



SGVCOG Planners TAC Approved Meeting Minutes

Date: June 28, 2018

Time: 12:00 P.M.

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

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:04 P.M.
2. Roll Call

Planners TAC Members Present

V. Reynoso, P. Lam; Alhambra
C. Hensley; Duarte
M. Carnahan; Glendora
M. Simpson; Irwindale
E. Scherer; La Verne
M. Huntley; Monterey Park
C. Hanh; Rosemead
L. Stevens; San Dimas
J. Drevno, N. Ornelas, M. Kim; LA County
DRP

Planners TAC Members Absent

Arcadia
Azusa
Baldwin Park
Claremont
Covina
Diamond Bar
El Monte
Monrovia
Pomona

San Gabriel
Sierra Madre
South Pasadena
Temple City
Walnut
West Covina

SGVCOG Staff

P. Duyshart; Staff

Guests

A. Ross; LA County DPW
I. McAleese; South El Monte
L. De Loza-Gutierrez; LA Metro
S. Corona; LA Metro

3. Public Comment.

No public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

4. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 04/26/2018
There was no quorum present to vote to approve the 04/26/2018 meeting minutes.

ACTION ITEMS

5. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2018-2019
There was no quorum present to receive nominations for, and elect, a Chair and Vice Chair for FY 2018-19.

PRESENTATIONS

6. East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan

Mi Kim, a Supervising Regional Planner with the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP) and her colleagues James Drevno and Norman Ornelas, Jr. provided this three-part presentation on the East San Gabriel Valley Area Plan for the unincorporated County communities of the eastern half of the San Gabriel Valley. The presenters first discussed the framework of both LA County's General Plan as well as the DRP's Area Plans, and the functions, guiding principles, and purposes of each plan. They also provided a background on the LA County Planning Areas and Supervisorial Districts, as well as some broad information on the nature and characteristics of many of the County's unincorporated neighborhoods. The layout of the County unincorporated neighborhoods in the East SGV subregion was also discussed, too.

The second portion of the presentation was the main part of the presentation, and revolved around LACDRP's incredibly extensive, thorough, and multi-faceted public outreach and community engagement plans and processes. County DRP staff explained how the main goals of the community engagement are to identify existing conditions and understand regional and community needs, appreciate diverse community perspectives on land use and transportation, engage a full spectrum of residents who may be unfamiliar with planning, development, and zoning in general, and ensure equitable and just participating in the East SGV Area Plan development process. The County will work to ensure that residents have access to subject matter experts, and will also work with community experts and advocacy organizations to improve accessibility to the outreach process. LACDRP will host an agency stakeholder group as well as a community stakeholder group, too.

The third part of the presentation consisted of LACDRP staff showing and demonstrating its different tools, outreach mechanisms, digital engagement, and examples of social media posts which make up its wholesome and comprehensive outreach initiatives and plans.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- A TAC member asked if all of the engagement activity is being completed in-house, or if there are consultants? M. Kim replied that the only consultant component is the artist.
- How does the Area Plan integrate with and relate to the General Plan and the SCA? DRP staff stated that the General Plan is a County Wide document, and the East SGV is one of 11 County Planning areas. The Area Plan is part of the General Plan. If needed, the County will also do Community Plans, too.
- Follow-up question: what about the SCAs? M. Kim remarked that SCAs are a map of natural resources, and those haven't been adopted yet. However, the SCA ordinance is currently being updated.
- Are significant County-owned facilities part of this Area Plan, even if they are within a City's jurisdiction? (Bonelli, Brackett Field, etc.)
- Ms. Kim also mentioned that County Public Works is doing an Active Transportation study for unincorporated communities, and this study is under the same charter/program.

- A lot of the outreach is technology based and targeted to a younger generation. Is the county doing traditional outreach, too? County stated that, yes, they are doing traditional print outreach as well.

7. LA Metro's NextGen Bus Study

L. De Loza-Gutierrez, the Community Relations and Local Government Affairs Manager of the San Gabriel Valley Area for LA Metro, presented on this item. She began by stating that a key reason for being at the Planning TAC is to ask TAC members and engineers for suggestions about treatments, infrastructure, routing changes, etc., which could encourage more ridership in each TAC member's respective cities. Metro needs valuable, technical, and targeted feedback from those who know their cities best.

