



San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

AGENDA AND NOTICE

OF THE MEETING OF THE SGVCOG PLANNING DIRECTORS

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES (TAC)

Thursday, May 25, 2017 12:00 PM

**PLANNERS'
TECHNICAL
ADVISORY
COMMITTEE**

Chair
Larry Stevens
City of San Dimas

Vice-Chair
Craig Hensley
City of Duarte

Thank you for participating in today's meeting. The Planners' Technical Advisory Committee encourages public participation and invites you to share your views on agenda items.

MEETINGS: *Regular Meetings of the Planners' Technical Advisory Committee are held on the fourth Thursday of each month at 12 PM at Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District-602 E. Huntington Dr., Suite B, Monrovia, CA 91016.* The Planners' Technical Advisory Committee agenda packet is available at the San Gabriel Valley Council of Government's (SGVCOG) Office, 1000 South Fremont Avenue, Suite 10210, Alhambra, CA, and on the website, www.sgvkog.org. Copies are available via email upon request (sgv@sgvskog.org). Documents distributed to a majority of the Committee after the posting will be available for review in the SGVCOG office and on the SGVCOG website. Your attendance at this public meeting may result in the recording of your voice.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION: Your participation is welcomed and invited at all Planners' Technical Advisory Committee meetings. Time is reserved at each regular meeting for those who wish to address the Board. SGVCOG requests that persons addressing the Committee refrain from making personal, slanderous, profane or disruptive remarks.

TO ADDRESS THE PLANNERS' TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE: At a regular meeting, the public may comment on any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee during the public comment period and may also comment on any agenda item at the time it is discussed. At a special meeting, the public may only comment on items that are on the agenda. Members of the public wishing to speak are asked to complete a comment card or simply rise to be recognized when the Chair asks for public comments to speak. We ask that members of the public state their name for the record and keep their remarks brief. If several persons wish to address the Committee on a single item, the Chair may impose a time limit on individual remarks at the beginning of discussion. **The Planners' Technical Advisory Committee may not discuss or vote on items not on the agenda.**

AGENDA ITEMS: The Agenda contains the regular order of business of the Planners' Technical Advisory Committee. Items on the Agenda have generally been reviewed and investigated by the staff in advance of the meeting so that the Committee can be fully informed about a matter before making its decision.

CONSENT CALENDAR: Items listed on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and will be acted upon by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Committee member or citizen so requests. In this event, the item will be removed from the Consent Calendar and considered after the Consent Calendar. If you would like an item on the Consent Calendar discussed, simply tell Staff or a member of the Planners' Technical Advisory Committee.



In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the SGVCOG office at (626) 457-1800. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the SGVCOG to make reasonable arrangement to ensure accessibility to this meeting.



PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment (*If necessary, the Chair may place reasonable time limits on all comments*)

CONSENT CALENDAR (*It is anticipated that the Committee may take action on the following matters*)

4. Joint PW/Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 4/17/2017
Recommended Action: Approve.

PRESENTATIONS

5. TOD Planning Grant and TOD-Based Tax Increment Financing Pilot Program: Presentations by Elizabeth Carvajal, Metro Transit Supportive Planning
Recommended Action: for information.

ACTION ITEMS (*It is anticipated that the Planning TAC may take action on the following matters.*)

DISCUSSION ITEMS

INFORMATION ITEMS

UPDATE ITEMS

6. Housing Legislation
Recommended Action: for information.
7. Measure H
Recommended Action: for information.
8. Measure M
Recommended Action: for information.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

CHAIR'S REPORT

9. Current City Projects
Recommended Action: For information.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- June 7, LACCE Workshop
- June 22, Next Planners TAC
- June 22, TOD Planning Grants and TOD-Based TIF Pilot Program Workshop

ADJOURN



SGVCOG Joint Special Meeting of the Public Works/Planners TAC Meeting

Minutes

Date: April 17, 2017

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 12:07 P.M.
2. Pledge of Allegiance. R. Guerrero led the TAC in the Pledge of Allegiance.
3. Roll Call

Public Works TAC Members Present

D. Bobadilla, Azusa
D. Liu, K. Young, Diamond Bar
N. Syed, T. Bu, El Monte
D. Co, Irwindale
A. Tachiki, Monrovia
B. Janka, Pasadena
R. Guerrero, Pomona
K. Patel, San Dimas
C. Consunji, West Covina
H. Hsing, J. Young, P. Doudar, M. Adhami, Y.
Sim, LACDPW

Public Works TAC Members Absent

Alhambra
Arcadia
Duarte

Planners TAC Members Present

J. Kasama, Arcadia
A. Harbin, S. Gutierrez, Baldwin Park
B. Desatnik, Claremont
M. Nakajima, Diamond Bar
H. Frederickson, La Verne
M. Huntley, Monterey Park
B. Johnson, Pomona
K. Garcia, Rosemead
L. Stevens, San Dimas
D. Grilley, San Gabriel
V. Gonzalez, J. Carlson, Sierra Madre
R. Casillas, K. Courdey, South Pasadena
S. Reimers, M. Forbes, Temple City
J. Anderson, West Covina

Planners TAC Members Absent

Alhambra
Azusa
Covina
Duarte
El Monte
Glendora
Irwindale
Monrovia
Pasadena
Walnut

Guests

G. Jaquez, MNS Engineers	S. Ariannia, Geo-Advantec
B. Jong, LACMTA	J. Martinez, NCE
F. Lao, SCST	F. Alamolhoda, LAE Associates

SGVCOG Staff

E. Wolf

Item #4

Page 1 of 2

C. Cruz
M. Creter

4. Public Comment.
Y. Sim reported on LACDPW close out construction.

CONSENT CALENDAR

5. Review Public Works TAC Meeting Minutes: 3/20/2017
There was a motion to approve the minutes (M/S: C. Consunji/P. Doudar).

[Motion Passed]

Ayes	Azusa, Diamond Bar, El Monte, Irwindale, Monrovia, Pasadena, Pomona, San Dimas, West Covina, LACDPW
Noes	
Abstain	
Absent	Alhambra, Arcadia, Duarte

6. Review Planners TAC Meeting Minutes: 3/23/2017
There was a motion to approve the minutes (M/S: A. Harbin/M.Huntley).

[Motion Passed]

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

PRESENTATIONS

7. Measure M – Mark Christoffels, CEO, The ACE Project
M. Christoffels presented an overview of the Measure M Guiding Principles then focused in on the draft SGVCOG comment letter identifying concerns the COG has with the draft Guiding Principles.

ACTION ITEMS

UPDATE ITEMS

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. ACE Ad Hoc Committee
There was no update on this item.
9. SB 649: Wireless Telecommunications Facilities
L. Stevens brought and distributed a handout that outlined the League of California Cities arguments in opposition to SB 649. The handout included photographs of various configurations of small cell sites mounted on public infrastructure.
10. Future Visioning
E. Wolf reviewed the COG planning efforts for the General Assembly. He discussed four future vision topic areas and an idea for a panel discussion format.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- May 15: PW TAC meeting
- May 25: Planners TAC meeting

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:14 P.M.

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant Program Guidelines

Round 5

4/27/17

I. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

TOD Planning Grant: Background

Los Angeles County is experiencing a transformational expansion of the public transit system that will dramatically change the options and opportunities that people travelling to, from, or through Los Angeles County will have to get around. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) has a vested interest in planning and investment efforts around transit stations that create an environment that promotes, encourages, and supports transit riders and the interface between public transportation and surrounding communities.

