. Watkins, South Pasadena  
 J. Anderson; West Covina  
 M. Kim; LA County DRP

**Planners TAC Members Absent**

Azusa  
 El Monte  
 Monrovia  
 Monterey Park  
 Pasadena  
 Pomona  
 Rosemead  
 Sierra Madre  
 Temple City  
 Walnut

**SGVCOG Staff / Guests**

M. Christoffels, Staff  
 P. Duyshart, Staff  
 H. Hsing, LA County DPW  
 A. Chang; TransTech Engineers

3. Public Comment.

No public comment.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

4. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 01/25/2018  
**There was a motion to approve the minutes (M/S: A. Harbin/L. Stevens).**

**[Motion Passed]**

Ayes	Alhambra, Arcadia, Baldwin Park, Claremont, Covina, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Glendora, Irwindale, La Verne, San Dimas, San Gabriel, South Pasadena, West Covina, LA County DRP
Noes	
Abstain	
Absent	Azusa, El Monte, Monrovia, Monterey Park, Pasadena, Pomona, Rosemead, Sierra Madre, Temple City, Walnut

## ACTION ITEMS

### 5. SB 827: Planning and Zoning: Transit-Rich Housing Bonus (Wiener)

P. Duyshart, a Project Assistant with the SGVCOG, reported on this item. Duyshart first discussed some of the provisions of Senator Wiener’s SB 827. This bill would exempt certain transit-oriented housing projects from locally developed and adopted City General Plans, including locally adopted height limitation, floor area ratios, densities, parking requirements, and design review standards, among other building requirements. These housing projects in designated “transit-rich housing” zones would be projects which are within one-half mile of a “major transit stop” or within a one-quarter mile radius of a “high-quality transit corridor.

Duyshart then continued by pointing out some of the arguments presented by local SGV cities and the League of California Cities. This bill will likely subvert and undercut cities’ authority, particularly with regards to General Plans, Housing Elements, and SCSs. On a related note, in addition to the bill possibly weakening local government autonomy, the legislation could also render moot local public and community engagement, input, and outreach efforts, which goes against the principles of local resident participation and even local democracy.

Since SB 827 will be heard in the California Senate Committee on Transportation and Housing and in the Senate Committee on Governance and Finance within the next few weeks, COG staff is recommending that, if the SGVCOG Governing Board wishes to take a formal position on this piece of legislation, this would need to occur in the next month. This way, the COG has a public voice and opinion on this matter before the bill is deliberated on in the California Senate Committees.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One TAC member showed a map to the entire TAC; this map showed how SB 827’s definition of a “transit-rich housing project” would actually include over half of the overall land his municipality. He then went on to point out that this proves that SB 827 is a bill which is too onerous, burdensome, and broad.
- This same TAC member argued that, besides opposing the technical provisions of this bill, the SGVCOG should also oppose this bill on principle alone, since the legislation takes away local control and devalues local resident input.
- Another TAC member reminded the COG that the South Pasadena City Council also recently voted to oppose SB 827.
- Additionally, a TAC member express concern and worry that Sen. Wiener is only considering Northern California policy, land-use, and housing issues pertaining to what he is trying to address in his bill.

**There was a motion to recommend that the SGVCOG Governing Board formally oppose SB 827 (Wiener). (M/S: L. Stevens/J. Anderson).**

**[Motion Passed]**

Ayes	Alhambra, Arcadia, Baldwin Park, Claremont, Covina, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Glendora, Irwindale, La Verne, San Dimas, San Gabriel, South Pasadena, West Covina, LA County DRP
Noes	
Abstain	
Absent	Azusa, El Monte, Monrovia, Monterey Park, Pasadena, Pomona, Rosemead, Sierra Madre, Temple City, Walnut

## PRESENTATIONS

### 6. City of La Verne's Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD)

E. Scherer of the City of La Verne gave a presentation to the TAC about La Verne's EIFD, or Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District. He stated that La Verne is one of the only cities in the Los Angeles region which has an adopted EIFD. Scherer also showed a map of the proposed EIFD, and pointed out how this EIFD is near and adjacent to the City's future Metro Gold Line light rail station at E Street and Arrow Highway, and that there is also a sub-area at the University of La Verne's West campus near Arrow hwy. and Wheeler Ave. In addition to the EIFD, La Verne also recently changed the Old Town La Verne Specific Plan to support higher density and mixed-use development.

