



SPECIAL SGVCOG Planners TAC Meeting Minutes

Date: September 27, 2018

Time: 12:00 P.M.

Location: **Monrovia Community Center**
119 West Palm Avenue; Monrovia, CA 91016

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:01 P.M.
2. Roll Call

Planners TAC Members Present

M. Ronzio-Garcia, P. Lam; Alhambra
L. Flores; Arcadia
B. Lee; Covina
G. Lee; Diamond Bar
C. Hensley; Duarte
J. Kugel, M. Carnahan; Glendora
M. Simpson; Irwindale
E. Scherer; La Verne
J. Mayer, S. Bermejo; Monrovia
M. Huntley; Monterey Park
L. Stevens; San Dimas
I. McAleese; South El Monte
J. Anderson; West Covina
M. Kim, J. Drevno; LA County DRP

Planners TAC Members Absent

Azusa
Baldwin Park
Claremont
El Monte
Montebello
Pomona
Rosemead
San Gabriel
Sierra Madre
South Pasadena
Temple City
Walnut

SGVCOG Staff

M. Creter
K. Ward
P. Duyshart

Guests

B. Hyun; City of Industry
E. Stadnicki; La Cañada Flintridge
A. Ross; LA County DPW

3. Public Comment.

No public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

4. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 07/26/2018
Recommended Action: Approve.

There was a motion made to approve the Consent Calendar (M/S: M. Huntley / E. Scherer).

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

PRESENTATIONS

(Item 5 was scheduled to take place before Item 6; however, Planning TAC Chair Craig Hensley approved a change in agenda order to move Item 5 after Item 6 in the agenda order)

5. SCAG Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process & SCAG Sustainable Communities Program Grants

This item consisted of a two-part presentation. The first topic which was covered was SCAG’s Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process, and Kome Ajise, the Director of Planning at SCAG, presented on this matter. Mr. Ajise talked about how SCAG is currently developing its 2020 RTP/SCS (the horizon year of which is 2045), and this highly in-depth plan seeks to set even higher sustainability and transportation accessibility goals than the 2016 version of the RTP/SCS. These differences include:

- More aggressive GHG targets.
- New MAP-21/FAST Act performance measures and target setting.
- Two new federal planning factors, including improving the reliability of the transportation system and mitigating stormwater impacts of transportation.
- Coordination with, and relation to, the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).
- More thorough local outreach and engagement.

Mr. Ajise pointed out that since SCAG’s goal is to conduct more thorough and meticulous feedback while developing the 2020 RTP/SCS, SCAG has been developing and implementing its Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process. The purpose of this outreach project is to gather feedback and information from local jurisdictions across Southern California regarding base land use, sustainability practices, anticipated population and employment growth, local transit supportive measures, and local policies as they relate to environmental sustainability. SCAG has been conducting one-on-one sessions with cities and counties to get a better understanding for their goals, measures, and best practices pertaining to transit improvement and sustainability. SCAG’s outreach to date as part of the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process has included:

- 197 Work Plans Distributed to Local Jurisdictions
- 197 One-on-One Meetings with Local Jurisdictions
- 80 Jurisdictions Offered On-Site Technical Assistance
- 21 Subregional Presentations

Additionally, Caitlin Sims, a SCAG Management Analyst, presented on SCAG’s Sustainable Communities Program Grants. The Call for Applications for this funding opportunity opened on September 10th, and the deadline for applications is November 15, 2018. Ms. Sims stated that there are 3 planning project categories for the Sustainable Communities Program grant: Active Transportation, Integrated Land-Use (ILU) and Green Region Initiative (GRI). She also pointed out how applicants which are awarded funding will receive technical assistance from SCAG, too.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were asked about and discussed:

- A TAC member pointed out that there needs to be a better relation to where the jobs and the housing are actually going to be. Additionally, he also pointed out that, as we evaluate the criteria for coming up with the new numbers for housing, SCAG needs to consider that there isn't as much funding sources available to cities anymore to produce and build affordable housing. The mandates that are being put on cities are near-impossible for cities to meet, as a result.
- ***Marisa Creter announced that the COG will have a call for projects for some cities to work together collaboratively to build some housing (ask Marisa). However, a TAC member pointed out that this funding is still not enough for cities to meet the requirements.
- There was a remark about how EIFDs are great IF the County supports the implementation of the EIFDs.
- Because of new laws, this plan (SCAGs) is just a construction mandate for cities.
- One member of the TAC said that we need to find a way to solve the housing crisis, rather than come out with more directives and plans. New requirements need to be much more pragmatic.
- There was feedback regarding SCAG's grant application: the application is lengthy, and the application should have been simplified.
- SCAG is looking for which projects will actually move the needle on GHG reduction, but a comment was made to SCAG representatives that the application does not reflect this.
- A member of the TAC thinks the way that SCAG manages the Go Human grant and Sustainable Communities grants are inefficient, and create problems for the cities. Cities should be given more independence on these projects, because it reduces communication delays and red tape delays. Says SCAG had an account manager run their project. K. Ajise responded to that by saying that he's seen many cities fail audits, so SCAG wants to keep most control over these projects.
- Another Planning TAC voting member pointed out that project delays that result from the auditor or consultant, fall on City staff from the Council (because it looks bad to blame 3rd parties when you are accountable to a Council).
- **Marisa Creter announced that the COG is willing to assist cities in completing applications for this grant program (especially multi-jurisdictional corridor plans) (also EV vehicle charging plans). COG can be a partner and resource for cities.

