



**San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments**  
**AGENDA AND NOTICE**  
**OF THE MEETING OF THE SGVCOG PLANNING DIRECTORS**  
**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES (TAC)**  
**Thursday, January 26, 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](http://www.sgvkog.org). Copies are available via email upon request ([sgv@sgvkog.org](mailto:sgv@sgvkog.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. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 12/01/2016  
*Recommended Action: Approve.*

## **PRESENTATIONS**

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

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

5. Housing Crisis and Possible Approaches to Solutions
  - SB 35 (Wiener)
  - Governor Brown's Proposed Budget
  - [Statewide Housing Assessment](#)
    - o Exhibit C1: Major State Funded Housing and Community Development Programs
    - o Exhibit C3: Major Federally Funded Housing Programs
  - SCAG 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle RHNA Allocation Plan*Recommended Action: for discussion.*
6. Impact of Future Trends on Local Planning
  - Transportation: autonomous vehicles, ridesharing, ride hailing
  - Electrical Grid: Community Choice Electricity
  - Communications: satellite-based internet, municipally-owned internet, Wide Area Networks
  - Retail/Sales: on-demand purchasing, warehouse-based retail, lighter-than-air warehousing, drone delivery*Recommended Action: for discussion.*
7. Measure M Guidelines  
*Recommended Action: for discussion.*

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

## **UPDATE ITEMS**

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

## **CHAIR'S REPORT**

8. Current City Projects  
*Recommended Action: For information.*

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

## **ADJOURN**



## **SGVCOG Planner's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Unapproved Minutes**

Date: Thursday, December 1, 2016

Time: 12:00 PM

Location: Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District

602 E. Huntington Dr., Suite B, Monrovia, CA 91016

### **PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:07 PM.
2. Roll Call

#### **Members Present**

V. Reynoso, T. Pace, Alhambra  
J. Kasama, Arcadia  
G. Gubman, Diamond Bar  
C. Hensley, Duarte  
E. Stadnicki, Glendora  
S. Bermejo, Monrovia  
M. Huntley, Monterey Park  
C. Hanh, Rosemead  
L. Stevens, San Dimas  
J. Anderson, West Covina

#### **Staff**

M. Creter  
E. Wolf

#### **Members Absent**

Azusa  
Baldwin Park  
Claremont  
Covina  
El Monte  
Irwindale  
La Verne  
Pasadena  
Pomona  
San Gabriel  
Sierra Madre  
South Pasadena  
Temple City  
Walnut

3. Public Comment  
There was no public comment.

### **CONSENT CALENDAR**

4. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 9/22/2016, 10/27/2016  
**There was a motion to approve consent items 4 (M/S: C. Hensley/E. Stadnicki).**  
**[Motion Passes]**

<b>AYES:</b>	Alhambra, Arcadia, Diamond Bar, Duarte, Glendora, Monrovia, Monterey Park, Rosemead, San Dimas, West Covina
<b>NOES:</b>	
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Azusa, Baldwin Park, Claremont, Covina, El Monte, Irwindale, La Verne, Pasadena, Pomona, San Gabriel, Sierra Madre, South Pasadena, Temple City, Walnut

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

5. Joint Public Works/Planning TAC Call for Projects Process Improvement Working Group

M. Huntley volunteered to be a member of this PIWG.

6. Housing Crisis and Possible Approaches to Solutions

The committee discussed the need to collect information on the experience SGV cities have with requests for housing permits as a way to apply actual experience to the housing crisis discussion. SGV cities do not believe the current discussion by Metro and others considers the number of applicants SGV cities actually receive (very few), the thoroughness of those applications and how that affects the length of time it takes to process them, and the type of housing being sought. Staff will work with the Chair to develop a survey tool to facilitate collecting this data.

7. Rail Corridor Quiet Zones: Executive Level Meeting, 12 Dec

Staff updated the committee on plans for this meeting.

8. Marijuana Update

L. Stevens presented an overview of the proposition approved by voters on November 8<sup>th</sup>. He reviewed policies the cities of Glendora and San Dimas have put in place and invited committee members to list what policies their cities have, or are planning to establish. All cities represented had either banned commercial sales or were planning to. Most cities had established conditions for personal cultivation such as regulating the wattage of lighting, prescribing ventilation standards, curtailing the use of chemicals, and dictating in which rooms cultivation may occur.

9. [Metro Complete Streets Workshop](#)

Staff discussed the upcoming Complete Streets Workshops.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

10. Total GHG Impact of Transit Trips

M. Creter related the findings of a study that calculated the total impact of GHGs, by light rail line. The study compared GHGs from various mixes of modes, including single occupant auto-to-station, carpooling, single-auto trips, and other variations.

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

### **CHAIR'S REPORT**

SCAG Sustainability Grants. Staff solicited information regarding individual city applications for SCAG Sustainability Grants. The City of Duarte applied for a grant to further greening efforts. Arcadia applied for a grant for street improvements around their Gold Line station.

LA Homeless Survey. Members wanted to know which cities would be participating in the homeless count on January 24, 2017 and which department within the city was taking the lead.

Recycling and Donation Boxes. Members discussed requests they have had from a “non-profit” to install donation boxes in their cities as a “fund raiser.” They concluded that the same entity is approaching multiple cities with the same request and that this may be a front for a for-profit company.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 P.M.

**Introduced by Senator Wiener**

December 5, 2016

---

An act relating to housing.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 35, as introduced, Wiener. Planning and Zoning: affordable housing: streamline.

The Planning and Zoning Law requires a city or county to adopt a general plan for land use development within its boundaries that includes, among other things, a housing element. Existing law provides for various incentives intended to facilitate and expedite the construction of affordable housing. Existing law requires the Department of Housing and Community Development to determine existing and projected needs for housing for each region and, in consultation with each council of governments, adopt a final regional housing plan that allocates a share of the regional housing need to each city, county, or city and county that meets specified requirements.

This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation to streamline, incentivize, and remove local barriers to housing creation, as specified.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no.  
State-mandated local program: no.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

- 1 SECTION 1. It is the intent of the Legislature to enact
- 2 legislation to streamline and incentivize the creation of affordable
- 3 housing projects, to remove local barriers to creating affordable
- 4 housing in all communities, to streamline, incentivize, and remove

- 1 local barriers to housing creation in jurisdictions failing to meet
- 2 their regional housing needs contained in their housing element,
- 3 and to ensure the payment of prevailing rate of wages in the
- 4 creation of this housing.

O

## 2017 – 18 GOVERNOR’S PROPOSED BUDGET SUMMARY

### Key Planning-Related Issues

\*Taken directly from the Governor’s summary

#### **General**

State revenues, which had surged during several years of the recovery, are now beginning to lag expectations. Consequently, the budget—which remained precariously balanced even in the strongest revenue years—now faces a deficit of almost \$2 billion if action is not taken.

#### **Housing**

##### Local Decisions Drive Per-Unit Costs

Local governments have primary control over land-use and housing-related decisions, and can enact policies that either encourage or discourage housing construction, which impacts housing costs for all Californians. Even though job and housing markets cross jurisdictional boundaries, housing entitlements and permits are determined locality by locality.

Throughout the development process, each local government is faced with factors that discourage housing development, including community opposition, incentives to approve sales-tax generating development over residential development, and market conditions, such as high land and construction costs.

The number of new units developed continues to be very low in many jurisdictions compared to the projected need. Figure SLA-02 demonstrates that housing production rates, proportional to projected housing need, vary widely across the state. Between 2003 and 2014, only 47 percent of projected need was constructed and not one of the state’s regions built enough housing to meet all identified housing needs. Construction rates were lowest for housing serving lower income families. Total development costs average \$332,000 per unit for the construction of new affordable units, which limits the number of units that can be built with limited resources.

To address the statewide housing shortage more units need to be built at a lower per-unit cost. Local factors that drive up per-unit costs include permitting and impact fees, delays in permit approvals, and parking requirements. These cost drivers can add tens of thousands of dollars to the cost of constructing housing.

Last year, the Administration proposed legislation to increase the housing supply through a streamlined permit approval process that would have eliminated duplicative administrative barriers, such as discretionary local government reviews for housing developments consistent with objective general plan and zoning standards. **As the streamlining of the local approval process was not adopted and the General Fund's condition has deteriorated, the one-time \$400 million General Fund set-aside is no longer available.** However, the Administration and Legislature approved measures that facilitate affordable housing development at the local level and assist individuals and families experiencing and at risk of homelessness.