As a result, in 2011 Metro created the TOD Planning Grant Program (Program), a competitive grant program that funds local governments to develop and adopt transit supportive regulations that promote equitable, sustainable, transit-supportive planning.

Transit-supportive places are places where the presence of effective and predictable transit can be enhanced through appropriate patterns and types of development. This can be achieved through practices such as community-scaled density, diverse land use mix, reduced reliance upon private automobiles, and enhanced infrastructure for pedestrians, bicyclists and people of all ages and abilities.

Between 2011 and 2016, Metro released four (4) rounds of the TOD Planning Grant, and awarded \$21.6 million in 35 grants, to 30 cities across LA County.

TOD Planning Grant: Round 5

Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit

In 2016, Metro released the Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit (Toolkit). Funded by a grant from the Strategic Growth Council, and as part of a broader study on Climate Change Adaption Strategies, the Toolkit is a comprehensive research-based resource that includes best practices, tools and case studies that local municipalities can use to advance Transit Supportive Planning in Los Angeles County. The Toolkit identifies 10 characteristics of transit supportive places that collectively are shown to reduce vehicle miles travelled and increase transit ridership (see Attachment A for brief overview). Round 5 of the TOD Planning Grant will require grantees to utilize the Toolkit as a resource and apply the 10 characteristics of transit supportive planning in grant funded efforts. The Toolkit is a web-based program that can be found on Metro's website at <https://www.metro.net/projects/tod-toolkit/>

Transit Oriented Communities (TOC) Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Pilot Program

In 2011, the California State legislature abolished redevelopment and the state's only effective TIF vehicle. Since then, the legislature has created new enabling legislation to support tax increment financing (TIF). Unlike redevelopment, the new TIF programs (EIFDs & CRIAs) cannot include property taxes from education entities (approximately ½ of all property taxes). Property tax contributions from the other taxing entities are voluntary. TIF can be an important tool in the creation of transit supportive communities, as it can be used to finance infrastructure improvements as

well as affordable housing. With Round 5 of the TOD Planning Grant program, Metro is partnering with SCAG to offer funding to municipalities seeking to study the feasibility of forming TIF districts (either an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) or a Community Revitalization and Investment Authority (CRIA)). Study funding may be available to examine areas around transit stations for municipalities that:

- Have adopted or are in progress with creating a transit supportive regulatory environment; and
- Measure favorably against the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) online Screening Criteria that can be found at [EIFD/CRIA Technical Assistance Tool](#)

As a partner in this effort, SCAG will provide training on the formation and study of the EIFD and CRIA districts as well as use of their TIF screening tool. The County of Los Angeles will provide support by providing updated and accurate tax assessment and collection information.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

- Support municipalities in implementing complimentary transit-supportive infrastructure projects and affordable housing.
- Increase transit ridership.
- Increase the number of comprehensive, community-driven transit supportive planning efforts around Metro light rail, Metrolink stations, and Metro Transitway/Bus Rapid Transit stations and adjacent transit corridors in Los Angeles County.
- Improve local and regional efforts that enhance an equitable integration of transportation and community planning.
- Improve the transit network and increase utilization of public transit by reducing the number of modes of transportation necessary to access regional and local transit lines;
- Further the reduction in greenhouse gases through encouraging in-fill development along transit corridors and transit use;
- Support and implement sustainable development principles.
- Increase opportunities to meaningfully engage diverse stakeholders, especially underserved and vulnerable communities, in advancing transit supportive planning efforts across the region.

III ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Cities and the County of Los Angeles with land use regulatory authority:

- Within 1/2 mile of Metro Light Rail, Metrolink Stations and/or Transitway/Bus

Rapid Transit stations and adjacent transit corridors in Los Angeles County

- Within 1/2 mile of the existing, funded, planned (priority will be given to station area planning efforts that are nearer-term) Metro rail or bus rapid transit stations and/or adjacent transit corridors. Grantees are not required to focus on a circular 1/2 mile radius around a transit facility. Adjacent transit corridors refer to proposed planning areas that are less circular and more corridor-based. Grantees must make the case for the corridor-level approach.

Applicants seeking funds along transit corridors **MUST** demonstrate the corridor's relevancy to the development of transit supportive planning around the station area. The corridor may, for example, connect the station area to significant activity centers, carry significant pedestrian traffic to and from the station area, and/or connect the station area to other areas with significant transit service.

IV. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

Round 5 of the Program offers two categories of activities: (1) Transit supportive regulatory documents, which will result in the elimination of regulatory constraints and the development of regulatory documents that promote transit supportive planning that can be adopted by governing bodies; and (2) TIF Feasibility Studies, which will study the feasibility of pursuing either an EIFD or CRIA within 1/2 mile of Metro Light Rail, Metrolink Stations and/or Transitway/Bus Rapid Transit stations and adjacent transit corridors in Los Angeles County, create a vision/objectives for such a district, and determine the amount of TIF that could be generated under several scenarios. Applicants may apply to one or both of the categories; however the TIF feasibility study requires that transit supportive land use regulations are already in place or under development, so an applicant cannot apply for the regulatory change and TIF feasibility study in the same area at the same time. Robust and inclusive multilingual community engagement shall be an integral component of all Metro-funded planning efforts.

Transit Supportive Regulatory Documents

Regulatory documents must include a land use component (with corresponding zoning code updates). However, Applicants and Grantees are required to advance comprehensive plans that encompass the 10 Toolkit characteristics to ensure that the region is advancing holistic, transit supportive plans and which are consistent with Metro adjacent development requirements where applicable. Eligible Regulatory Documents include, but are not limited to:

- New or amended specific plans;
- New or amended ordinances;
- New or amended overlay zones;
- New or amended general plans;
- Transit Village Development Districts; and
- Environmental studies required to support the new or amended regulatory

documents

TIF Feasibility Studies

- Through the TOC TIF Pilot, Round 5 of the Program will fund TIF Feasibility Studies. Grantees may explore the formation of an Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD) or a Community Revitalization Investment Authority (CRIA), including engaging with stakeholders to determine vision and objectives for a TIF district. The Round 5 Grant application includes a sample scope of work for such studies to provide guidance on eligible activities.
- To be eligible, Grantees must (1) demonstrate that a transit supportive regulatory document is in place or under development; (2) show eligibility for one or both TIF districts (EIFD or CRIA) using the SCAG TIF Screening Criteria; (3) meet the criteria for TIF formation adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in spring 2017, included as Attachment B; and (4) Priority will be given to the most Disadvantaged Communities as defined by CalEnvironScreen.

V. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated according to the following criteria. The first section applies to regulatory documents (Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments, Overlays, etc.), the second set of criteria apply to TIF Feasibility Studies. More detailed scoring criteria are provided in the grant application.

Transit Supportive Regulatory Documents Criteria

Section 1. Project Scope

a. Project Area/Targeted Communities:

- Concise and clear description of the project area, targeted communities, and specific transit stations and/or corridors the project will impact.
- Clear description of the prominent equity concerns in the community (such as lack of affordable housing, economic development, environmental justice, safety, active transportation needs, public health disparities, and so forth).
- Description of the station and/or corridor significance to the local community and larger region including importance for the transit network and ridership.
- Description of the most pressing barriers to public transportation usage and non-private vehicle multi-modalism (walking, rolling, biking).

b. Regulatory Constraints:

- Clear description of the specific regulatory constraints and/or general land use challenges/ barriers in the project area to advancing an equitable transit supportive planning effort. (Does current zoning support transit-supportive development patterns? Has the jurisdiction adopted a Complete Streets Policy?)
- Description of the regulatory barriers that preclude the jurisdiction from addressing the equity issues identified in Section 1.a.

