



SGVCOG Public Works TAC Approved Meeting Minutes

Date: September 17, 2018

Time: 12:00 P.M.

Location: Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
602 E. Huntington Dr., Suite B, Monrovia, CA 91016

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:06 p.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance. R. Guerrero led the Public Works TAC in the Pledge of Allegiance.
3. Roll Call

Public Works TAC Members Present

P. Wray; Arcadia
C. Curiel; Azusa
F. Lopez, M. Tipping; Claremont
D. Liu, K. Young; Diamond Bar
J. Chung, B. Yu; El Monte
S. Hopkins, A. Sweet; Glendora
A. Tachiki, C. Velarde; Monrovia
R. Guerrero; Pomona
K. Patel, S. Barragan; San Dimas
R. Salas; South El Monte
R. Casillas; South Pasadena
M. Forbes; Temple City
M. Heredia; West Covina
J. Lu, A. Ross, J. Yang; LACDPW

Public Works TAC Members Absent

Irwindale
San Gabriel

Guests

M. Chavez; City of Alhambra	D. Kessey, A. Ciotti; City of La Verne
D. Lopez; City of Baldwin Park	T. Renteria; City of Duarte
R. Alfonso; City of Monterey Park	B. Janka; City of Pasadena
C. Marcarello; City of Covina	J. Nelson, T. Dutta; City of Industry/CNC
B. Schmith; LA Metro	J. Martinez, M. Yapp, C. Palmer; NCE
F. Alamolhoda; LAE Associates	V. Sedagat, S. Ariannia; Geo-Advantec, Inc.
G. Jaquez; MNS Engineers	S. Abegunrin; SAA Associates
S. Novotny; Caltrans	S. Morgan, D.Purcell; SCE
P. Bollier; Infrastructure Engineers	O. Denird; Transtech Engineers
J. Quan; League of California Cities	R. Cruz; SoCalGas

SGVCOG Staff

M. Christoffels
P. Hubler
P. Duyshart

4. Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

5. Review Public Works TAC Meeting Minutes: 07/16/2018
There was a motion to approve the minutes (M/S: R. Salas/K. Patel).

[Motion Passed]

Ayes	Arcadia, Azusa, Claremont, Diamond Bar, El Monte, Glendora, Monrovia, Pomona, San Dimas, South El Monte, South Pasadena, Temple City, West Covina, LACDPW
Noes	
Abstain	
Absent	Irwindale, San Gabriel

PRESENTATIONS

6. Save California Streets 2018 -- Findings

Margot Yapp, P.E., the Vice President of Nichols Consulting Engineers (NCE) presented the findings of the California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment 2018 to the Public Works TAC. Ms. Yapp explained that the objectives of the study are:

1. What are the pavement conditions statewide?
2. How much will it cost to maintain local roads, bridges, and essential components?
3. What is the funding shortfall?
4. What are the impacts and consequences if Prop. 6 passes?
5. Communicate results to elected officials and to the voting public.

Yapp also discussed what the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is, how it’s used to grade the condition of roads, and which counties have poor PCI scores. According to Ms. Yapp, the study found that, on average, LA County’s roads are in the “At-Risk” category, with many roads in “Poor” condition. Additionally, Ms. Yapp provided information about pavement needs, future trends of needed construction expenditures, and cost overrun. The total pavement needs across California total \$61.7 billion over the next 10 years, and LA County has only met 40-60% of its pavement improvement needs.

Moreover, “Percent Needs Met” was also a metric which was analyzed and studied, and the assessment revealed that there are 9,667 miles of unpaved roads that need \$947 million over a 10-year period. LA County’s Pavement Needs Met falls within the 40%-60% range, which falls only within the “Fair” range. Also, the funding analysis portion of this study found that cities and counties will lose out on about \$1 billion in annual funding for road repairs if SB 1 is repealed.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- There was a question regarding what the timespan is regarding the Good/Fair/Poor breakdown pertaining to PCI scores. Ms. Yapp responded that it is a 10-year timeframe for this calculation.
- A TAC guest asked: Any thought about analyzing how PCIs can be improved? What financial strategies can enable more PCIs to be improved?
- A TAC member asked how statewide average PCIs get determined and calculated? Yapp said this comes down to, in qualitative terms: how many roads do you have, and out of those roads, which ones are major and which ones are minor? PCIs are determined by a manual survey of the pavement, and then major roads across the state are compared with each other and minor roads are compared to each other (for an applies-to-apples comparison).