#### Housing Policy Principles

The Administration is committed to working with the Legislature on the development of a legislative package to further address the state's housing shortage and affordability pressures. Such a package should include additional reforms and any new funding should not rely on the General Fund. Because it is counterproductive to develop a new funding source for affordable housing under a system that increases time, risk, and cost, the Administration puts forth the following principles:

- ) **Streamline Housing Construction — Reduce local barriers to limit delays and duplicative reviews, maximize the impact of all public investments, and temper rents through housing supply increases.**
- ) Lower Per-Unit Costs—Reduce permit and construction policies that drive up unit costs.
- ) Production Incentives — Those jurisdictions that meet or exceed housing goals, including affordable housing, should be rewarded with funding and other regulatory benefits. Those jurisdictions that do not build enough to increase production should be encouraged by tying housing construction to other infrastructure-related investments.
- ) **Accountability and Enforcement — Compliance with existing laws — such as the housing element—should be strengthened.**



- J) No Impact to the General Fund—No new costs, or cost pressures, can be added to the state’s General Fund, if new funding commitments are to be considered. Any permanent source of funding should be connected to these other reforms.

**CEQA**

The transportation package also includes the following reforms and efficiencies at Caltrans to streamline project delivery and advance projects more quickly:

- Streamlined Project Delivery — Provide a limited California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemption for projects on existing rights-of-way with previously completed CEQA approval; remove the sunset date for the federal delegation of environmental reviews so federal and state environmental review can be completed concurrently.
- Advanced Mitigation — Advance project environmental mitigation to get early permitting approval as well as stakeholder and advocate buy-in on activities, reducing the challenges that can occur later which sometimes delay projects.

## Transportation

The Budget includes total funding of \$18.1 billion for all programs administered within the Agency. In addition, the Shared Revenues budget in the General Government area allocates over \$1.6 billion in fuel excise tax to cities and counties for local streets and roads (including \$200 million from the Governor's transportation package).

The Governor’s transportation package addresses the state’s most urgent transportation needs and reflects the following principles:

- )] **Focusing new revenue primarily on “fix-it- first” investments to repair neighborhood roads and state highways and bridges.**
- )] **Making key investments in trade corridors to support continued economic growth and implementing a sustainable freight strategy.**
- )] **Providing funding to match locally generated funds for high-priority transportation projects.**

- J Continuing measures to improve performance, accountability and efficiency at Caltrans.
- J Investing in passenger rail and public transit modernization and improvement.
- J Avoiding an impact on the General Fund.

The Budget reflects the Governor's transportation funding and reform package. First outlined in September 2015, the package includes a combination of new revenues, additional investments of Cap and Trade auction proceeds, accelerated loan repayments, Caltrans efficiencies and streamlined project delivery, accountability measures, and constitutional protections for the new revenues.

The 10-year funding plan will provide a total of almost \$43 billion in new funding and redirected savings from efficiencies for transportation priorities. Specifically, the proposal includes annualized resources as follows:

- Road Improvement Charge—\$2.1 billion from a new \$65 fee on all vehicles, including hybrids and electrics.
  - Stabilize Gasoline Excise Tax—\$1.1 billion by setting the gasoline excise tax at the 2013-14 rate of 21.5 cents and eliminating the current annual adjustments. The broader gasoline tax would then be adjusted annually for inflation to maintain purchasing power.
  - Diesel Excise Tax—\$425 million from an 11-cent increase in the diesel excise tax. This tax would also be adjusted annually for inflation to maintain purchasing power.
  - Cap and Trade—\$500 million in additional Cap and Trade proceeds.
  - Caltrans Efficiencies — \$100 million in cost-saving reforms.
- Additionally, the Budget includes a General Fund commitment to transportation by accelerating \$706 million in loan repayments over the next three years. These funds will support additional investments in the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, trade corridor improvements, and repairs to the state highway system.

The plan also includes a significant investment in public transit and active transportation. Figure TRN-01 lists expenditure totals for 2017-18 as well as anticipated annualized expenditures over the course of the 10-year plan. Key components of the 10-year plan are as follows:

- ) Active Transportation Program—\$1 billion Cap and Trade for Caltrans to expand the grant program for local projects that encourage active transportation such as bicycling and walking, with at least 50 percent of the funds directed to benefit disadvantaged communities.
- ) **Local Streets and Roads/Local Partnership Funds—About \$11.4 billion in Shared Revenues to be allocated by the Controller to cities and counties for local road maintenance according to existing statutory formulas, and over \$2.2 billion in state-local partnership grants.**
- ) **Sustainable Transportation Grants — An increase of \$25 million annually for competitive planning grants to assist regions and local governments in achieving the sustainable transportation requirements in Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008 (SB 375), and other State objectives.**
- ) Corridor Mobility Improvements — An increase of over \$2.7 billion for multi-modal investments on key congested commute corridors that demonstrate best practices for quality public transit and managed highway lanes such as priced express lanes or high-occupancy vehicle lanes. Included is also \$25 million annually to expand the freeway service patrol program.
- ) Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program—An increase of over \$4.2 billion (including \$4 billion in additional Cap and Trade as well as \$256 million from loan repayments) for transit capital investments that provide greenhouse gas reductions, with at least 50 percent of the funds directed to benefit disadvantaged communities.
- ) Highway Repairs and Maintenance — An increase of almost \$18 billion (including \$1 billion from Caltrans efficiency savings) for Caltrans to fund repairs and maintenance on the state highway system.
- ) State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) — An augmentation and stabilization to the STIP, which should not only allow the California Transportation Commission to restore funding for \$750 million worth of projects cut from the program in 2016, but also program approximately \$800 million in new projects in the 2018 STIP.
- ) Trade Corridor Improvements — An increase of over \$2.8 billion (including \$2.5 billion in new revenues and \$323 million from loan repayments) for Caltrans to fund projects along the state’s major trade corridors, providing ongoing funding for a program originally established with \$2 billion in one-time Proposition 1B bond funding.

## Cap and Trade and Climate Change

Consequently, the Administration proposes legislation to confirm the Air Board's authority, through a two-thirds urgency vote, to administer Cap and Trade auctions beyond 2020.

The Budget proposes a \$2.2 billion Cap and Trade Expenditure Plan to be allocated after legislation confirming the Air Board's authority to administer the Cap and Trade Program beyond 2020 is enacted through a two-thirds vote. The Budget builds upon the investment categories funded in the 2016 Cap and Trade agreement, such as short-lived climate pollutants, carbon sequestration, low-carbon transportation, and transformative climate communities.

**The Cap and Trade Expenditure Plan also includes \$500 million for the Administration's proposed Transportation package. Consistent with the provisions of Chapter 36, Statutes of 2014 (SB 862), the Budget also reflects \$900 million, or 60 percent of projected auction proceeds, in continuously appropriated funds for high-speed rail, affordable housing, sustainable communities, and public transit.**

**\$863 million is proposed for transportation programs to lower emissions in the sector that represents the largest share of statewide emissions at nearly 40 percent. This funding could support a reduction in housing and transportation costs through the development of transit-oriented development that brings jobs and housing closer together,** as well as provide a substantial investment in incentives for electric vehicles and the development of in-state low-carbon biofuels.

An additional \$392 million is proposed for programs that could expand the amount of green spaces and new and upgraded housing in the state's disadvantaged and low-income communities, reduce pollution at landfills and provide new recycling jobs, improve the condition of the state's forests, and enhance agricultural water conservation. Funding for these programs will be allocated only upon legislative confirmation of the Air Board's authority, through a two-thirds vote, to administer Cap and Trade auctions beyond 2020.

## Water

The California Water Action Plan recognizes the need for better regional coordination on local projects and emphasizes the need for regionally driven multi-benefit projects. Proposition 1 provided \$510 million for integrated regional water management projects. To date, the state has appropriated over \$1 billion for local projects and plans that support regional self-reliance and integrated water management.

- Integrated Regional Water Management Program—An increase of \$248 million Proposition 1 funding for Department of Water Resources for integrated regional water management projects. This funding supports regionally driven multi-benefit projects that help meet the long-term water needs of the state, including assisting water infrastructure systems to adapt to climate change, encouraging collaboration in managing a region’s water resources and setting regional priorities for water infrastructure, and improving regional water self-reliance.

To further this important component of the Water Action Plan, the Budget supports public investments in water storage infrastructure and additional funding for SGMA implementation.

- )] Water Investment Storage Program—An increase of \$1.9 million in reimbursements, from the California Water Commission’s allotment of \$2.7 billion Proposition 1 water storage funding, for the Department of Fish and Wildlife to support initial outreach and technical review of the ecosystem benefits of water storage project proposals submitted to the Commission.
- )] Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Implementation:
  - )] Department of Water Resources—An increase of \$15 million General Fund for 29 existing positions for statewide technical assistance and to provide detailed information on basin scale water use, water supplies, and groundwater conditions. Gathering data on a statewide level is more efficient and provides greater consistency.
  - )] State Water Board—An increase of \$2.3 million Water Rights Fund for 5 new positions and \$1.5 million in contract funds to enforce reporting requirements and protect local groundwater resources beginning July 1, 2017 in high-or medium-priority groundwater basins that fail to form local governance structures as required by SGMA.