- Degree to which constraints and barriers are aligned with the Toolkit's 10 characteristics of Transit Supportive Places (i.e. outdated parking requirements, height or density restrictions, incompatible land uses, lack of bicycle and pedestrian access and utilization incentives, etc.).

c. Proposed Regulatory Documents:

- Clear description of the regulatory documents that will require revision and/or new regulatory documents. Documents may include a community's general plan, zoning ordinances, parking codes, specific plans, Transit Village District documents, etc. If General Plan land uses are proposed, a clear description of whether or not zoning code updates will be included should be noted.
- Extent to which regulatory documents promote Program objectives as identified in these Guidelines and the Toolkit and are consistent with Metro Adjacent Development requirements where applicable.

d. Impact of Proposed Regulatory Changes:

- Thoroughness in explaining how the regulatory changes directly mitigate the constraints previously identified; how they will improve community-specific equity concerns; how they will result in an increase in transit-ridership; and how they will improve the overall interface between the public transportation system and the surrounding community.

Section 2 - Public Participation

a. Outreach Plan:

- Clear identification of all impacted communities and stakeholders affected by the proposed regulatory changes, including description of key community organizations (advocacy groups, business groups, religious/social organizations, etc.) that will be engaged and the role that they will play in the process.
- Demonstration of a comprehensive and meaningful public participation and outreach program necessary to bring the regulatory changes forward.
- Clear description of how disadvantaged and/or underserved communities will be engaged in the process and the proactive activities that will be undertaken to engage these populations (translators, preparing materials in multiple languages, hosting meetings in the evenings and/or weekends, etc.).

b. Community and Policy Maker Support:

- Demonstration that community stakeholder and policy maker support for the types of regulatory changes being proposed exist. This could be evidenced by prior actions implementing similar changes elsewhere in the community, specific direction by elected officials, letters of support, etc.

Section 3 - Future Implementation

a. Opportunity Sites:

- Ability to link regulatory changes with the near term potential for

implementing transit supportive projects through the availability of suitable opportunity sites, particularly if controlled by the applicant.

b. Next Steps:

- Demonstration of a well thought out long term plan for building a successful transit supportive area once grant funded regulatory changes are adopted.

Section 4 - Project Implementation Plan

a. Project Schedule, Tasks, and Budget:

- Schedule demonstrates the overall approach for project completion and that the project can be completed in 36 months.
- Principle tasks that will be undertaken to complete the project are identified, reasonable, and realistic.
- Overall expenditures (local and grant) as well as expenditures per task are both realistic and highly cost efficient, maximizing the impact of the funds requested.

b. Project Management:

- Clear description of team composition, including the roles and responsibilities of city/county staff and/or consultants.

c. Prior Grant Performance:

Demonstrated performance that does not include:

- Project delays to due unreasonable schedule proposals,
- Numerous untimely or incomplete quarterly reports and invoices.

TOC TIF Feasibility Studies Criteria

Applicants seeking funding for TIF Feasibility Studies must utilize SCAG's Screening Criteria available at [EIFD/CRIA Technical Assistance Tool](#) to assess TIF District viability and grant program eligibility. SCAG will offer training on this tool as well as technical assistance to applicants. TIF Feasibility Study applications will require data collection from the City, SCAG, the County Assessor, the County Auditor-Controller, and as appropriate, the State Department of Finance.

A. Screening Criteria

Applicants are required to perform an initial screening of their proposed TIF district in order to ensure that the feasibility study is for an area that meets the State's legal requirements and also that has the capacity to generate enough investment and TIF to create the desired impacts. The TOC TIF grant application will include questions that closely align with the SCAG screening criteria. Interested parties will be required to advise on how their proposed project fares against the screening criteria. The SCAG Screening Criteria will be critical to vetting applications and informing on potential project viability. The screening criteria will be discussed further in a pre-application workshop. An overview is

provided below.

1: EIFD/CRIA Successor Agency Prerequisites

- Clear description of any former redevelopment project areas that overlap with the proposed TIF project boundaries.
- If overlap exists, a **Receipt of Finding of Completion** must be secured from the Department of Finance and submitted along with grant application.
- Provide detailed overview of current ROPS obligations (include most recent report submitted to the Department of Finance) and whether the City is producing residual revenues that could be applied toward the EIFD/CRIA. Lack of residual revenues post-dissolution could disqualify a proposed area for lack of property taxes if they are pledged to repay the debts of the former CRA in the foreseeable future.

Resource: City to obtain from the State Department of Finance and City Finance Department

2: Economic Development Potential

Demonstrated potential for economic development and therefore, a financially viable TIF district. This can be demonstrated by identifying underutilized and/or publicly owned parcels, planned projects, and looking at changes in parcel values over time:

- Identify underutilized and/or publicly held properties and planned projects within the study area.
- Clearly describe existing parcel values within the potential project area(s) and any significant changes over time (past 5-15 years).
- Clear demarcation and description (size, location, zoning, current use, obligation status) of publicly held properties within the potential TIF district that can be leveraged for economic development purposes.

Resource: SCAG GIS Land Use Data and Parcel Data (Screening Site)

3: Current Zoning and Density in Project Area

- Clear description of the adopted or in-progress transit supportive regulatory document (Specific Plan, Overlay, etc.) with adoption date. Including:
 - The current or proposed zoning and General Plan principles and how they align with the 10 elements of the Transit Supportive Toolkit.
 - The nexus with the transportation network,

- Clear description of regulatory principles that lend themselves to TIF district formation (infrastructure, economic development, sustainability, affordable housing, etc.).
- Whether an updated environmental clearance would be required.

Resource: City documents and SCAG GIS data (including General plan, Specific Plans, existing land uses).

4: Project Location and Infrastructure Needs

Proposals must demonstrate a strong and compelling nexus to public transportation and how project implementation will advance accessibility, integration, and usability of the public transportation system. This can be demonstrated by:

- Half-mile from a Metro Light Rail Station, Metrolink Station, and Metro Transitway/Bus Rapid Transit stations and adjacent transit corridors.
- Description the infrastructure needs such as bike and pedestrian improvements with map(s) that shows the project area, transit network, and 'infrastructure need' areas. Data should be gathered from the Metro Active Transportation Strategic Plan.
- Clear description of how a TIF district could improve infrastructure needs, improved connectivity to public transportation, district-scale sustainable infrastructure improvements, and encourage redevelopment of underutilized properties.

Resource: SCAG GIS data, HQTA/ TPP/ TPA maps, City documents

5: Potential Infrastructure Financing Solutions

- Using SCAG's Screening Criteria, Projects must demonstrate a Tax Increment Capture Rate of 15 cents (.15) for every dollar (\$1) for the Project Area. Taxing entity proportional shares should be current (redevelopment era shares were pre-ERAF) and come from County Auditor-Controller.
- Clear demonstration of project area viability to secure grant funding to advance early implementation of TIF District activities, such as location in a disadvantaged community, other demographic data, safety statistics, etc.

Resource: SCAG Property Tax Data, GIS Data, TPA, Disadvantaged Community Maps

6: CRIA Eligibility

Clear description of the Project Area's eligibility to form a Community Revitalization Investment Authority (CRIA):

- 80% of land (calculated by census tracts or block groups) must have median household income of less than 80% of statewide median
- Must exhibit at least three of the following conditions:
 1. Non-seasonal unemployment rate 3% higher than statewide median
 2. Crime rates 5% higher than statewide median
 3. Deteriorated or inadequate infrastructure
 4. Deteriorated commercial or residential structures
- Note: AB 2492 (NEW) to qualify under CalEPA designation as disadvantaged community (based on geographic, socioeconomic, public health, environmental factors).