ACTION ITEMS

7. Measure M MSP Subregional Fund Programming – Proposed Projects List for First Five-Year Programming Plan

Peter Duyshart, a Project Assistant with the SGVCOG, provided the staff report on this matter to the TAC. He began his presentation by mentioning how, in June 2017, the Metro Board of Directors adopted the Measure M guidelines, establishing a process by which subregional funds under Measure M will be programmed by the subregional entities, including the SGVCOG, through the development of five-year subregional fund programming plans. Duyshart then described how there will be \$31,827,287 in available funds for Active Transportation, First/Last Mile, and Complete Streets projects for the first Measure M Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) 5-Year Plan, which includes FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22.

Duyshart explained how the COG held a transparent and accessible call for projects process for about two months, through which cities could submit projects for Measure M programming consideration simply via email. The COG ended up receiving 54 projects from a total of 16 San Gabriel Valley agencies (cities and LA County). The total cost of all qualifying projects which were submitted to the SGVCOG for Measure M MSP subregional funding consideration was approximately \$158,096,065. Out of the \$158 million, SGV local agencies requested about \$142,703,919 in Measure M MSP subregional dollars to fund their respective projects.

Since there is only \$31,827,287 in available funds, but \$142,703,919 in funding and programming requests from 16 different SGV agencies, COG staff tried to come up with an equitable way to distribute the allocation of funding. Duyshart stated that COG staff felt the fairest way to distribute the funding is to fund each submitting-agency's top priority project. When considering only each agency's top project, the total amount of MSP-requested funds totals \$31,242,200, which is below the \$31,827,287 cap.

P. Duyshart also asked the TAC to consider whether or not there should be a local 10% match requirement for each agency, too.

Mark Christoffels, the Chief Engineer of the SGVCOG, then added that cities which have submitted a project for Measure M funding need to make conservative monetary projections and need to be very realistic when assessing whether or not project delivery of their projects is attainable. The reason for these warnings is LA Metro's Measure M Guidelines and eventual funding agreements stipulate that cities must draw down and fully expend funds for a project within 3 fiscal years of their award fiscal year. If cities do not fully draw down these funds, then Metro reserves the right to take back the allotted funding. While the funding is still required to be programmed for SGV projects, Metro has the right to not apportion the funding to the subregion for another 20-30 years, for example. Additionally, Mr. Christoffels went over the funding and project documents that cities are required to submit to Metro for their projects which are being recommended for programming. These documents and funding projections are required in order to execute funding contracts with Metro.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- A member of the TAC, who is a Public Works staffer for a City which did submit projects for Measure M MSP funding consideration, pointed out that many cities like his own are resource-limited and capital-limited. Since Metro does not require a local match for MSP subregional programming dollars, this is one of the few transportation grant opportunities that his City has in which the City does not have to provide a

monetary match. Thus, he does not think it would be fair for the COG to require cities which are awarded funding for an MSP project to provide a 10% match.

There was a motion made to approve the SGVCOG Staff’s methodology for determining which submitted projects are to receive MSP programming funding, and to approve Staff’s proposed project recommendations list (M/S: R. Salas/R. Guerrero).

[Motion Passed]

Ayes	Arcadia, Azusa, Claremont, Diamond Bar, El Monte, Glendora, Monrovia, Pomona, San Dimas, South El Monte, South Pasadena, Temple City, West Covina, LACDPW
Noes	
Abstain	
Absent	Irwindale, San Gabriel

Additionally, there was a motion made to recommend that SGVCOG staff NOT require cities which are awarded Measure M MSP subregional programming funds to provide a local 10% match for these awarded projects (M/S: R. Salas/R. Guerrero).

[Motion Passed]

Ayes	Arcadia, Azusa, Claremont, Diamond Bar, El Monte, Glendora, Monrovia, Pomona, San Dimas, South El Monte, South Pasadena, Temple City, West Covina, LACDPW
Noes	
Abstain	
Absent	Irwindale, San Gabriel

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. SB 1 Local and Municipal Education and Engagement Strategies

Jennifer Quan, who is the Regional Public Affairs Manager and the Executive Director of the LA County Division of the League of California Cities, gave this short presentation to the TAC. She discussed ways and strategies by which cities and local agencies can engage with their constituents and residents and share factual information with them about the local road repair projects and repairs that SB 1 provides local agencies funding for. Ms. Quan stressed that cities, as public entities are required by law to *not* advocate; however, cities are permitted to *educate* the public about the financial benefits of SB 1 funds. She mentioned that cities should utilize multiple mediums and platforms in order to share information about SB 1-funded projects that cities have been working on or have even completed. Local governments can effectively make use of posting before and after photos on social media, websites, newsletters, local TV stations, and roadside signs and banners. Quan also provided TAC members with useful tools and fact sheets from the League of California Cities, Rebuilding California, and the CTC/Caltrans.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

UPDATE ITEMS

9. Capital Project Review Process & ACE/COG Integration

No update.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

No comments.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

R. Guerrero announced that the next Public Works TAC meeting will take place on Monday, October 15th, 2018.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:09 p.m.