



SGVCOG Planners TAC Meeting Minutes

Date: January 24, 2019

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 12:00 P.M.
2. Roll Call

Planners TAC Members Present

V. Reynoso, S. Quyle; Alhambra
L. Flores; Arcadia
B. Johnson, A. Turner; Claremont
B. Lee; Covina
M. Nakajima, G. Lee; Diamond Bar
C. Hensley, J. Golding; Duarte
T. Bu, C. Averell; El Monte
M. Carnahan; Glendora
E. Scherer; La Verne
S. Bermejo; Monrovia
A. Lao; Rosemead
L. Stevens, A. Garcia; San Dimas
T. Steinkruger, M. Chang; San Gabriel
V. Gonzalez; Sierra Madre
S. Reimers; Temple City
J. Anderson; West Covina
M. Kim; LA County DRP

Planners TAC Members Absent

Irwindale
Montebello
Monterey Park
South El Monte
South Pasadena

SGVCOG Staff

P. Duyshart
J. Cicco

Guests

B. Shevlin; Mayor Pro-Tem of the City of Monrovia
S. Ruelas, R. Garcia; Baldwin Park
D. Flores; Azusa
A. Ross; LA County DPW
H. Stratman; Principle Strategic Advisors

3. Public Comment.

No public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

4. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 11/29/2018

There was a motion made to approve the Consent Calendar (M/S: S. Reimers/L. Stevens).

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

PRESENTATIONS

5. Establishing a Regional Housing and Land Trust Fund

Heather Stratman of Principle Strategic Advisors provided the presentation for this item. She also provided a presentation about Regional Housing Trust Funds to the SGVCOG’s Homelessness Committee this past December.

During his presentation, Ms. Stratman did the following:

- Provided background and a description of Regional Housing Trust Funds and how they function.
- Explained the primary benefits of Regional Housing Trusts
- Explained the structure of Regional Housing Trusts, and how funding for these entities are generated and distributed. She went over the funding sources for Regional Housing Trusts.
- Stressed the importance of capacity building
- Discussed different Regional Housing Trusts in California, including how most Trusts are privatized. However, she noted exceptions to this rule, including how Berkeley’s Housing Trust is a P-3 partnership, and Orange County’s Trust is a public sector JPA that was established through AB 448.
- Talked about how to develop a comprehensive plan for implementing and establishing a Regional Housing Trust. This included explanations about regionalization, finance, and funding, and “Wrap Around Services.”
- Clarified how Housing Trusts are meant to fill funding gaps for housing projects, NOT to be the only source of funding.
- Stressed the importance of finding leadership in order to usher through Regional Housing Trusts.
- Mentioned how a lot of cities will have to pitch in a work collaboratively together.

Ms. Stratman then opened it up to members of the TAC to ask her questions and engage in discussion on this matter.

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

- A member of the TAC asked if, for the Regional Housing Trust Funds, there affordability limits?
- There were multiple questions about coalition cities and how to approach cities which are skeptical of these Trusts.
- A second TAC member asked: in terms of the funding, how much of the funding is projects-based vs. providing ongoing continuity, management, and leadership? He noted that the biggest problem with past homeless work was to get continuous funding for this type of work. How much do cities that are participating in this have to pitch in in order to keep up the continuity of the Regional Housing Trust Funds?

- Ms. Stratman referred to how SB 2 funds are a great funding source for the Trust, especially for entitlement and technical type of work. She also noted how services still have to be provided, and the County holds the purse strings for those types of funds. PPPs (Public-Private-Partnerships) are also effective, too. You have to create some sort of mental health system, as well. In Orange County, the County, hospitals, and other groups came together to fund this. You need unique financial arrangements.
- There was a question about how many units can be required to be built, and how this affects cities' RHNA requirements?
 - Ms. Stratman stated that 2,700 units over 10 years is under the requirements and thresholds. SB 35 also affects this matter, too.
- Another TAC member asked about HEAP funding, and if this is this calculated into any of this. This TAC member also asked if cities are looking to apply for HEAP funding that can be calculated into this funding mechanism.
 - Ms. Stratman said how these funds went to pay for shelter beds.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

6. Housing, Planning, Development Legislative Preview for the 2019-2020 State of California Legislative Session

Peter Duyshart, who is a Project Assistant with the SGVCOG, provided this legislative preview legislation to the Planning TAC. Mr. Duyshart gave this presentation to the TAC since a plethora of new legislation has already been introduced in the 2019-2020 Session of the California State Legislature, and COG staff wants to notify the TAC early on in the legislative cycle about the types of legislation that are currently being introduced, and that cities might have to comply with in the future. Mr. Duyshart also shared the primary legislative goals of the League of California Cities as a reference point by which cities can assess the legislation with.