Resource: SCAG Socioeconomic Data, GIS Data, including Disadvantaged Community Maps

B. Project Description and Stakeholder Engagement

Section 1: Project Description

- While a specific, defined boundary for the TIF district would be determined through the feasibility study, applicant must offer a clear, concise description of the targeted geographic area under consideration, the transit station(s) within the area, and the kinds of projects/programs that would be funded if a TIF district were in place
- The application must describe how it has positioned itself to advance a successful TIF district and transit supportive investments, through regulatory plan adoption or proposed plan under development, economic development efforts, early TIF exploration, and/or securing other funding sources to implement transit supportive projects.
- Describe how the proposed TIF district could support increased transit access and ridership. This can be based on anticipated public improvements, new development and community serving facilities, etc.

Section 2: Stakeholder Engagement

a. Outreach Plan:

- Clear identification of impacted communities and stakeholders affected by the proposed TIF district, including description of key community organizations (advocacy groups, business groups, religious/social organizations, etc.) that will be engaged and the role that they will play in the process
- Demonstration of a comprehensive and meaningful public participation and outreach program necessary to identify support and create a vision/objectives for a TIF district.

- Clear description of how disadvantaged, underserved communities will be engaged in the process and the proactive activities that will be undertaken to engage these populations (translators, preparing materials in multiple languages, hosting meetings in the evenings and/or weekends, etc.).

A panel of LACMTA staff will evaluate all applications. TIF applications may include evaluators from SCAG. Applicants who do not receive award will have an opportunity to appeal to Metro's Technical Advisory Committee following Board of Directors' action on staff recommendations for award. Unsuccessful applicants will receive an email by LACMTA notifying them of the opportunity to appeal. Unsuccessful applicants interested in presenting their appeal should reply to LACMTA's project manager.

Disclaimer: Please note that successful award does not imply County participation in future TIF District.

VI. ELIGIBLE COSTS

Applicants will develop and submit a budget as part of the application. Funds awarded will not exceed the budget submitted and may be less if the key objectives can be achieved at lower costs. Any cost overruns shall be the responsibility of the applicant. The grant can fund:

- a. Both third party consulting costs and internal staff costs for staff directly providing services with respect to the project will be eligible for funding. Such eligible costs shall not include overtime costs.
- b. Costs associated with community outreach may include food, and non-cash incentives. Such proposed expenditures must be approved by Metro in advance of incurring costs.

VII. NON-ELIGIBLE COSTS

- a. Third party consultants and contracted staff costs such as equipment, furniture, rental vehicles, mileage, food, office leases or space cost allocations.
- b. Applicant staff overtime costs, mileage reimbursements, food and use of pool cars.

VIII. GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONDITIONS

- a. **Duration of Grant Projects.** Projects' schedules must demonstrate that the projects can be completed, including related actions by the governing body (if any), within 36 months of award.

- b. **Governing Body Authorization.** Completed TOD Planning Grant Program and TOC TIF Feasibility Study applications must include authorization and approval of the grant submittal and acceptance of award by the governing body, if required, within three months of notification of award.
- c. **Grant Agreement.** Each awarded applicant must execute a Grant Agreement with Metro. The Agreement will include the statement of work, including planning objectives to be achieved, the financial plan reflecting grant amount and any local match, if applicable, as well as a schedule and deliverables. The schedule must demonstrate that the project will be completed within 36 months from the date of execution.
- d. **Funding Disbursements.** The Program is reimbursement-based. Funding will be disbursed on a quarterly basis subject to satisfactory compliance with the expenditure plan and schedule as demonstrated in a quarterly progress/expense report supported by a detailed invoice demonstrating the staff and hours charged to the project, any consultant hours, etc. An amount equal to 5% of each invoice will be retained until final completion of the project and audits. In addition, final scheduled payment will be withheld until the project is complete and approved by Metro and all audit requirements have been satisfied. All quarterly reports will be due on the last day of the months of October, January, April, and July. Project expenditures that reach 75% of grant budget will be put on suspension when they are behind in submitting a series of quarterly reports and deliverables. Grantees are responsible for submitting on-time completed quarterly reports and invoices. Reports that are delayed or incomplete will result in payments being suspended until the work is on schedule and deliverables are provided according to the Scope of Work and Attachment A.
- e. **Audits.** All grant program funding is subject to Metro audit. The findings of the audit are final. At the Project Manager's discretion, informal audits will be administered by the project manager for grant awards under \$750,000. Grant awards above the \$750,000 threshold will be assigned a formal audit.
- f. **Contract Management.** Program and contract grant management shall be administered by the City staff. City staff must clearly define roles of staff administration and management and may budget through the grant to hire contract staff to assist in managing the program. The contractor or consultant must be defined in the grant application and scope of work. Contractor or consultant staff shall not be associated with the hiring of consultants to perform the development of the regulatory documents.
- g. **Design Guidelines-** Program outreach activities will adhere to Metro's logo and design requirements and standards by clicking on the following link:
[https://media.metro.net/projects_studies/tod/images/Metro Logo Guidelines.pdf](https://media.metro.net/projects_studies/tod/images/Metro_Logo_Guidelines.pdf)
- h. **Program Conditions-** Delivery of draft work products at significant milestones and quarterly project briefings will be coordinated with Metro grant administrator.
 - Grant recipients are required to share their proposed draft RFP, draft

consultant contract and draft regulatory documents to Metro project staff prior to City approval.

- Quarterly briefings will be conducted with Metro staff throughout the project schedule at significant milestones, i.e., kick off meetings, draft documents, outreach events and committee approvals, etc.
- Grantee shall demonstrate that it can meet project milestones and stay within the budget identified in the Grant Agreement. If at the time Grantee has expended seventy-five percent (75%) of the Grant Funds and Grantee has not demonstrated that the work is sufficiently complete consistent with Grant Agreement, LACMTA's Project Manager will notify Grantee's Project Manager through written notice that payments will cease until a mutually agreed-to cost control plan is in place. In the case of insufficient Funds to complete the Project, no further payments will be made and Grantee will identify and secure additional funds to complete the project identified in Attachment A.

IX Deobligation of Funds. Grantee must demonstrate timely use of the funds and effective implementation of project scope of work by:

- i. Executing the Agreement within sixty (60) days of receiving formal transmittal of the Agreement from LACMTA.
- ii. Meeting the Project milestone and deliverable due dates as stated in the Project Schedule and Budget, and Scope of Work.
- iii. Timely submitting of the Quarterly Progress/Expense Reports as defined in Part II, Section 2 of the Agreement and the Reporting and Expenditure Guidelines; and
- iv. Expending funds granted within thirty-six (36) months from the date the Grant Agreement is fully executed.
- v. Procuring contract/consultant to complete grant Scope of Work within six (6) months of agreement execution with LACMTA.
- vi. Notifying LACMTA as soon as grantee is aware of any changes and circumstances which alter the eligibility of the Board approved project.

In the event that timely use of funds and effective implementation of the project scope of work is not demonstrated, the Project will be reevaluated by LACMTA as part of its annual budget recertification of funds/TOD Planning Grant Program deobligation process and the Funds may be deobligated and reprogrammed to another project by the LACMTA Board of Directors. Prior to LACMTA Board of Directors' action to deobligate funds, Grantees recommended for deobligation will have an opportunity to appeal to Metro's Technical Advisory Committee. Grantees will receive a letter by LACMTA

notifying them of the opportunity to appeal. Grantees interested in presenting their appeal should reply to LACMTA's project manager.