## Exhibit C1: Major State Funded Housing and Community Development Programs (Current)

PROGRAM	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	STATE ADMINISTERING ENTITY	ESTIMATED AMOUNT AVAILABLE 2016-2017	ACTIVITY COMPONENTS	TARGET POPULATION	POLICY OBJECTIVES
<b>Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities</b>	Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund; 20% of GGRF auction proceeds through end of cap-and-trade program	Strategic Growth Council (SGC), implemented by California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)	\$320 million (half of funds designated for affordable housing)	Funds housing, transportation, and land preservation projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.	Required minimum threshold of affordable units and 10% of points available for deeper income targeting.	Reduces greenhouse gases by promoting sustainable communities and infill development.  Provides benefits to disadvantaged communities.  Reduces rental shortage.
<b>MyHome Down Payment Assistance</b>	CalHFA-Administered Subordinate Financing for Single Family (Pursuant to Health & Safety Code 51351 et seq.)	California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA)	\$176 million	Down payment assistance loans.	Potential low- and moderate-income homeowners.	Increases access to homeownership.
<b>State Low Income Housing Tax Credits</b>	State tax credits/investor equity	California Tax Credit Allocation Committee	~\$100 million	Supports rental home production and rehabilitation.	Primarily serves very low- and low-income households.	Reduces rental shortage.

Exhibit C1: Major State Funded Housing and Community Development Programs (Current)

PROGRAM	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	STATE ADMINISTERING ENTITY	ESTIMATED AMOUNT AVAILABLE 2016-2017	ACTIVITY COMPONENTS	TARGET POPULATION	POLICY OBJECTIVES
<b>Mental Health Services Act (MHSA)</b>	Proposition 63, Millionaires tax	CalHFA and Counties	\$80 million	State: Supports permanent supportive housing multifamily production and rehabilitation, as well as operating subsidies.  Local: Flexible funds, including rental assistance.	Persons experiencing homelessness or at risk of homelessness currently being served by State and County mental healthcare system.	Reduces and prevents homelessness.  Reduces rental shortage.
<b>Veterans Housing and Homeless Prevention Program</b>	Proposition 41, General Revenue Bond redirected prior bond funds. \$600 million available total	HCD with CalHFA & California Department of Veterans Affairs (CalVet)	\$75 million	Supports rental home production and rehabilitation, permanent supportive housing and transitional housing for veterans and their families.	Primarily serves extremely low- and very low-income households, targeted to homeless veterans.	Reduces and prevents veteran homelessness.  Reduces rental shortage.
<b>California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS) Housing Support Program</b>	General Fund	Department of Social Services	\$47 million	Homelessness prevention and rapid re-housing financial assistance and services.	Families currently receiving CalWORKs benefits.	Reduces and prevents homelessness.



Exhibit C1: Major State Funded Housing and Community Development Programs (Current)

PROGRAM	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	STATE ADMINISTERING ENTITY	ESTIMATED AMOUNT AVAILABLE 2016-2017	ACTIVITY COMPONENTS	TARGET POPULATION	POLICY OBJECTIVES
<b>CalWorks Homeless Assistance Program</b>	General Fund	Department of Social Services	\$32 million	Provides a once-per-year payment to meet the reasonable costs of obtaining permanent housing, and/or temporary shelter while seeking permanent housing.	Families currently receiving CalWORKs benefits.	Reduces and prevents homelessness.
<b>SSI/SSP Outreach to Homeless Individuals with Disabilities</b>	General Fund	Department of Social Services	\$45 million	Funds outreach to increase participation among homeless persons with disabilities who may be eligible for a disability benefits program.	Homeless individuals with disabilities.	Reduces and prevents homelessness.
<b>State Emergency Solutions Grant Program</b>	General Fund	HCD	\$35 million	Funds activities eligible under the Federal Emergency Solutions Grant Program, including rapid rehousing, outreach, and services.	Persons experiencing homelessness or at-risk of homelessness.	Reduces and prevents homelessness.

Exhibit C1: Major State Funded Housing and Community Development Programs (Current)

PROGRAM	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	STATE ADMINISTERING ENTITY	ESTIMATED AMOUNT AVAILABLE 2016-2017	ACTIVITY COMPONENTS	TARGET POPULATION	POLICY OBJECTIVES
<b>Housing Related Parks Program</b>	Remaining Proposition 1C Funds	HCD	\$25 million	Provides financial incentives to cities and counties with documented newly constructed affordable homes.	Rewards local jurisdictions that plan and approve housing serving very low- and low-income households.	Incentivizes local housing planning.
<b>Community-Based Transitional Housing Program</b>	General Fund	Department of Finance	\$25 million	Provides grants of up to \$2 million to cities and counties that approve conditional use permits or other entitlements for facilities that provide transitional housing and support services.	Offenders released from state prisons and county jails. Cities and counties may also apply for funds to serve other populations that they believe will benefit from the Program's services.	Treatment and reentry programming to individuals who will benefit from those services.
<b>Mobilehome Park Rehabilitation and Resident Ownership Program</b>	Revolving fund	HCD	\$15 million	Supports ownership conversion of mobilehome parks to residents, nonprofit housing sponsors or local public agencies; as well as park rehabilitations.	Eligible parks must have at least 30% low-income residents.	Creates low-income ownership opportunities.

Exhibit C1: Major State Funded Housing and Community Development Programs (Current)

PROGRAM	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	STATE ADMINISTERING ENTITY	ESTIMATED AMOUNT AVAILABLE 2016-2017	ACTIVITY COMPONENTS	TARGET POPULATION	POLICY OBJECTIVES
<b>Bringing Families Home Program</b>	General Fund	Department of Social Services	\$10 million	A matching grant program for counties to reduce homelessness.	Families experiencing homelessness who are part of the child welfare system.	Reduces and prevents homelessness.
<b>Homeless Youth and Exploitation Program</b>	General Fund	Office of Emergency Services	\$12 million	Assists homeless youth in exiting street life and provides specialized services to youth involved in sexually exploitive activities.	Homeless youth and youth involved in sexually exploitive activities.	Reduces and prevents homelessness.
<b>Integrated Services for Mentally-Ill Parolees</b>	General Fund	California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation	\$2 million	Provides varied levels of care, supportive/transitional housing, and an array of mental health rehabilitative services to assist with the development of independent living in the least restrictive environment possible.	Mentally ill parolees.	Reintegration of the parolees into the community, increase public safety, and reduce State costs of recidivism.

Exhibit C1: Major State Funded Housing and Community Development Programs (Current)

PROGRAM	FUNDING SOURCE(S)	STATE ADMINISTERING ENTITY	ESTIMATED AMOUNT AVAILABLE 2016-2017	ACTIVITY COMPONENTS	TARGET POPULATION	POLICY OBJECTIVES
<b>No Place Like Home</b>	A \$2 billion bond secured by a portion of future Proposition 63 revenues	HCD	\$267 million (Notice of Funding Availability pending program development and bond validation)	Competitive and over-the-counter program to finance the construction, rehabilitation, or preservation of permanent supportive housing.	Individuals with mental health supportive needs who are homeless, chronically homeless, or at-risk of chronic homelessness.	Reduces and prevents homelessness.

## Exhibit C3: Major Federally Funded Housing Programs (Current)

PROGRAM	ADMINISTERING AGENCY(IES)	ACTIVITY COMPONENTS	TARGET POPULATION
<b>Federal Tax Credits (9%)</b>	Treasury Department/ Allocated at State level by California Treasurer's Office	Supports rental home production and rehabilitation.  Federal 9%: Provides a high contribution to a development, extremely competitive and California uses the maximum available every year.	Households with incomes 60% of area median income (AMI) or below
<b>Federal Tax Credits (4%)</b>	Treasury Department/ Allocated at State level by California Treasurer's Office	Supports rental home production and rehabilitation.  Federal 4%: Provides lower contribution to a development, needs large gap funding from other sources, thus less competitive. However, additional 4% credits would be available to California if more matching funds became available.	Households with incomes below 60% AMI or below
<b>Keep Your Home California</b>	Trouble Asset Relief Program/ Allocated at the State level by California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA)	Mortgage assistance and other foreclosure and default mitigation tools.	Current low and moderate income homeowners experiencing financial hardship.
<b>Public Housing</b>	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)/  Allocated at State level by California Public Housing Authorities (PHAs)	Public housing developments are overseen and administered by local public housing authorities and provide housing for low-income households. No funding for new public housing developments have been available since the mid-1990s.	Households with incomes 80% AMI, low-income or below; 40% of new admissions must be 30% AMI or below, extremely low-income.