Ms. De Loza-Gutierrez pointed out that Metro's Bus system has not been significantly updated or revamped in approximately 25 years, meaning that the system is outdated. Since that time, LA County has evolved and transformed quite dramatically. This means that some routes likely service districts and neighborhoods which do not require as much service anymore, while other newly developed neighborhoods and districts which require new, additional, or supplemental bus service to meet the needs of those respective communities do not currently have an adequate level of bus service.

Throughout the presentation, De Loza-Gutierrez discussed how Metro, as part of the study, is analyzing service parameters, transit speed competitiveness, and transit compatibility indices. Metro's studies are data based and model based, in order to be as scientific, meticulous, and accurate as possible. Metro is also conducting extensive outreach, including by hosting a bi-monthly external working group which includes regional government agencies (such as COGs), non-profit groups, social justice and socio-economic advocacy groups, other transportation agencies, and faith-based groups to provide community input on Metro's outreach, quantitative studies, and, eventually, the actual new bus service models, maps, and plans themselves.

Ms. De Loza-Gutierrez added that Metro, in order for this massive undertaking of overhauling the bus system to be successful, needs provide a mechanism through which people can provide feedback to Metro on this study. She asked if cities could please provide links to the Bus Study survey or information on City websites. Additionally, if cities have community events, please invite Metro or partner with Metro so that Metro can get feedback right in the community.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One TAC member asked: are you only looking at Metro bus operations with this study, or other Bus services, too? De Loza-Gutierrez said that Big Blue Bus, Pasadena Transit, and Glendale Transit are included within the parameters of the study, and added that Foothill Transit has not opted in yet, but Metro will likely publish suggestions for the San Gabriel Valley still.
- The same TAC member asked: Did you take into account the characteristics and habits of suburban riders (SGV riders) vs. urban and more dense riders? Suburban ridership has a lot of different characteristics than urban ridership does.
- A TAC member stated that of the important things to think about relates to First Last Mile connections and buses as a way to connect to rail transit, since especially suburban riders see rail as more desirable, reliable, and convenient than are buses. Bus travel is also an opportunity to facilitate rail transit, rather than competition with rail.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

INFORMATION ITEMS

UPDATE ITEMS

8. Update on Measure M Subregional Fund Programming

P. Duyshart provided an update to the TAC on this matter. Chief Engineer Mark Christoffels has announced a call for projects for both First-Last Mile program project proposals, and, more recently, for Active Transportation and Greenway program project proposals. P. Duyshart reminded TAC members to please send in their proposed projects, as Measure M subregional fund allocation and programming cannot occur until the COG receives more proposals. While the First-Last Mile program call for projects was only sent to cities which have a rapid transit station (i.e. Metro Rail, bus rapid transit, and Metrolink) located within its jurisdiction, all cities received the call for projects notification for the Active Transportation program. The deadline for local agencies to submit projects for consideration is July 13.

9. ACE/COG Integration

P. Duyshart updated the TAC on this item. He provided a chart which showed the timeline of the various integration activities, projects, and aspects for the next year. He also reported that a compensation and classification study for the integrated agency is being conducted, and the initial results of the Classification portion of the study will be presented to the ACE Integration Ad Hoc Committee next week. Duyshart also reminded TAC members that the draft LOI for the new COG/ACE Project Review and Selection process for capital construction projects was released earlier this month, and that agencies have until August 31 to submit projects for consideration. Unlike the Measure M solicitation of projects, cities can submit any capital construction project, not just transportation-related projects.

10. Subcommittee on LA County Fire Department Compliance

P. Duyshart provided a short update to the TAC. He reported that the City Managers' Steering Committee agreed with the Planners' TAC that the plan check issues and customer service issues which were identified by the Planners are significant issues for cities. Additionally, a few City Managers of contracting non-District cities expressed concern and disappointment regarding increased contracting costs for these cities, and how the process by which costs increase is very opaque. Additionally, the City Managers directed COG staff to work with contracting cities first, and then 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.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

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

CHAIR'S REPORT

11. Solicitation of presentation topics
There was no discussion on this item.

12. Current City Projects
There was no discussion of city projects.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

There will be no Planning Directors' TAC meeting in August. The next Planning Directors' TAC Meeting will be on *September 27th*.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 P.M.