Administrative extensions may be granted under the following conditions:

- (i) Project delay due to an unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance beyond the control of the project sponsor (legal challenge, act of God, etc).
- (ii) Project delay due to an action that results in a change in scope of work or project schedule that is mutually agreed upon by LACMTA and the project sponsor prior to the extension request.
- (iii) Project fails to meet completion milestone, however public action on the proposed regulatory change(s) has been scheduled and noticed to occur within 60 days of the scheduled completion milestone.
- (iv) Administrative time extensions longer than 6 months will require a formal written amendment of the grant agreement.









Informal administrative amendments may be granted under the following conditions:



- (i) Project that requires a one-time 6-month time extension based on the Administrative extensions conditions noted above may be eligible for an informal administrative approval. Informal administrative approval will be provided via a signed letter from Metro Project Manager. The Metro Project Manager must secure concurrence from the Senior Executive Officer.

Upon full execution of agreement, Grantee has committed to having the staffing necessary to fulfill the scope of the project. Therefore, inadequate staffing shall not be considered a basis for administrative extensions or appeal of deobligation of funds.

If Grantee does not complete an element of the Project, as described in the Scope of Work, due to all or a portion of the Funds lapsing, the entire Project may be subject to deobligation at LACMTA's sole discretion. In the event that all the Funds are reprogrammed, the Project shall automatically terminate.

Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit

10 Transit Supportive Planning Elements			
 <p>Compact Design</p>	<p>Higher density, especially within a quarter or half mile of a transit facility, can impact travel behavior by providing more opportunities to live in close proximity to transit.</p>	 <p>Complete Neighborhoods</p>	<p>Complete neighborhoods include a variety of housing options, retail and commercial services, and community services. Complete neighborhoods bring land uses and amenities closer together, reduce travel distances, and allow for more non-automobile trips.</p>
 <p>Street & Network Connectivity</p>	<p>Well-connected streets and non-automobile networks bring destinations closer together, reduce travel distances, and improve pedestrian and bicycle access to adjacent areas and uses.</p>	 <p>Site Layout, Parking Layout & Building Design</p>	<p>Placing building towards the edges of streets and public spaces help create walkable urban environments.</p>
 <p>Affordable Housing</p>	<p>Low-income residents often have some of highest rates of transit ridership. Adding new affordable housing near transit can improve access to employment, health care, and education opportunities and reduce commuting cost for low-income families.</p>	 <p>Commercial Stabilization, Business Retention & Expansion</p>	<p>Commercial stabilization measures can help protect and encourage existing small, local businesses that serve the needs of neighborhood residents.</p>
 <p>Transit Prioritization, Accessibility & Area Design</p>	<p>Prioritizing transit and active transportation as the first and highest priority of a circulation network may result in increased transit service, through better travel times and speeds, which can result in significant transit ridership</p>	 <p>Parking Management</p>	<p>Efficient parking management can reduce the parking supply needed, allowing an increase in land use intensity, mix of uses, wider sidewalks, and bike networks.</p>

	improvements.		
 <p>Transportation Demand Management</p>	<p>TDM strategies influence a variety of factors to encourage greater transportation system efficiency, including trip mode, trip timing, travel safety, and trip cost.</p>	 <p>Pedestrian & Bicycle Circulation</p>	<p>Adding pedestrian and bicycle amenities to station areas and connecting those facilities to the surrounding area can create a more accessible transit environment, encouraging new riders.</p>

Metro Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant Program

ROUND 5 WORKSHOPS

Metro is launching Round 5 of its Transit Oriented Development Planning Grant Program (TOD Grant) to fund the advancement of comprehensive transit supportive planning in Los Angeles County. The TOD Grant will fund the following:

- 1) Adoption of transit supportive regulatory plans, using the Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit, and
- 2) Transit Oriented Communities Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District pilot program feasibility studies.

Please visit www.metro.net/projects/tod to download the TOD Planning Grant Program Guidelines.

Metro will review application requirements at the following workshops:

- > **Metro Headquarters Los Angeles – Wednesday, June 7th, 1–4 pm**
Transit Supportive Planning/TIF Combined Workshop
One Gateway Plaza, Henry Huntington Room, 3rd Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Parking is available off Vignes Street. Please bring ticket with you for validation. Transit options include Metro Red, Purple, Gold, and Silver Lines.
- > **Gateway Cities Council of Governments – Tuesday, June 20th, 1–4 pm**
Transit Supportive Planning Workshop only
16401 Paramount Boulevard, Clearwater Building
Paramount, CA 90723
Parking is available on site.
- > **San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments – Thursday, June 22nd, 1–4 pm**
Transit Supportive Planning/TIF Combined Workshop
602 East Huntington Drive, Suite B, Shamrock Conference Room
Monrovia, CA 91016
Parking is available on site.
- > **SCAG Headquarters Los Angeles – Tuesday, June 27th, 10 am–12 pm**
Transit Supportive Planning/TIF Combined Workshop
818 W 7th Street, Boardroom, 12th floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
*Parking lot entrance on Flower Street off of 7th Street
Transit options include 7th /Figueroa station on Metro Red, Purple, LADOT, Metro buses*

Please contact Desiree Portillo Rabinov at 213.922.3039 with any questions.



Metro

2017 Proposed Housing Legislation

SB 540 (Roth) - This bill would authorize a local government, as defined, to establish a Workforce Housing Opportunity Zone by preparing an EIR pursuant to CEQA and adopting a specific plan that is required to include text and a diagram or diagrams containing specified information. The bill would prohibit a local government, for a period of 5 years after the plan is adopted, from denying any development that is proposed within the area of the zone if that development satisfies certain criteria, unless the local government makes certain findings. The bill would provide that, after the zone is adopted, a lead agency is not required to prepare an EIR or negative declaration for a housing development that occurs within the zone if specified criteria are met.

Transportation and Housing, Governance and Finance, Environmental Quality, Appropriations; unanimous support in all committees. Suspense file.

AB 1585 (Bloom) - This bill would establish in each city, county, and city and county in the state an affordable housing zoning board and procedures by which a public agency or nonprofit organization proposing to build affordable housing units, as defined, or a developer proposing to build a housing project that meets specified affordability criteria, could submit to that board a single application for a comprehensive conditional use or other discretionary permit. The bill would provide that the comprehensive permit would have the same force and effect as a conditional use or other discretionary permit issued by an affected local agency, but would prohibit the board from abrogating a provision of the general plan or zoning ordinances of the affected local agency except to grant a density bonus, as provided. The bill would require the Department of Housing and Community Development to establish a housing appeals committee. The bill would provide that the committee would not have jurisdiction if the affected local agency has permitted construction of unspecified percentages of its allocation of units for very low, low-, and moderate-income households in the previous regional housing needs allocation plan cycle. The bill would authorize the committee, following a public hearing conducted according to specified procedures, to affirm, modify, or reverse the decision of the board.

Stuck in Committee on Local Government; pulled by author.

AB 1397 (Low) - This bill would revise the inventory of land suitable for residential development to include vacant sites and sites that have realistic and demonstrated potential for redevelopment to meet a portion of the locality's housing need for a designated income level. Existing law requires the inventory of land to include, among other things, a general description of existing or planned water, sewer, and other dry utilities supply, including the availability and access to distribution facilities. Existing law specifies that this information does not need to be identified on a site-specific basis. This bill would instead require parcels included in the inventory to have sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities supply available and accessible to support housing development or be included in an existing general plan program or other mandatory program or plan to secure sufficient water, sewer, and dry utilities supply to support housing development within 3 years of the beginning the planning period.