Exhibit C3: Major Federally Funded Housing Programs (Current)

PROGRAM	ADMINISTERING AGENCY(IES)	ACTIVITY COMPONENTS	TARGET POPULATION
<b>Housing Choice Vouchers</b>	HUD/Allocated at State level by PHAs	Rental housing assistance provided to low-income renter households to reduce market rate rents to affordable levels.	Primarily serves households with incomes 50% AMI or below.
<b>Section 8 Project-Based Rental Assistance</b>	HUD/Allocated at State level by PHAs	Rental housing assistance linked to a particular property rather than a renter household and does not move with that household.	Primarily serves households with incomes 50% AMI or below.
<b>National Housing Trust Fund</b>	HUD/ Allocated at State level by State Housing Agencies: HCD & CalHFA	Primarily supports rental home production and rehabilitation. Up to 10% of funds can be used to support homeownership activities.	At least 75% of the funds used for rental housing must benefit households with incomes 30% AMI or below, extremely low-income. All funds must be used for households with incomes 50% AMI or below, very low-income.
<b>Community Development Block Grant</b>	HUD/ Allocated at State level by HCD & local entitlement jurisdictions	Supports home production and rehabilitation for both single-family and multifamily developments, public Improvements in support of new housing construction, public services that include shelters, and technical assistance and planning activities.	Provides benefit to households with incomes below 80% AMI, low-income.
<b>HOME Investment Partnerships Program</b>	HUD/ Allocated at State level by HCD & local participating jurisdictions	Supports home production and rehabilitation for both single-family and multifamily developments. Rental assistance is also an eligible activity.	Primarily serves households with incomes 60% AMI or below, can serve households with incomes up to 80% AMI, low-income.
<b>Emergency Solutions Grant</b>	HUD/ Allocated at State level by HCD & local entitlement jurisdictions	Emergency shelters, rapid rehousing, homeless prevention programs, and street outreach.	People experiencing or at-risk of homelessness.

Exhibit C3: Major Federally Funded Housing Programs (Current)

PROGRAM	ADMINISTERING AGENCY(IES)	ACTIVITY COMPONENTS	TARGET POPULATION
<b>Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS</b>	HUD/ Allocated at State level by California Department of Public Health (CDPH)	Covers a wide range of activities. Supports shelter and rental home production and rehabilitation, social services, program planning, facility operations, rental assistance, and homeless prevention programs.	Individuals with HIV/AIDS, and their families, with incomes below 80% AMI, low-income. Primarily serving households with incomes 30% AMI and below, extremely low-income and formerly homeless households.
<b>Rural Housing Programs (515, 514/516, 521)</b>	United States Department of Agriculture direct to applicants	<p>The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Rural Development (RD) arm runs several rental and homeownership programs through its Rural Housing Service.</p> <p>515: Loans to support home production and rehabilitation for multifamily developments. Since 2011 all funds have been used to preserve existing units, rather than new construction.</p> <p>514/516: Loans to support home production and rehabilitation for both single-family and multifamily developments for farmworkers.</p> <p>521: Project-based rental assistance to preserve the affordability of USDA-financed rentals.</p>	<p>515: Rural households with incomes 120% AMI and below, moderate income.</p> <p>Section 514/516: Farmworker households with incomes 120% AMI and below, moderate income.</p>

Exhibit C3: Major Federally Funded Housing Programs (Current)

PROGRAM	ADMINISTERING AGENCY(IES)	ACTIVITY COMPONENTS	TARGET POPULATION
<b>Housing for the Elderly (202)/ Disabled (811)</b>	HUD direct to applicants	<p>Housing for the Elderly (202): This program formerly supported rental home production, but this aspect of the program was eliminated by congress in fiscal year 2012. The program continues to provide rental assistance, preservation rental assistance (for older 202 properties), service coordination to help residents of 202 buildings age in place, and a demonstration program to test the effectiveness of housing and services models.</p> <p>Supportive Housing for Persons with Disabilities (811): This program began as a subset of the 202 program and became its own program in 1992. Provides project based rental assistance to ensure community integration with people who do not have disabilities, the funding requires that no more than 25% of the units in a development receiving 811 project rental assistance may be targeted specifically for people with disabilities.</p>	<p>202: Serves people over the age of 62 with incomes below 50% AMI, very-low income</p> <p>811: Persons ages 18-61 who have significant and long-term disabilities and incomes 30% AMI and below, extremely low-income.</p>



Southern California Association of Governments  
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

Income Category Distribution*						Draft RHNA Components**				Final RHNA Allocation					
		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
County															
Imperial		25.2%	15.8%	15.5%	43.5%	100.0%	17,428	479	49	1,404	4,194	2,553	2,546	7,258	16,551
Los Angeles		25.3%	15.6%	16.8%	42.3%	100.0%	200,572	6,131	1,268	28,297	45,672	27,469	30,043	76,697	179,881
Orange		22.9%	16.8%	18.5%	41.8%	100.0%	41,530	1,143	414	6,150	8,734	6,246	6,971	16,015	37,966
Riverside		23.7%	16.5%	18.3%	41.5%	100.0%	120,308	2,948	175	22,059	24,117	16,319	18,459	42,479	101,374
San Bernardino		23.3%	16.6%	18.4%	41.7%	100.0%	70,623	1,890	469	16,833	13,399	9,265	10,490	24,053	57,207
Ventura		23.5%	16.5%	18.6%	41.4%	100.0%	19,628	523	41	647	4,516	3,095	3,544	8,003	19,158
SCAG		24.3%	16.2%	17.6%	41.9%	100.0%	470,089	13,113	2,416	75,390	100,632	64,947	72,053	174,505	412,137
County	City	% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Imperial	Brawley city	24.9%	15.9%	15.4%	43.8%	100%	3,080	90	4	141	760	470	466	1,338	3,034
Imperial	Calexico city	25.3%	15.5%	15.3%	43.9%	100%	3,139	91	8	13	817	489	490	1,428	3,224
Imperial	Calipatria city	25.9%	15.8%	15.5%	42.9%	100%	187	5	0	48	37	22	22	63	144
Imperial	El Centro city	25.2%	15.9%	15.5%	43.3%	100%	2,118	64	8	265	487	300	297	840	1,924
Imperial	Holtville city	25.5%	15.3%	15.4%	43.8%	100%	222	7	1	20	54	31	32	92	209
Imperial	Imperial city	26.5%	16.1%	15.5%	41.9%	100%	1,367	32	1	91	349	205	202	553	1,309
Imperial	Westmorland city	24.2%	15.5%	15.6%	44.6%	100%	230	7	3	8	57	35	36	105	233
Imperial	Unincorporated	25.1%	15.8%	15.5%	43.5%	100%	7,085	182	25	819	1,633	1,001	1,001	2,839	6,474
Los Angeles	Agoura Hills city	27.0%	16.6%	17.1%	39.4%	100%	113	2	0	0	31	19	20	45	115
Los Angeles	Alhambra city	25.4%	15.4%	16.6%	42.6%	100%	1,580	52	0	141	380	224	246	642	1,492
Los Angeles	Arcadia city	26.1%	16.2%	16.9%	40.8%	100%	1,141	30	0	117	276	167	177	434	1,054
Los Angeles	Artesia city	25.5%	15.1%	16.6%	42.8%	100%	112	3	5	0	31	18	20	51	120
Los Angeles	Avalon city	25.5%	15.0%	17.2%	42.3%	100%	149	6	3	79	20	12	14	34	80
Los Angeles	Azusa city	25.4%	15.5%	16.4%	42.7%	100%	868	25	6	120	198	118	127	336	779
Los Angeles	Baldwin Park city	25.3%	15.3%	16.2%	43.1%	100%	528	14	15	0	142	83	90	242	557
Los Angeles	Bell city	24.1%	15.2%	16.7%	44.0%	100%	40	1	6	0	11	7	8	21	47
Los Angeles	Bellflower city	25.3%	15.3%	16.5%	42.9%	100%	91	3	0	115	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Bell Gardens city	24.5%	15.0%	16.4%	44.1%	100%	33	1	12	0	11	7	8	20	46
Los Angeles	Beverly Hills city	26.0%	16.3%	17.1%	40.7%	100%	271	9	34	324	1	1	1	0	3
Los Angeles	Bradbury city	27.5%	17.1%	17.7%	37.7%	100%	7	0	1	7	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Burbank city	25.8%	15.8%	16.6%	41.9%	100%	2,767	88	62	234	694	413	443	1,134	2,684
Los Angeles	Calabasas city	26.7%	16.8%	17.5%	39.0%	100%	325	7	0	3	88	54	57	131	330
Los Angeles	Carson city	26.2%	15.9%	16.6%	41.3%	100%	1,662	36	0	0	447	263	280	708	1,698
Los Angeles	Cerritos city	26.5%	16.2%	17.0%	40.2%	100%	84	2	0	0	23	14	14	35	86
Los Angeles	Claremont city	26.2%	16.1%	17.1%	40.6%	100%	372	9	0	8	98	59	64	152	373
Los Angeles	Commerce city	25.1%	15.5%	15.9%	43.6%	100%	44	1	0	0	12	7	7	20	46
Los Angeles	Compton city	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100%	11	0	4	302	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Covina city	26.0%	15.6%	16.6%	41.7%	100%	310	9	2	90	60	35	38	97	230
Los Angeles	Cudahy city	25.0%	14.7%	16.1%	44.2%	100%	303	12	3	0	80	46	51	141	318
Los Angeles	Culver City city	26.0%	16.0%	16.9%	41.1%	100%	180	5	0	0	48	29	31	77	185
Los Angeles	Diamond Bar city	26.8%	16.3%	16.7%	40.2%	100%	1,122	23	0	0	308	182	190	466	1,146
Los Angeles	Downey city	25.7%	15.4%	16.6%	42.2%	100%	854	25	19	84	210	123	135	346	814
Los Angeles	Duarte city	25.7%	16.0%	16.3%	42.0%	100%	329	8	0	0	87	53	55	142	337
Los Angeles	El Monte city	24.6%	15.0%	16.5%	43.8%	100%	2,069	67	34	28	529	315	352	946	2,142
Los Angeles	El Segundo city	26.5%	16.0%	17.3%	40.2%	100%	60	2	7	0	18	11	12	28	69
Los Angeles	Gardena city	24.7%	15.4%	16.6%	43.2%	100%	394	12	0	9	98	60	66	173	397
Los Angeles	Glendale city	25.1%	15.7%	16.8%	42.4%	100%	2,291	77	61	411	508	310	337	862	2,017
Los Angeles	Glendora city	26.4%	15.9%	16.8%	40.9%	100%	661	15	9	0	171	100	108	267	646
Los Angeles	Hawaiian Gardens city	24.9%	15.3%	16.4%	43.4%	100%	124	4	3	2	32	19	21	57	129