ACTION ITEMS

(Item 6 was scheduled to take place after Item 5; however, Planning TAC Chair Craig Hensley approved a change in agenda order to move Item 6 before Item 5 in the agenda order)

6. Measure M MSP Subregional Fund Programming – Proposed Projects List for First 5-Year Programming Plan

Marisa Creter, the Executive Director of the SGVCOG, provided the staff report on this matter to the TAC. She began 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. Ms. Creter 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.

Creter 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. Creter 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. She also emphasized that there are two large-scale projects which are currently being recommended for funding for Design only, and that is because it is projected that the Construction expenditures for those two projects will not take place until FY 2022-23, which is not part of the current MSP 5-Year Plan.

Ms. Creter continued by mentioning 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, Creter quickly talked about funding projection and planning documents that are required to be submitted to Metro by each awarded agency in order to execute funding contracts with Metro.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were asked about and discussed:

- A TAC member asked for clarification about the total project cost, including design and construction, of one of the recommended MSP projects.
- One TAC member inquired about how can the Gold Line Phase 2B cities find a way to secure funding for the outstanding 3% match requirement? M. Creter pointed out that the Planning TAC could make a motion or an amendment to a motion to ask the COG to commit to work with the Phase 2B cities to ensure they get their 3% match covered.
- One City pointed out that they think their recommended Measure M project is actually an Active Transportation project, not a First/Last Mile project.
- Another City representative asked if his City could change the scope or even name of their project. And, if so, how much time does their City have to refine the scope and description of their project before the project gets submitted to Metro for review? M. Creter responded by saying that cities can change the scope for now, as long as the project is not a drastic change from what was submitted, and that cities have until this Measure M recommended projects list goes to the Governing Board for consideration and possible final approval in either November or December.

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, but with the following stipulations and recommendations:

- a) **COG staff should work with jurisdictions that have been recommended for funding to confirm that they will be able to execute their projects within the 3-year lapsing of funds window, and**
- b) **COG staff shall make a commitment to work with Gold Line Phase 2B cities to find ways to secure funding for their required 3% local match obligation.**

**(M/S: L. Stevens / E. Scherer)
[Motion Passed]**

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

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S COMMENTS

There were no comments or announcements made by the SGVCOG Executive Director.

UPDATE ITEMS

7. SB 1 Sustainable Communities Competitive Grant

P. Duyshart of the SGVCOG provided the members of the Planning TAC with an overview of the SB 1 Sustainable Communities Competitive Grant. He went over eligible projects, funding minimums and maximums, local match requirements, grant deadlines and key dates, and the purpose of the State providing this grant opportunity. Applications for this planning grant are due on November 30, 2018.

8. Capital Projects Review Process & ACE/COG Integration Update

There were no updates to give on this item.

9. LA County Fire Department Compliance and Customer Service Issues

P. Duyshart provided a short update on this item to the TAC. He reminded members of the TAC that the City Managers’ Steering Committee directed COG staff to work with contracting cities first, and then to schedule a meeting between City Managers and high-ranking LACFD representatives, but only after the City Managers initially try to work through the California Contract Cities Association (CCCA). Duyshart announced that the CCCA scheduled Associate LACFD Chief Nick Duvally to attend the City Managers’ Steering Committee on October 3rd. The purpose of Chief Duvally attending a meeting with the City Managers is to give Duvally a forum through which he can address many of the complaints from City Planners and City Managers regarding LACFD customer service and code compliance issues. Members of the Planning TAC are invited and encouraged Planning TAC members to attend this meeting to provide feedback and comments to Chief Duvally about how LACFD can improve service to contracting cities.

Additionally, P. Duyshart reported that the CCCA hosted a meeting between Chief Osby of the LACFD and city managers of non-District and contracting cities from throughout the Los Angeles County region to address the fees-for-service issues. The CCCA reported that the meeting was

constructive and productive, and included conversations on issues related to administrative overhead costs, medical versus fire service calls, and LA County Fire Department updates.

CHAIR'S REPORT

10. Solicitation of presentation topics

There was no discussion on this item.

11. Current City Projects

There was no discussion of city projects.

12. Future Planners' TAC Meeting Time and Location

P. Duyshart reported to the TAC that the TAC's normal meeting venue, the Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District, recently informed COG staff that their Board Room will no longer be available for meetings on the fourth Thursday of each month. This means that the Planning TAC will either have to be moved to a different recurring monthly day, or will have to change venues. When Duyshart first asked whether the TAC members would rather switch venues or would rather stay at the Upper District, the TAC unanimously responded that it would be preferred to stay at the Upper District. Duyshart then reported that the Upper District states that their room is available for use on the following days:

- 2nd Monday of each month
- 4th Monday of each month
- 4th Tuesday of each month
- 4th Wednesday of each month

Members of the Planning TAC directed Duyshart to send out a Doodle Poll to determine the best new day to hold future Planning TAC meetings on. Additionally, they also directed COG staff to have the next couple of Planning TAC meetings at the Monrovia Community Center on a temporary basis.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

C. Hensley, the Chair of the Planning TAC, announced that the next Planning Directors' TAC Meeting will be on October 25th.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 P.M.