Housing and Community Development, Local Government; unanimous support. Sent to Appropriations last week for hearing.

AB 73 (Chiu and Caballero) - This bill would authorize a city, county, or city and county, including a charter city, charter county, or charter city and county, to establish by ordinance a housing sustainability district that meets specified requirements, including authorizing residential use within the district through the ministerial issuance of a permit. The bill would provide that a city, county, or city and county with a housing sustainability district would be entitled to a zoning incentive payment, subject to appropriation of funds for that purpose, and require that 1/2 the amount be provided upon zone approval by the office and 1/2 the amount upon verification by the department of the issuance of permits for the projected units of residential construction within the zone, provided that the city, county, or city and county has received a certificate of compliance for the applicable year.

Local Government, Natural Resources; near unanimous support. Referred to Appropriations last week.

SB 469 (Skinner) - This bill, among other things, would prohibit a city, county, or city and county from permitting or causing its inventory of sites identified in the housing element to be insufficient to meet its remaining unmet share of the regional housing need for lower- and moderate-income households. The bill also would expand the definition of “lower residential density” if the local jurisdiction has not adopted a housing element for the current planning period or the adopted housing element is not in substantial compliance, as specified. This bill would also condition the approval or development containing fewer housing units at each income level than its identified capacity upon identifying sufficient sites or rezones, as prescribed, to ensure no net loss of residential unit capacity.

Gut and amend. Now a child support bill.

AB 30 (Caballero) - This bill would authorize a legislative body of a city or county to identify an area of underperforming infill and direct the planning agency to prepare a specific plan, in accordance with the above described provisions and specified additional procedures, to provide for immediate development within that area. The bill would require the specific plan make certain findings relating to the need for affordable housing and to designate the specific plan area as an overlay zone in which development is permitted by right.

Rereferred to Committees on Natural Resources, Housing and Community Development.

SB 35 (Wiener) - This bill would require an accessory dwelling unit development or a multifamily housing development that satisfies specified planning objective standards to be subject to a streamlined, ministerial approval process, as provided, and to not be subject to a conditional use permit. To qualify the development must be consistent with objective zoning standards and objective design review standards in effect at the time that the development is submitted to the local government pursuant to this section. For purposes of this paragraph, “objective zoning standards” and “objective design review standards” mean standards that involve no personal or subjective judgment by a line public official.

Transportation and Housing, Governance and Finance; with mixed support. Set for hearing in Appropriations on May 22.

SB 2 (Atkins) - This bill would enact the Building Homes and Jobs Act. The bill would make legislative findings and declarations relating to the need for establishing permanent, ongoing sources of funding dedicated to affordable housing development. The bill would impose a fee, except as provided, of \$75 to be paid at the time of the recording of every real estate instrument, paper, or notice required or

permitted by law to be recorded, per each single transaction per single parcel of real property, not to exceed \$225. The bill would require that revenues from this fee, after deduction of any actual and necessary administrative costs incurred by the county recorder, be sent quarterly to the Department of Housing and Community Development for deposit in the Building Homes and Jobs Fund, which the bill would create within the State Treasury. The bill would, upon appropriation by the Legislature, require that 20% of the moneys in the fund be expended for affordable owner-occupied workforce housing and 10% of the moneys for housing purposes related to agricultural workers and their families, and would authorize the remainder of the moneys in the fund to be expended to support affordable housing, home ownership opportunities, and other housing-related programs, as specified.

Passed through all committees with mixed support: Transportation and Housing, Governance and Finance, Appropriations. Currently, on suspense file.

SB 3 (Beall) - This bill would enact the Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018, which, if adopted, would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$3,000,000,000 pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law. Proceeds from the sale of these bonds would be used to finance various existing housing programs, as well as infill infrastructure financing and affordable housing matching grant programs, as provided. This bill would provide for submission of the bond act to the voters at the November 6, 2018, statewide general election in accordance with specified law.

Passed through all committees with mixed support: Transportation and Housing, Governance and Finance, Appropriations. Currently, on suspense file.

AB 346 (Daly) – Existing law dissolved redevelopment agencies and community development agencies as of February 1, 2012, and provides for the designation of successor agencies to wind down the affairs of the dissolved redevelopment agencies and to, among other things, make payments due for enforceable obligations and to perform duties required by any enforceable obligation. The housing successor may expend a specified amount per fiscal year for homeless prevention and rapid rehousing services, and must use all funds remaining thereafter for the development of affordable housing, as specified. This bill would authorize a housing successor to also use funds remaining in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Asset Fund for homelessness services, transitional housing, or emergency housing services, as well as for the development of affordable housing.

Passed unanimously through committees on Housing and Community Development, and Local Government. Unanimous Assembly Floor vote. Sent to the Senate.

REPORT

DATE: May 18, 2017

TO: SGVCOG Homelessness Committee
SGVCOG Governing Board Delegates and Alternates

FROM: Phil Hawkey, Executive Director

RE: **MEASURE H COMMENT LETTER**

RECOMMENDED ACTION


Recommend SGVCOG President send a comment letter to the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors in reference to the Measure H Planning Group Funding recommendations.

BACKGROUND

The Los Angeles County Homeless Initiative (HI) formed a Measure H Planning Group to discuss final funding recommendations for Measure H funds to be submitted to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (BOS). The Measure H Planning Group began meeting in March and includes representatives from County departments, LAHSA, COGs, homeless services agencies, the faith community, and persons with lived experience. On April 13, The Planning group requested updated funding amounts for eligible strategies to consider and were provided an updated spreadsheet at their May 4th meeting (Attachment A). The Planning Group intends to finalize the recommended funding allocations by May 2017 and present the recommendations to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors in June 2017.

Last month, the Governing Board approved guiding principles to provide staff general policy direction. Staff is now seeking to submit a comment letter to the BOS that addresses specific areas of concern.

An initial draft comment letter was reviewed by the Homelessness Committee in April. The comment letter was updated to reflect committee members' comments and the new funding allocation plan. The Homelessness Committee will consider the updated draft comment letter at its May 11th meeting.

Prepared by: 
Christian Cruz
Management Analyst

Approved by: 
Marisa Creter
Assistant Executive Director

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Funding Recommendations
Attachment B – Draft Comment Letter

Requested Funding Amounts for Measure H Eligible Strategies (4-22-17)