Southern California Association of Governments  
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Los Angeles	Hawthorne city	24.8%	15.2%	16.5%	43.5%	100%	711	26	0	55	170	101	112	300	683
Los Angeles	Hermosa Beach city	26.8%	16.1%	17.4%	39.7%	100%	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Hidden Hills city	27.6%	17.0%	18.2%	37.2%	100%	18	0	3	2	5	3	3	7	18
Los Angeles	Huntington Park city	24.1%	14.7%	16.7%	44.5%	100%	845	31	18	0	216	128	149	402	895
Los Angeles	Industry city	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Los Angeles	Inglewood city	24.5%	15.2%	16.6%	43.7%	100%	1,159	39	75	261	250	150	167	446	1,013
Los Angeles	Irwindale city	25.9%	15.8%	16.4%	41.9%	100%	15	0	1	1	4	2	2	7	15
Los Angeles	La Canada Flintridge city	27.0%	16.5%	17.6%	38.8%	100%	110	2	0	0	30	18	20	44	112
Los Angeles	La Habra Heights city	26.8%	16.6%	17.5%	39.1%	100%	117	2	1	1	32	19	21	47	119
Los Angeles	Lakewood city	26.5%	16.0%	16.7%	40.8%	100%	425	10	0	32	107	63	67	166	403
Los Angeles	La Mirada city	26.2%	16.1%	17.0%	40.7%	100%	230	5	0	0	62	37	40	96	235
Los Angeles	Lancaster city	24.9%	15.7%	16.5%	42.9%	100%	3,980	107	33	1,610	627	384	413	1,086	2,510
Los Angeles	La Puente city	25.4%	15.1%	16.5%	43.0%	100%	942	25	0	0	208	121	135	354	818
Los Angeles	La Verne city	26.1%	16.1%	16.8%	41.0%	100%	585	13	3	39	147	88	94	233	562
Los Angeles	Lawndale city	25.0%	15.4%	16.4%	43.3%	100%	368	13	0	0	96	57	62	166	381
Los Angeles	Lomita city	25.8%	15.8%	16.8%	41.6%	100%	36	1	9	0	12	7	8	20	47
Los Angeles	Long Beach city	25.1%	15.5%	16.7%	42.8%	100%	9,487	309	0	2,748	1,773	1,066	1,170	3,039	7,048
Los Angeles	Los Angeles city	24.8%	15.5%	16.8%	42.8%	100%	95,023	3,186	0	16,207	20,427	12,435	13,728	35,412	82,002
Los Angeles	Lynwood city	24.9%	15.0%	16.5%	43.6%	100%	453	14	27	0	123	72	81	218	494
Los Angeles	Malibu city	26.4%	16.5%	17.4%	39.6%	100%	130	3	3	198	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Manhattan Beach city	26.9%	16.5%	17.5%	39.1%	100%	37	1	0	0	10	6	7	15	38
Los Angeles	Maywood city	24.3%	14.8%	16.7%	44.2%	100%	50	2	1	0	13	8	9	23	53
Los Angeles	Monrovia city	25.8%	15.9%	16.7%	41.6%	100%	388	12	14	25	101	61	65	162	389
Los Angeles	Montebello city	25.2%	15.5%	16.5%	42.8%	100%	1,031	32	3	0	269	161	175	461	1,066
Los Angeles	Monterey Park city	25.0%	15.5%	17.0%	42.5%	100%	755	21	41	2	205	123	137	350	815
Los Angeles	Norwalk city	25.8%	15.7%	16.3%	42.1%	100%	187	5	9	0	52	31	33	85	201
Los Angeles	Palmdale city	25.5%	15.5%	16.6%	42.4%	100%	6,432	158	0	1,139	1,395	827	898	2,332	5,452
Los Angeles	Palos Verdes Estates city	27.3%	16.8%	17.6%	38.3%	100%	3	0	15	2	4	3	3	6	16
Los Angeles	Paramount city	24.7%	15.2%	16.2%	43.9%	100%	151	5	0	51	26	16	17	46	105
Los Angeles	Pasadena city	25.4%	15.9%	16.9%	41.8%	100%	2,051	65	29	812	340	207	224	561	1,332
Los Angeles	Pico Rivera city	25.4%	15.8%	16.6%	42.2%	100%	829	20	0	0	217	131	140	362	850
Los Angeles	Pomona city	25.2%	15.3%	16.4%	43.0%	100%	3,862	110	0	346	919	543	592	1,572	3,626
Los Angeles	Rancho Palos Verdes city	26.9%	16.5%	17.4%	39.2%	100%	30	1	0	0	8	5	5	13	31
Los Angeles	Redondo Beach city	26.5%	16.4%	17.1%	40.0%	100%	1,293	38	121	56	372	223	238	564	1,397
Los Angeles	Rolling Hills city	27.3%	16.5%	17.8%	38.4%	100%	9	0	2	5	2	1	1	2	6
Los Angeles	Rolling Hills Estates city	27.1%	16.6%	17.9%	38.3%	100%	14	0	2	11	1	1	1	2	5
Los Angeles	Rosemead city	25.3%	15.0%	16.5%	43.2%	100%	550	17	35	0	153	88	99	262	602
Los Angeles	San Dimas city	26.1%	15.9%	16.8%	41.1%	100%	457	11	4	9	121	72	77	193	463
Los Angeles	San Fernando city	25.3%	15.3%	16.1%	43.3%	100%	221	6	5	15	55	32	35	95	217
Los Angeles	San Gabriel city	25.3%	15.6%	16.6%	42.4%	100%	958	29	0	57	236	142	154	398	930
Los Angeles	San Marino city	27.0%	16.6%	18.0%	38.4%	100%	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Santa Clarita city	26.4%	16.2%	17.0%	40.3%	100%	8,338	197	2	216	2,208	1,315	1,410	3,389	8,322
Los Angeles	Santa Fe Springs city	25.2%	15.8%	16.5%	42.5%	100%	350	9	0	35	82	50	53	139	324
Los Angeles	Santa Monica city	25.5%	16.1%	17.0%	41.5%	100%	1,745	64	83	218	428	263	283	700	1,674
Los Angeles	Sierra Madre city	26.3%	16.3%	17.1%	40.3%	100%	60	2	0	7	14	9	9	23	55
Los Angeles	Signal Hill city	26.1%	16.2%	16.5%	41.2%	100%	197	6	0	34	44	27	28	70	169
Los Angeles	South El Monte city	24.8%	14.9%	16.4%	43.9%	100%	162	5	6	0	43	25	28	76	172
Los Angeles	South Gate city	24.8%	15.1%	16.3%	43.8%	100%	1,172	37	53	0	314	185	205	558	1,262
Los Angeles	South Pasadena city	26.1%	16.2%	17.0%	40.7%	100%	130	4	3	74	17	10	11	25	63
Los Angeles	Temple City city	26.2%	15.8%	16.5%	41.5%	100%	531	14	61	2	159	93	99	252	603