P. Duyshart explained how SGVCOG Staff is seeking direction from the Planning TAC regarding which bills the SGVCOG should monitor or even take a position on. He encouraged TAC members to share bills of concern with him either during the course of the TAC meeting, or through email after the meeting.

The 26 pieces of legislation that Mr. Duyshart provided an overview of are as follows:

- Zoning and Land Use Legislation: SB 50 (Wiener) & SB 4 (McGuire and Beall)
- Low-income and Affordable Housing Legislation: AB 10 (Chiu, Bonta, Maienschein, Reyes, and Wicks), SB 9 (Beall), ACA 1 (Curry), AB 14 (Rivas), AB 36 (Bloom), & SCA 1 (Allen & Wiener)
- Accessory Dwelling Units Legislation: AB 68 (Ting), AB 69 (Ting), & SB 13 (Wieckowski)
- Redevelopment Legislation: AB 11 (Chiu, et al.), SB 5 (Beall and McGuire), SB 15 (Portantino), & AB 180 (Gipson)
- Homelessness Legislation: AB 22 (Burke), SB 48 (Wiener), AB 58 (Rivas), SB 18 (Skinner), AB 67 (Rivas), & AB 139 (Quirk-Silva)
- General Housing-Related Legislation: SB 6 (Beall and McGuire), SB 25 (Caballero), AB 53 (Jones-Sawyer and Bonta), AB 178 (Dahle), AB 191 (Patterson)

7. AB 626: Microenterprise Home Kitchen Operation (MEHKO): Discussion of Cities' Approaches to Complying with the Law

Peter Duyshart of the SGVCOG provided a background on AB 626 to the Planning TAC, and also explained what MEHKO's are. He also gave a summary of what the most notable and pertinent restrictions on MEHKO's are, as stipulated by AB 626.

Mr. Duyshart explained that, since AB 626 permits counties and local municipalities to enact an ordinance or resolution to authorize the local enforcement entity to issue public health permits and to conduct inspections, and since local agencies will now have to consider the implications and impacts that MEHKO's could have on their communities, the purpose of this discussion is for SGV Planners to hear about possible ideas or plans pertaining to any regulations that cities might have for MEHKO's.

Members of the TAC then held a short question and discussion session on how to approach the regulation of MEHKO's at the local level.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

J. Cicco, who is the Regional Homelessness Coordinator for the SGVCOG, provided some comments to the TAC with regards to SB 2 compliance. She stated how, as it relates to SB 2 compliance, but also in general, the COG is stronger if we can speak in a concerted voice and a collaborative voice together. Ms. Cicco announced that she wants to set up a conference call with City planners for SB 2 compliance, with the ultimate goal of trying to help the County better understand where the cities are coming from. She asked for members of the TAC to please let SGVCOG staff know if they want to participate in this call and effort.

UPDATE ITEMS

8. Measure M MSP Funding Update

P. Duyshart gave the update on this item. He notified TAC members that, within the next couple of weeks, the SGVCOG will be sending the draft of its MSP 5-Year Plans to Metro for review. Metro has 60 days to review the draft plans and recommended projects for eligibility, and during this time, they hold the right to request additional project information from each of the cities or agencies which submitted a project for MSP funding. COG staff will continue to keep pertinent cities and agencies apprised of new MSP developments and timeline updates.

One TAC member expressed concern about future MSP subregional funds being taken away from the subregion for the Gold Line Phase 2B extension project. He asked the COG and the cities to watch Metro and the Gold Line Construction Authority in their efforts to possibly take this funding away. Stressed how we all need to collaboratively be vigilant about watching this.

9. ACE Capital Projects and Construction Update

P. Duyshart also gave the update on this item. He reminded members of the TAC that the COG is re-opening the Capital Projects Review and solicitation process. Mr. Duyshart then announced that cities which want to submit possible capital projects that they would want the COG to take over construction management of to notify the COG, in writing, of which projects they want the COG to consider as soon as possible.

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.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

C. Hensley, the Chair of the Planning TAC, announced that the next Planning Directors' TAC Meeting will be on Thursday, February 28th, 2019.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:19 P.M.