Scherer then went on to discuss the basics and purpose of the EIFD. EIFD's provide an opportunity to issue bonds for public projects and support economic development efforts within a particular boundary of a taxing agency's jurisdiction. La Verne is establishing its EIFD to fund and facilitate the construction of infrastructure improvements in and around the future Gold Line station; the City is also aiming to improve sustainability and connectivity with the future Gold Line station. Moreover, he wanted to make clear that EIFDs differ from RDAs in a few ways.

Additionally, Scherer provided an overview of all key and major steps that La Verne has taken on its EIFD since September 2015. These steps include researching and gathering infrastructure needs, costs, and timing estimates of EIFD improvements, drafting an analysis of potential funding sources for the proposed district, conducting public outreach, and holding a stakeholder meeting, drafting the Infrastructure Finance Plan (IFP) and getting approved by the Public Financing authority (PFA). Scherer also shared fiscal and monetary assumptions and findings from Kosmont, La Verne's consultant, as well as estimate infrastructure costs.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One TAC member asked why an EIFD was established, as opposed to another special financing district.
- One TAC member commented that La Verne should try to partner with Fairplex for implementing key infrastructure improvements.
- Another member asked if La Verne has any pending applications from property owners within the EIFD.
- A member asked about the politics of selling the EIFD to Council.

### 7. SGVCOG/ACE Program Project Development, Evaluation, and Approval Process

M. Christoffels presented on this item. He first mentioned how the goal is to bring a final draft review process to the Governing Board for official approval in May.

The reason why the SGVCOG needs to draft a new thorough project selection process is the Governing Board approved the new ACE Program to take on a wider array of capital construction projects besides just Alameda Corridor East projects. M. Christoffels went on to say that COG staff is looking for feedback, guidance, and direction on all aspects of the drafts of the project selection and approval processes.

M. Christoffels then went on to describe the proposed project selection process for Funded Projects. This overall process consists of five sub-processes: Threshold Criteria, Review, Negotiation, Programming, and Annual Updates. For the Threshold Criteria Process, project sponsors will submit Letters of Interest (LOI) to the SGVCOG/ACE. The LOI will be relatively simple to fill out, and should not be overly time-intensive, because the COG wants to devise an

easy project submission process for cities, to encourage more participation. This submission process will not be as intensive as a Metro call for projects scenario. The LOI will include sections regarding Project Description, Project Benefits, and a Statement of Need, among other sections. The Statement of Need will be weighted heavily, as the COG wants to assist cities which have resource limitations. Once the COG/ACE's call for projects is complete, the Governing Board will provide direction to staff regarding which projects are to proceed to the Review Phase, and this requires a majority vote of 19 agencies to proceed.

M. Christoffels proceeded to discuss the next step in the process, which is the Review Process. During this process, a Project Manager will provide a recommendation to the COG/ACE Chief Engineer regarding which projects are most viable and ready. These selected projects will then move on to the Negotiation Phase, which is Step 3 in the overarching process. As part of the Negotiation Phase, a Project Manager will prepare a draft master agreement for a selected project, the Chief Engineer and Project Manager will meet with the City Manager or other sponsoring agency contacts to review the proposed agreement, and the project sponsor provides a letter of commitment to the COG; this letter will indicate interest in having the COG manage the project. Moreover, the 4<sup>th</sup> step in the project selection and evaluation process is the Programming Stage, in which the Project Managers and Chief Engineer create a 5-year workplan of projects which make it past the Negotiation Phase, the COG Executive Director presents this workplan to the Governing Board for approval, and each individual agency-to-agency project agreement would also be submitted separately for approval by the Governing Board, too. Then, the final step in the process is the Annual Updates Process, which consists of the Governing Board reviewing the 5-year workplan every Spring.

M. Christoffels then went on to discuss the project review and approval process for Unfunded Projects. The five sub-processes for the Unfunded Projects Process are the same as they are for the Funded Project Process, but there are key structural differences. The steps during the Threshold Criteria and LOI sub-process are the same as for Funded Projects. For the Review Process, a Project Manager and the Director of Community and Government Relations reviews the LOI and schedules a meeting with the sponsoring agency, and then the former two individuals provide a recommendation to the Executive Director regarding whether or not the project should proceed to Negotiation. During the Negotiation Phase, a project manager will draft an MOU instead of a contract. Moreover, the COG will charge an annual flat fee to sponsoring agencies for the COG's services: the annual flat fee will be \$5,000 or \$10,000, depending on the project type. The Programming Stage for Unfunded Projects is the same as it is for Funded Projects. The Annual Updates Requirement is similar, too; however, if a project is successfully awarded funding, then the project sponsor may choose to submit the project for COG implementation.