Southern California Association of Governments  
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Los Angeles	Torrance city	26.1%	16.0%	16.8%	41.0%	100%	1,416	40	38	43	380	227	243	600	1,450
Los Angeles	Vernon city	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Los Angeles	Walnut city	26.9%	16.3%	17.1%	39.6%	100%	892	17	0	0	246	144	155	363	908
Los Angeles	West Covina city	26.0%	15.8%	16.7%	41.5%	100%	806	20	5	0	217	129	138	347	831
Los Angeles	West Hollywood city	24.8%	15.7%	16.9%	42.7%	100%	408	16	0	347	19	12	13	33	77
Los Angeles	Westlake Village city	27.0%	16.3%	17.5%	39.2%	100%	44	1	0	0	12	7	8	18	45
Los Angeles	Whittier city	25.9%	15.8%	16.7%	41.6%	100%	911	25	3	60	228	135	146	369	878
Los Angeles	Unincorporated	25.6%	15.6%	16.8%	42.0%	100%	30,574	804	269	1,503	7,854	4,650	5,060	12,581	30,145
Orange	Aliso Viejo city	23.9%	17.0%	18.2%	40.9%	100%	38	1	0	0	9	7	7	16	39
Orange	Anaheim city	21.9%	16.3%	18.3%	43.5%	100%	6,877	209	0	1,385	1,256	907	1,038	2,501	5,702
Orange	Brea city	22.9%	16.9%	18.2%	42.0%	100%	1,826	47	4	26	426	305	335	785	1,851
Orange	Buena Park city	22.4%	16.1%	18.3%	43.2%	100%	349	10	7	27	76	53	62	148	339
Orange	Costa Mesa city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	174	6	24	312	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	Cypress city	23.1%	16.8%	18.2%	42.0%	100%	295	7	6	0	71	50	56	131	308
Orange	Dana Point city	23.0%	16.6%	18.6%	41.8%	100%	474	13	17	178	76	53	61	137	327
Orange	Fountain Valley city	23.1%	16.9%	18.2%	41.9%	100%	350	8	0	0	83	59	65	151	358
Orange	Fullerton city	22.2%	16.6%	18.4%	42.8%	100%	2,163	62	32	416	411	299	337	794	1,841
Orange	Garden Grove city	21.9%	16.4%	18.2%	43.5%	100%	715	20	12	0	164	120	135	328	747
Orange	Huntington Beach city	23.0%	16.7%	18.4%	41.9%	100%	1,478	40	11	175	313	220	248	572	1,353
Orange	Irvine city	23.1%	17.1%	18.5%	41.3%	100%	12,686	380	0	918	2,817	2,034	2,239	5,059	12,149
Orange	Laguna Beach city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	32	1	1	172	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	Laguna Hills city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	124	3	0	166	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	Laguna Niguel city	23.4%	17.1%	18.5%	41.0%	100%	158	4	21	0	43	30	34	75	182
Orange	Laguna Woods city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	129	3	0	443	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	La Habra city	22.4%	16.1%	18.1%	43.3%	100%	135	4	0	135	1	1	1	1	4
Orange	Lake Forest city	23.6%	16.9%	18.3%	41.2%	100%	2,663	63	0	0	647	450	497	1,133	2,727
Orange	La Palma city	23.2%	16.8%	18.3%	41.7%	100%	9	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	9
Orange	Los Alamitos city	22.6%	17.1%	17.7%	42.6%	100%	55	2	4	0	14	10	11	26	61
Orange	Mission Viejo city	23.4%	16.9%	18.5%	41.2%	100%	173	4	0	0	42	29	33	73	177
Orange	Newport Beach city	23.3%	17.2%	19.0%	40.6%	100%	533	15	0	608	1	1	1	2	5
Orange	Orange city	22.8%	16.6%	18.4%	42.2%	100%	394	11	7	49	83	59	66	155	363
Orange	Placentia city	22.6%	16.9%	18.3%	42.2%	100%	479	12	1	0	112	81	90	209	492
Orange	Rancho Santa Margarita city	23.9%	16.9%	18.4%	40.7%	100%	12	0	1	31	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	San Clemente city	23.0%	16.8%	18.7%	41.5%	100%	662	17	4	101	134	95	108	244	581
Orange	San Juan Capistrano city	22.9%	16.7%	18.9%	41.5%	100%	625	14	0	2	147	104	120	267	638
Orange	Santa Ana city	21.8%	16.1%	18.1%	44.0%	100%	503	15	25	339	45	32	37	90	204
Orange	Seal Beach city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	19	0	10	186	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	Stanton city	21.8%	16.1%	18.1%	44.0%	100%	329	10	2	28	68	49	56	140	313
Orange	Tustin city	22.9%	16.3%	18.3%	42.5%	100%	1,219	36	127	155	283	195	224	525	1,227
Orange	Villa Park city	24.5%	17.3%	19.2%	39.1%	100%	14	0	0	0	3	2	3	6	14
Orange	Westminster city	24.8%	24.8%	25.0%	25.4%	100%	110	3	5	297	1	1	0	0	2
Orange	Yorba Linda city	23.8%	17.3%	18.9%	40.1%	100%	633	13	24	0	160	113	126	270	669
Orange	Unincorporated	23.4%	17.1%	18.7%	40.8%	100%	5,094	111	67	0	1,240	879	979	2,174	5,272
Riverside	Banning city	23.0%	16.0%	18.2%	42.8%	100%	4,120	101	8	437	872	593	685	1,642	3,792
Riverside	Beaumont city	24.2%	16.7%	18.5%	40.6%	100%	5,415	122	2	289	1,267	854	969	2,160	5,250
Riverside	Blythe city	22.7%	16.4%	18.7%	42.2%	100%	565	17	15	194	91	64	75	172	402
Riverside	Calimesa city	23.2%	16.8%	18.6%	41.4%	100%	2,439	51	1	150	543	383	433	982	2,341
Riverside	Canyon Lake city	25.3%	17.0%	18.9%	38.7%	100%	141	3	0	61	21	14	16	32	83
Riverside	Cathedral City city	23.5%	16.2%	18.4%	41.8%	100%	1,241	32	19	693	141	95	110	254	600
Riverside	Coachella city	23.0%	16.0%	18.0%	43.0%	100%	6,871	181	1	283	1,555	1,059	1,212	2,945	6,771