#	STRATEGY	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
		(\$ million)	(\$ million)	(\$ million)
A Prevent Homelessness				
A1	Homeless Prevention Program for Families	\$3.000	\$6.000	\$6.000
A5	Homeless Prevention Program for Individuals	\$5.500	\$11.000	\$11.000
	Sub-Total for Prevent Homelessness	\$8.500	\$17.000	\$17.000
B Subsidize Housing				
B1	Provide Subsidized Housing to Homeless Disabled Individuals Pursuing Supplemental Security Income	\$5.138	\$5.138	\$5.138
B3	Expand Rapid Rehousing	\$57.000	\$73.000	\$86.000
B4	Facilitate Utilization of Federal Housing Subsidies	\$4.923	\$5.834	\$5.762
B6	Family Reunification Housing Subsidies	\$8.000	\$4.000	\$0.000
B7	Interim/bridge Housing for those Exiting Institutions	\$13.000	\$13.000	\$13.000
	Sub-Total for Subsidize Housing	\$88.061	\$100.972	\$109.900
C Increase Income				
C2	Increase Employment for Homeless Adults by Supporting Social Enterprise	\$0.000	\$2.000	\$2.000
C4	Countywide Supplemental Security/Social Security Disability Income	\$15.680	\$15.680	\$12.000
C5	and Veterans Benefits Advocacy			
C6				
C7	Subsidized Employment for Homeless Adults	\$5.000	\$5.150	\$5.300
	Sub-Total for Increase Income	\$20.680	\$22.830	\$19.300
D Provide Case Management and Services				
D2	Jail In-Reach	\$0.000	\$1.120	\$2.230
D4	Regional Integrated Re-entry Network	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$1.360
D6	Criminal Record Clearing Project	\$0.623	\$0.715	\$0.715
D7	Provide Services for Permanent Supportive Housing	\$17.600	\$41.800	\$64.600
	Sub-Total for Provide Case Management and Services	\$18.223	\$43.635	\$68.905
E Create a Coordinated System				
E6	Expand Countywide Outreach System	\$19.000	\$27.000	\$27.000
E7	Strengthen the Coordinated Entry System	\$25.000	\$34.000	\$34.000
E8	Enhance the Emergency Shelter System	\$56.000	\$56.000	\$56.000
E8 & B7	Crisis and Bridge Housing (One-time) ¹	\$93.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
E14	Enhanced Services for Transition Age Youth	\$5.000	\$19.000	\$19.200
	Sub-Total for Create a Coordinated System	\$198.000	\$136.000	\$136.200
F Increase Affordable/Homeless Housing				
F7	Promote the Development of Affordable Housing for Homeless Families and Individuals	\$10.000	\$15.000	\$20.000
F7	Housing Innovation Fund (One-time) ¹	\$10.000		
	Sub-Total for Increase Affordable/Homeless Housing	\$20.000	\$15.000	\$20.000
MISC.	Central Measure H Administration ²	\$1.500	\$1.500	\$1.500
Total Requested Amount		\$354.964	\$336.937	\$372.805
Measure H Revenue		\$355.000	\$355.000	\$355.000
Amount Under-requested/(Over-requested)		\$0.036	\$18.063	(\$17.805)
Balance		\$0.036	\$18.099	\$0.294

¹ This funding will carry over into future years until it is fully utilized.² Cost for additional staff for the CEO Office of Homelessness, annual evaluation, annual audit, and oversight committee.



DRAFT

May 22, 2017

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors
500 West Temple St, Ste 383
Los Angeles, CA 90012

OFFICERS

President
Cynthia Sternquist

1st Vice President
Margaret Clark

2nd Vice President
Vacant

3rd Vice President
Vacant

MEMBERS

- Alhambra
- Arcadia
- Azusa
- Baldwin Park
- Bradbury
- Claremont
- Covina
- Diamond Bar
- Duarte
- El Monte
- Glendora
- Industry
- Irwindale
- La Cañada Flintridge
- La Puente
- La Verne
- Monrovia
- Montebello
- Monterey Park
- Pasadena
- Pomona
- Rosemead
- San Dimas
- San Gabriel
- San Marino
- Sierra Madre
- South El Monte
- South Pasadena
- Temple City
- Walnut
- West Covina
- First District, LA County
Unincorporated Communities
- Fourth District, LA County
Unincorporated Communities
- Fifth District, LA County
Unincorporated Communities
- SGV Water Districts

RE: MEASURE H PLANNING GROUP FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

Dear Board of Supervisors:

The San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) has participated in the Measure H Planning Group and provides the following comments and recommended changes to the Measure H funding recommendations:

Comment No. 1 (Strategy E7):

The Coordinated Entry System is central to the County’s Homeless Initiative as it manages the initial interface with homeless residents and connects them with services. However, there is a critical element missing that will prevent achieving the mission and realizing this vision - namely the intentional engagement of local governments and regional governmental organizations as partners in this effort. There is in every strategy the recognition of the need and the resources to build the capacity of local service providers and community-based organizations; there is no such recognition or support for the role of local governments.

The SGVCOG submits the following recommendation for funding allocation under Strategy E7:

- Allocate a portion of Measure H funds to be used to allow interested COG’s to hire/create an in-house COG Regional Homeless Coordinator, to help expand capacity and facilitate coordination with regional member cities.

A COG Homeless Coordinator would coordinate and engage with COG member cities, regional service providers and their SPA to support the Coordinated Entry System and the Continuum of Care services for residents currently homeless and those who are at risk of becoming homeless.

Comment No. 2 (Strategy E6):

Strategy E6 includes \$1.245 million per year for the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department for homeless outreach services. However, this strategy does not provide similar funding for cities that provide the same services. Currently, local police departments and transit agencies with homeless task forces have limited resources to expand or maintain outreach services.

The SGVCOG submits the following recommendation for funding allocation under Strategy E6:

- Provide a portion of Measure H funds under this strategy for local police departments and agencies to provide similar services within their jurisdictions.

Comment No. 3 (Strategy B4):

Currently, Measure H does not provide any direct allocation of funding for Continuum of Cares (CoC's). The organizational infrastructure that exists within the CoC's, as well as the collaborations between the County and the CoC's are critical to delivering effective and relevant homeless prevention services consistent with the strategies outlined in Measure H.

The SGVCOG submits the following recommendation for funding allocation under Strategy B4:

- Provide a portion of Measure H funding for each of the CoC's so that they may support the County's overall homeless reduction efforts. At a minimum, CoC cities should receive a pro rata share of the funding or the Measure H funded strategies in which LAHSA is the designated lead agency. Additionally, funding should go directly to participating Housing Authorities and not remain solely with HACoLA to reduce bureaucracy and increase the usefulness of the program by enabling quick access to the funds.

Comment No. 4 (Strategies D2 and D4):

The program expansion for homeless inmates is a priority since it would offer all homeless inmates jail in reach services from the beginning of incarceration. By coordinating all services provided to homeless inmates, it would be possible to provide one case plan monitored by one assigned case manager, with the goal of ensuring strong service integration. Additionally, the expansion of Jail in-reach, in conjunction with the Re-entry Network, will help integrate high-quality mental health, physical health, and substance use disorder providers. It is necessary to include other law enforcement agencies to expand their capacity for Jail in-reach.

The SGVCOG submits the following recommendation for funding allocation under Strategy D2 and D4:

- Increase funding under these strategies to allow city police departments to participate and to provide in-reach services to city jails.

Comment No. 5 (Strategy C7):

The subsidized employment program currently provides subsidized employment to GROW youths, aged 18 to 24. The existing program design and infrastructure could be leveraged and expanded to provide services countywide to adults.

The SGVCOG submits the following recommendation for funding allocation under Strategy C7:

- Currently, the Transitional Subsidized Employment (TSE) temporary employment program only allows eight months of employment which is not long enough to make a long-term impact for the clients. Therefore, additional funds should be allocated to allow funding for temporary employment programs with longer durations of employment.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and participate in this process. Should you have any questions, please contact our office at (626)457-1800.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Sternquist, President
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
Councilmember, City of Temple City

c.c.: SGVCOG Board of Directors
Supervisor Hilda Solis, First District
Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas, Second District
Supervisor Sheila Kuehl, Third District
Supervisor Janice Hahn, Fourth District
Supervisor Kathryn Barger, Fifth District

DRAFT

REPORT

DATE: April 20, 2017

TO: Transportation Committee
Governing Board Delegates and Alternates

FROM: Phil Hawkey, Executive Director

RE: **MEASURE M COMMENT LETTER**

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Direct staff to send comment letter on draft Measure M Guidelines.