M. Christoffels also added how if the COG and ACE get a lot of LOIs, then the COG would have to address issues with staff capacity. He reminded Committee members that one of the main purposes of the COG's role here is to play an advocacy role in securing funding and resources for cities' processes. He also wanted to make it clear that this Project Development Process will include all capital construction projects, such as water or storm water infrastructure projects, not just transportation projects.

Christoffels also wanted to remind cities that projects which have a wholistic and regional impact will have a better chance at getting selected than a project which is narrow or small in scope.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One TAC member asked how much some accepted projects will cost the SGVCOG.

- A second TAC member believes that multi-jurisdictional projects make the most subregional sense for the COG to support and assist with.
- Another member asked if the COG will do something similar with the Metro Measure M subregional money. M. Christoffels responded that this separate project selection process today has no money attached to it. The SGVCOG would be helping with technical assistance and grant searching for projects. On the other hand, Metro will be providing subregional funds for projects. Additionally, the Metro subregional programming process will occur before the COG's separate general call for projects.

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

8. Solicitation and discussion of specific compliance issues with LA County Fire Department's Fire Code Requirements

The Chair of the TAC, C. Hensley, facilitated and led the discussion on this topic. He stated that the purpose of discussing this item is to try to figure out how to proceed on this matter, and to identify the most common and pressing issues that cities have faced when interacting and working with the LA County Fire Department. If the cities of the TAC do decide to try to formally address a particular problem pertaining to difficulty with complying with the County's fire code requirements, how can the TAC address a problem, and which alternatives can the TAC consider? He asked Planning Directors and City Planners to share some of the problems that they have had when working with the LA County Fire Dept.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One Planning Director pointed out that when his city submits applications to LA County Fire, LA County Fire will not approve a project until the city's planning commission approves the project. However, after that action has been taken, then the Fire Department often makes significant changes to a plan check, and then after applying these changes to the project, the City has to bring the item back to the planning commission. He complained that this is an inefficient process, and slows down projects and plan checks.
- A second TAC member said he's observed that LA County Fire has been very inconsistent overall, in terms of its plan approval or evaluation procedures. LACF's Pomona office sometimes won't even review plan checks, but its Glendora office will. He also stated that LACF has been unresponsive too often, and that LACF will try to make final revisions on projects on which the city is just trying to receive tentative approval on.
- There was also a concern that the County does not even have a uniform or consistent established system for paying fees; it has a fee schedule, but that is about it. This makes the County seem unorganized.
- A TAC member said that his city has adopted the State code pertaining to some fire compliance issues rather than the County's code, since the County sometimes falls behind in the application and enforcement of its code.
- Another TAC member asked the entire TAC when the last time was that a City has received a copy of LA County Fire's fire department standards.

C. Hensley declared that this item will be put on next month's agenda, too, since a couple cities who have had specific problems with fire code compliance with the County were not represented at today's TAC meeting. He reminded committee members that if you have additional issues, or new ideas about solutions to some of the discussed problems, that they should be sent to P. Duyshart of the COG before the March TAC meeting.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

## **UPDATE ITEMS**

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

There were no comments or announcements from or on behalf of the SGVCOG Executive Director.

## **CHAIR'S REPORT**

9. Solicitation of presentation topics  
C. Hensley reminded members again that he wants cities to present on their projects and specific plans at future meetings. Duarte and Monterey Park will be presenting at the next couple of meetings.
  
10. Current City Projects  
There was no discussion of city projects.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

March 22<sup>nd</sup>, next Planning Directors' TAC Meeting.

L. Stevens of the City of San Dimas urged cities which have Gold Line Phase 2A stations that do not charge parking to reach out to Mr. Chen to ask when Metro will start charging for parking at all remaining Phase 2A stations. He does not think that Metro will conduct sufficient or effective outreach on this matter, and he believes that cities should hold Metro accountable for doing outreach. He also pointed out how Gold Line Phase 2B cities have had a plethora of problems with proposed parking plans near and around their future station sites right now.

## **ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 1:06 P.M.