Southern California Association of Governments  
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Riverside	Corona city	25.0%	17.0%	18.4%	39.5%	100%	1,081	27	5	343	192	128	142	308	770
Riverside	Desert Hot Springs city	22.6%	16.1%	18.5%	42.8%	100%	4,944	151	3	903	946	661	772	1,817	4,196
Riverside	Eastvale city	25.6%	17.1%	18.7%	38.6%	100%	1,578	32	0	147	374	250	274	565	1,463
Riverside	Hemet city	22.2%	16.3%	18.6%	43.0%	100%	2,797	74	0	2,267	134	96	112	262	604
Riverside	Indian Wells city	25.3%	17.3%	19.2%	38.2%	100%	291	6	1	138	40	27	31	62	160
Riverside	Indio city	23.6%	16.5%	18.4%	41.5%	100%	4,053	103	0	1,131	714	487	553	1,271	3,025
Riverside	Jurupa Valley city	23.9%	16.1%	17.9%	42.1%	100%	1,975	49	0	313	409	275	307	721	1,712
Riverside	Lake Elsinore city	24.3%	16.7%	18.3%	40.8%	100%	5,211	131	11	424	1,196	801	897	2,035	4,929
Riverside	La Quinta city	25.0%	17.1%	18.2%	39.7%	100%	1,336	30	18	1,020	91	61	66	146	364
Riverside	Menifee city	23.9%	16.5%	18.3%	41.3%	100%	6,842	150	0	748	1,488	1,007	1,140	2,610	6,245
Riverside	Moreno Valley city	24.3%	16.5%	18.1%	41.1%	100%	7,114	182	15	1,142	1,500	993	1,112	2,564	6,169
Riverside	Murrieta city	25.1%	17.1%	18.5%	39.3%	100%	2,174	52	4	657	395	262	289	627	1,573
Riverside	Norco city	25.0%	17.0%	18.6%	39.4%	100%	809	17	4	12	205	136	151	326	818
Riverside	Palm Desert city	23.9%	16.5%	18.6%	41.0%	100%	1,960	50	0	1,596	98	67	76	172	413
Riverside	Palm Springs city	23.3%	16.3%	18.5%	42.0%	100%	2,010	55	8	1,802	63	43	50	116	272
Riverside	Perris city	24.0%	16.3%	17.8%	41.9%	100%	4,693	118	4	536	1,026	681	759	1,814	4,280
Riverside	Rancho Mirage city	24.3%	17.1%	18.6%	40.0%	100%	594	12	0	511	23	15	18	39	95
Riverside	Riverside city	24.2%	16.5%	18.2%	41.0%	100%	9,534	270	35	1,556	2,002	1,336	1,503	3,442	8,283
Riverside	San Jacinto city	23.1%	16.6%	18.2%	42.1%	100%	3,000	74	5	646	562	394	441	1,036	2,433
Riverside	Temecula city	25.2%	17.2%	18.2%	39.4%	100%	1,903	46	14	470	375	251	271	596	1,493
Riverside	Wildomar city	24.5%	16.8%	18.3%	40.4%	100%	2,620	60	1	146	621	415	461	1,038	2,535
Riverside	Unincorporated	23.8%	16.6%	18.4%	41.3%	100%	32,994	752	0	3,443	7,173	4,871	5,534	12,725	30,303
San Bernardino	Adelanto city	22.2%	16.5%	18.1%	43.1%	100%	3,276	91	8	534	633	459	513	1,236	2,841
San Bernardino	Apple Valley town	22.8%	16.6%	18.8%	41.8%	100%	4,055	98	0	819	764	541	622	1,407	3,334
San Bernardino	Barstow city	22.2%	16.8%	18.4%	42.6%	100%	1,456	44	4	662	188	138	154	363	843
San Bernardino	Big Bear Lake city	25.0%	25.0%	25.1%	24.8%	100%	188	5	11	776	1	1	0	0	2
San Bernardino	Chino city	24.3%	16.9%	18.5%	40.2%	100%	3,008	73	0	187	707	478	533	1,176	2,894
San Bernardino	Chino Hills city	25.0%	17.6%	19.1%	38.3%	100%	844	18	0	0	217	148	164	333	862
San Bernardino	Colton city	23.0%	16.1%	18.1%	42.8%	100%	2,265	67	17	425	443	302	347	831	1,923
San Bernardino	Fontana city	24.0%	16.7%	18.3%	40.9%	100%	6,385	155	0	564	1,442	974	1,090	2,471	5,977
San Bernardino	Grand Terrace city	23.6%	16.9%	18.4%	41.1%	100%	158	4	0	44	28	19	22	49	118
San Bernardino	Hesperia city	23.1%	16.4%	18.4%	42.1%	100%	2,416	60	7	768	398	274	314	729	1,715
San Bernardino	Highland city	23.2%	16.8%	18.8%	41.2%	100%	1,744	44	3	291	349	246	280	625	1,500
San Bernardino	Loma Linda city	23.1%	16.6%	18.6%	41.7%	100%	1,354	45	3	308	254	177	202	462	1,095
San Bernardino	Montclair city	23.4%	16.7%	18.0%	41.9%	100%	709	19	3	35	164	114	125	294	697
San Bernardino	Needles city	21.0%	16.6%	18.9%	43.4%	100%	359	10	3	191	38	29	34	80	181
San Bernardino	Ontario city	23.8%	16.5%	18.3%	41.5%	100%	10,921	310	22	392	2,592	1,745	1,977	4,547	10,861
San Bernardino	Rancho Cucamonga city	24.5%	17.1%	18.7%	39.8%	100%	1,002	26	9	188	209	141	158	340	848
San Bernardino	Redlands city	23.8%	16.7%	18.7%	40.8%	100%	2,765	74	8	418	579	396	453	1,001	2,429
San Bernardino	Rialto city	23.4%	16.3%	18.3%	42.0%	100%	3,304	85	0	674	636	432	496	1,151	2,715
San Bernardino	San Bernardino city	22.3%	16.3%	18.5%	43.0%	100%	6,116	183	113	2,028	980	696	808	1,900	4,384
San Bernardino	Twentynine Palms city	22.5%	16.3%	18.6%	42.6%	100%	807	28	2	384	103	72	84	195	454
San Bernardino	Upland city	24.0%	16.7%	18.6%	40.7%	100%	1,945	54	3	412	382	260	294	653	1,589
San Bernardino	Victorville city	23.0%	16.8%	18.3%	42.0%	100%	8,679	230	42	1,579	1,698	1,207	1,342	3,124	7,371
San Bernardino	Yucaipa city	23.4%	16.7%	18.7%	41.2%	100%	1,942	44	13	395	376	261	299	669	1,605
San Bernardino	Yucca Valley town	22.4%	16.4%	18.6%	42.6%	100%	1,262	33	2	366	209	149	172	400	930
San Bernardino	Unincorporated	23.0%	16.5%	18.5%	41.9%	100%	3,662	89	197	4,392	9	6	7	17	39
Ventura	Camarillo city	24.1%	16.9%	18.6%	40.4%	100%	2,229	54	0	59	539	366	411	908	2,224
Ventura	Fillmore city	23.0%	16.6%	18.5%	41.9%	100%	714	18	2	40	160	112	128	294	694
Ventura	Moorpark city	24.7%	17.3%	18.7%	39.3%	100%	1,135	25	4	0	289	197	216	462	1,164

Southern California Association of Governments  
5th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Final Allocation Plan, 1/1/2014 - 10/1/2021

County		% very low income households	% low income households	% moderate income households	% above moderate income households	% total	Household Growth (2014-2021)	Base Vacancy Needs	Total Replacement Needs	Vacancy Credit	Number of very low income households	Number of low income households	Number of moderate income households	Number of above moderate income households	Total
Ventura	Ojai city	23.3%	16.3%	19.0%	41.4%	100%	382	11	0	22	87	59	70	155	371
Ventura	Oxnard city	23.0%	16.3%	18.6%	42.1%	100%	7,090	200	11	0	1,688	1,160	1,351	3,102	7,301
Ventura	Port Hueneme city	23.1%	15.9%	18.2%	42.8%	100%	162	5	0	173	1	1	0	0	2
Ventura	San Buenaventura (Ventura) cit	23.5%	16.6%	18.5%	41.5%	100%	3,706	105	6	163	861	591	673	1,529	3,654
Ventura	Santa Paula city	22.3%	16.0%	18.9%	42.8%	100%	1,261	35	2	14	288	201	241	555	1,285
Ventura	Simi Valley city	24.6%	17.0%	18.4%	40.1%	100%	1,228	28	0	0	310	208	229	509	1,256
Ventura	Thousand Oaks city	24.6%	17.1%	18.8%	39.5%	100%	188	4	0	0	47	32	36	77	192
Ventura	Unincorporated	24.2%	16.9%	18.7%	40.3%	100%	1,534	37	15	177	246	168	189	412	1,015

\*Final income category distribution is based on 2005-09 ACS data, HCD's regional income category distribution, 110% social equity adjustment, and adjustments resulting from any incorporation agreements. Due to rounding, the Final RHNA Allocation may not follow the exact percentage.

\*\*The Draft RHNA Allocation components do not total the Final RHNA Allocation due to adjustments resulting from the revision request process (La Puente and County of Ventura), and a correction made due to the inclusion of unincorporated county growth (Glendora). In some local jurisdictions, the sum of the components may not equal to the Final RHNA Allocation.



# The Impact of Future Trends on Local Planning

January 26, 2017

# Future Visioning

- Transportation: Autonomous Vehicles, Ridesharing, VTOL Transit, Ride Hailing
- Electrical Grid: Community Choice Electricity
- Communications: Satellite-based Internet, Wide-Area Networks, Municipality-owned Network
- Retail/Sales: On-demand purchasing, Virtual Checkout, Lighter-than-air Warehousing, Drone Delivery



# Transportation: Uber Elevate's Flying Taxi

- On demand
- Fully electric
- Tilt-wing, vertical takeoff and landing (VTOL)
- Minimal infrastructure
  - Unlike light rail and hyperloop, only needs a heliport and charging station
- Challenges
  - FAA regulations, aircraft control
  - Local support
  - Technology
  - Infrastructure



# The Future of the Electricity Grid

- Incorporate more and more renewables
  - More unpredictability and variability
  - Harder to match generation with load
- Renewables located far from demand
  - Expand transmission system
- Increased demand
  - Electric vehicles, wireless everything
  - Increase at peak demand times
- New network metering technology
  - Real-time demand management
  - Demand-based pricing
- New network management technology
  - Increased grid reliability and flexibility
  - Increase capacity utilization