BACKGROUND

Metro is currently in the process of developing Measure M Expenditure Guidelines, which will outline the eligible uses of and requirements for Measure M funds. Metro intends to finalize these guidelines by June 2017, so that they are in place when the sales tax begins being collected on July 1, 2017. As a part of the guideline development process, Metro has formed a Measure M Policy Advisory Council (PAC), with representatives from cities, transit providers, and transit and roadway users. Mark Christoffels (ACE CEO) is representing the SGVCOG on the Measure M Policy Advisory Council and Marisa Creter (SGVCOG Assistant Executive Director) is the alternate.

Last month, the Governing Board approved guiding principles to provide staff general policy direction. Staff is now seeking to authorization to submit a comment letter that addresses specific areas of concern. Attached is the draft letter.

Prepared by: Marisa Creter
Marisa Creter
Assistant Executive Director

Approved by: Phil Hawkey
Phil Hawkey
Executive Director

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A –Draft Measure M Comment Letter



April 10, 2017

DRAFT

OFFICERS

- President*
Cynthia Sternquist
- 1st Vice President*
Margaret Clark
- 2nd Vice President*
Vacant
- 3rd Vice President*
Vacant

Honorable John Fasana, Chairman
 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
 One Gateway Plaza
 Los Angeles, CA 90012

RE: DRAFT MEASURE M GUIDELINES

Dear Chairman Fasana:

The San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments (SGVCOG) has reviewed the draft Measure M Guidelines and provides the following comments and recommended changes:

MEMBERS

- Alhambra
- Arcadia
- Azusa
- Baldwin Park
- Bradbury
- Claremont
- Covina
- Diamond Bar
- Duarte
- El Monte
- Glendora
- Industry
- Irwindale
- La Cañada Flintridge
- La Puente
- La Verne
- Monrovia
- Montebello
- Monterey Park
- Pasadena
- Pomona
- Rosemead
- San Dimas
- San Gabriel
- San Marino
- Sierra Madre
- South El Monte
- South Pasadena
- Temple City
- Walnut
- West Covina
- First District, LA County
Unincorporated Communities
- Fourth District, LA County
Unincorporated Communities
- Fifth District, LA County
Unincorporated Communities
- SGV Water Districts

Comment No. 1:

Throughout the document, Metro refers to the term “Project Sponsor” when discussing the programming and use of subregional funds. This term is not defined and opens the door for individual cities or other entities within a sub-region to take the lead in programming specific projects and seeking approval directly from Metro. The SGVCOG feels strongly that these are sub-regional funds established and defined by the sub-regions and any project to be funded under these programs must come to Metro through a programming effort by the sub-regions.

To insure this is accomplished, the Measure M Guidelines should include a provision requiring Project Sponsors to have the concurrence of the sub-region (essentially, the COG’s¹ and joint powers authorities officially identified by Metro as regional planning agencies) prior to being included by Metro in their annual funding plan even if already included in the various adopted Mobility Matrices. To provide this concurrence, each COG should be required to adopt a five-year programming plan for each sub-regional program within their respective sub-region. The five-year programming plan would have to identify specific projects and phasing, allocated funding amounts, and project timing and be submitted to Metro. These programming plans would be required to be updated or amended on an annual basis reflecting executed funding MOU’s and project additions or deletions. Unless prohibited by the adopted guidelines, revenue constraints, or the Measure M ordinance, Metro would be required to adhere to these COG adopted sub-regional programming plans when executing funding MOU’s for specific projects. Should a project included in a COG adopted sub-regional programming plan be denied by Metro, each COG shall have the right to appeal the denial to the Measure M Oversight Board. Attachment A proposed a flowchart of the proposed process.

Comment No. 2:

The guidelines allow for “Project Sponsors” to borrow from one Sub-Regional Program to accelerate the funding of a project in another Sub-Regional Program with the consent of

¹ Note: Throughout this letter the term “COG” is intended to reference both Councils of Governments and joint powers authorities that are identified by Metro as regional planning agencies.

the Metro Board and the “affected sub-region(s)”. The SGVCOG appreciates this flexibility, but would like to see language that requires the affected sub-regions to approve the proposed borrowing, by amending their affected adopted sub-regional programming plans as defined in our comment No. 1, to reflect the transfer of funds and acknowledging the associated timing impact for projects included in those sub-regional programs.

Comment No. 3:

The guidelines state that Measure M funds may be used for pre-construction as well as construction activities. Pre-construction activities are defined in the guideline and include “planning studies”. The SGVCOG recommends that this term be expanded to “planning and programming studies”. Adding the term “programming studies” will allow the sub-regions through their respective COGs to develop sub-regional project lists for corridor planning and coordination, and for subsequent project development and delivery. This will ensure that proposed projects complement each other and maximize mobility and/or sustainability.

Comment No. 4:

The Measure M Guidelines regarding Sub-Regional Equity funds state that Metro may meet these obligations using “any combination of federal, state or Metro controlled funds including, but not limited to, Measure M.” SGVCOG appreciates the need for this flexibility, however this flexibility being sought by Metro potentially places significant grant compliance requirements on sub-regions that may conflict with proposed projects or uses of those funds. The guidelines should be revised to not allow Metro the ability to unilaterally determine that a sub-region’s funding requirement under the “Sub-Regional Equity Fund” be met with something other than Measure M. Such a funding substitution should only be allowed with the affected COG (sub-region’s) concurrence. In addition, the SGVCOG requests that uses of the “Sub-Regional Equity Fund” be expanded to include the use of these funds for bonding capacity to accelerate proposed projects within the other sub-regional programs.

Comment No. 5:

The definition for eligible uses for the “Highway Demand Based Program” should include park and ride facilities, as well as other ridesharing related facilities.

Comment No. 6:

Under the section “3% Local Contribution to Major Transit Projects”, the guidelines state that “betterment work” funded by the local agency and as defined as “a change that will improve the level of service and/or capacity, capability, appearance, efficiency or function over that which is required by the Metro Design”, shall not be counted towards the 3% required local contribution. The SGVCOG disagrees with this exclusion and would like to see the guidelines amended to allow such betterment work to be counted towards the 3% local contribution. Any capital investment that enhances and improves the operation of the transit system and funded by a local agency should be desirable to Metro and should not be discouraged by not allowing this type of betterment work to be counted towards the required 3% contribution.

Comment No. 7:

Under the section “3% Local Contribution to Major Transit Projects”, “in kind” local contributions as defined should include the cost of staff time from the commencement of the environmental phase through the end of the warranty period.

Comment No. 8:

Under the section “3% Local Contribution to Major Transit Projects”, local contribution limits are determined at the conclusion of preliminary engineering (30% plans). The guidelines need to have language to address projects that have already exceeded this point such as the Gold Line Foothill Extension. How will local contribution be determined for that project? SGVCOG suggests that language be added that states for projects that have exceeded preliminary engineering as of the initial adoption of the these Measure M guidelines, Metro shall consult with the local affected agencies to determine the appropriate project scope and cost estimate to determine the local contribution limits.

Comment No. 9:

Under local return, Metro is currently recommending a \$100,000 annual minimum allocation for small population cities that would normally receive less than this amount. The SGVCOG does not object to this proposal, however is not in favor of increasing this amount beyond the current recommended \$100,000 minimum.

Comment 10:

Upon the approval of the Measure M Guidelines and the initiation of project funding MUO's, the SGVCOG requests that they be included in all communications from Metro to Project Sponsors related to the allocation and use of sub-regional funds assigned to the SGVCOG's sub-region.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Sternquist, President
San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments
Councilmember, City of Temple City

c.c.: SGVCOG Board of Directors
L. A. Metro Board of Directors
Phillip Washington, CEO, L. A. Metro

SGVCOG proposed project funding approval process for sub-regional funds