# Publically Owned Internet: Chattanooga, Loma Linda, Culver City

## Chattanooga

- Reputation for innovation
  - Sparked local tech scene
  - Relocation of businesses to city
  - Renaissance in the way the city thinks about itself
- \$111 million grant from DOE
  - 5,000 businesses connected
  - 57,000 households connected
- 1 Gig (1,000 megabits) - \$70 per month
  - Average US connection is 9.8 megabits
- Lawsuits from local cable companies



## Loma Linda

- 23,000 residents
- 5 hospitals, one graduate school of medicine
- Started in 2005
  - \$8 million, mostly private funding
- Connectivity in 2016: 20% of residents

# Retail/Sales: Amazon Go

- Amazon Go
  - Beta testing in downtown Seattle
  - Goes public in 2017
- Cashier: 2<sup>nd</sup> largest occupation in the US
  - 3.5 million cashiers nation-wide
- Select an item
  - Virtual shopping cart
  - Networked inventory system
  - Machine learning
- Walk out the door
  - Scan your phone







**Metro**

Metropolitan Transportation Authority

One Gateway Plaza  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952

213.922.2000 Tel  
metro.net

**December 20, 2016**

**TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**THROUGH: PHILLIP A. WASHINGTON** *PAW*  
**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

**FROM: THERESE MCMILLAN** *Tmc*  
**CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER**

**SUBJECT: POLICY ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR MEASURE M GUIDELINES  
AND THE LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

**ISSUE**

On June 23, 2016, the Metro Board of Directors approved the Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan Ordinance (#16-01). This Ordinance, titled Measure M, was approved by more than 71% of voters at the November 8, 2016 general election. As a result, the projects and programs in the Expenditure Plan of the Ordinance have been approved and must now be implemented. Implementation will require Long Range Transportation Plan resources as well as Measure M revenues.

At the December 1, 2016 Board Meeting, Chief Executive Officer Phillip Washington presented the Proposed Staff Approach for Measure M Implementation, which included a recommendation for a Policy Advisory Council that would directly advise the Board regarding Measure M Guidelines and the Long Range Transportation Plan. The proposed Policy Advisory Council will not vote on single positions, but will instead provide broad input from all perspectives represented on the Council.

**DISCUSSION**

**Background**

The projects and programs included in Measure M were developed through a “bottoms up” process where cities and subregions developed their priority projects to meet their mobility needs and submitted them to Metro for inclusion in the measure. A draft expenditure plan was then developed based on performance metrics approved by the Metro Board.

Following the release of the Draft Potential Ballot Measure Expenditure Plan in March 2016, Metro undertook a comprehensive public review and input process which resulted not only in a refined list of projects and programs, but a greater appreciation of the mobility related needs across the spectrum of the Los Angeles County populous – young, senior and disabled travelers; low income communities seeking broader transport options; businesses large and small who wish to partner in the delivery of this massive infrastructure package, entrepreneurs seeking innovation; and those

committed to protecting our natural and social resources. In this same spirit of collaboration, Metro seeks to involve stakeholders in review of its proposed guidelines. The success of Measure M hinges on the continued involvement of a diverse and committed coalition that supported its passage.

#### Policy Advisory Council

Staff recommends that a new Policy Advisory Council be established to review and comment on the draft Guidelines and provide advisory policy recommendations and input directly to the Board. The Policy Advisory Council will provide insight and input on the Measure M Master Guidelines document and the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The development process for both documents will be reported separately to the Metro Board in related staff reports in January and February.

The Advisory Council will ensure an equal, representative voice for the following constituencies: transportation consumers; transportation providers; and accountable jurisdictions. These categories represent: those who use or are impacted by our complex transport system; those who supply or regulate transportation infrastructure and services; and elected bodies accountable to the needs of both consumer and provider constituencies. The development of the Advisory Council is described in Attachment A to this report.

Based on conversations with the Chair since its presentation to the Board on December 1, 2016, staff has incorporated the following modifications to the the Advisory Council structure:

- The Accountable Jurisdictions category will be modified to accommodate representatives from the COGs. The COGs will be responsible for being a conduit to all cities within their jurisdictional boundaries. Consistent with the direction provided to representatives in the Transportation Consumer and Transportation Provider categories, the COGs are to represent the various voices of cities with respect to issues and questions relative to the Guidelines, not the agenda of individual COG Boards, per se.
- The original staff proposal had eight (8) representatives within each of three categories. Because accommodating the COGs would result in a total of nine representatives in this category, an additional seat is being added to both the Consumer and Provider categories. It is essential to the purpose of the Advisory Council that representation be equal across the three categories.
- It is recommended that the additional slot in the Consumer category be assigned to the Chair of Metro's Citizen's Advisory Council (for reasons elaborated below). For the Provider category, it is recommended that the additional slot be assigned to an entity representing bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities and programs, to round out the modal representation in that group.

The proposed Council will also serve as advisors during the development of a new LRTP, ensuring that Metro includes the voices of the constituencies it serves as it

implements the Plan. Equally represented voices for transportation consumers, providers and jurisdictions serving side by side on the Council should create a forum for diverse discourse for the myriad of policies and priorities that the LRTP must consider and balance.

#### **Alternatives Considered**

Staff investigated the use of existing committees at the request of Board Chair John Fasana at the December 1<sup>st</sup> Board Meeting. Specifically, Metro has two existing advisory groups that were considered as options for Measure M guideline development review. Metro has a Technical Advisory Committee, made up of representatives from municipal transit operators, as well as the local cities and the County of Los Angeles. Metro also has a Citizens Advisory Council, which is intended to represent a broad spectrum of interests and all geographic areas of the County. Both entities were formed pursuant to California Public Utilities Code §130105.

Individually, these bodies represent components of the interests that staff seeks to include in the Measure M guideline development process, but both groups are limited in different ways (e.g., private versus public representatives). For this reason staff recommends a fresh and more expeditious approach as outlined in Attachment A. However, we recommend that the Chair of the Citizens Advisory Council be added to the Transportation Consumer category of the Policy Advisory Council.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

Staff will recruit members for the new Advisory Council according to the plan detailed in Attachment A, so that the members are in place by April 1, 2017 to review the Measure M Master Guidelines document. That document will be drafted by the end of March 2017.

#### **ATTACHMENT**

Attachment A - Development Plan for Measure M Policy Advisory Council

## ATTACHMENT A

### Measure M Advisory Council

The Advisory Council will be made up of three major constituency categories to reflect a diverse coalition. They will represent those constituent groups, and no single or individual agenda. For this reason, it is important to note, that the representatives will not include elected officials.

Members will be called upon to broadly disseminate information to, and input from, their represented constituencies. As a result, they must have resources or access to resources that can support broad, rapid outreach to the constituency.

The Advisory Council ensures an equal, representative voice for the following three (3) categories, each which will get eight (8) representatives, as indicated in the table below:

**Transportation Consumers:** Impacted by our complex transport system

**Transportation Providers:** Supply or regulate transportation infrastructure and services

**Accountable Jurisdictions:** Elected bodies accountable to needs of consumers and constituencies



CONSUMERS	PROVIDERS	JURISDICTIONS
Elderly/Disabled	Transit Munis	County of LA
Students	CalTrans	City of LA
Enviro/Social Equity	Metrolink	San Gabriel COG
Enviro/Social Equity	Access Services	San Fernando Valley COG
Enviro/Social Equity	Ports	Gateway COG
Business	Airports	South Bay COG
Small Business Assn.	Federal	North County COG
Labor (Non-Metro)	Auto Club	Westside Cities COG
CAC Chair	Bike/Pedestrian infrastructure & programs	Las Virgenes/Malibu COG

<sup>1</sup> City of Los Angeles holds the Central City COG position. Cities in the Arroyo Verdugo area group of have representation in the SFV, and SG COGs.



The following agencies and entities are potential nomination resources:

<b>CONSTITUENCY</b>	<b>POTENTIAL REPRESENTATION RESOURCES</b>
<b>CONSUMERS</b>	<b>CONSUMERS</b>
Elderly/Disabled	E.g., AARP, LA Co. Area Agency on Aging, LA City Area Agency on Aging, Veterans' Groups, So. Cal. Resource Services for Independent Living, State Council on Dev. Disabilities, 211
Students	E.g., School Districts, Comm. Colleges, Universities, Youth Policy Institute
Environmental/Social Equity (3 members)	E.g., Move LA, EnviroMetro, Investing in Place, Climate Resolve ACT-LA, LA Thrives, ONE LA, Strategic Actions for a Just Economy (SAJE), California Endowment, Advancement Project, Community Coalition of South LA, Mex. American Opportunity Foundation, TRUST South LA
Business	Chambers of Commerce, LAEDC, BizFed,
Small Business	Small Business/DBE associations (e.g., Hispanic Business Association)
Labor (Non-Metro)	Unions (e.g., AFL-CIO, LA/OC Building Trades)
CAC	CAC Chair
<b>PROVIDERS</b>	<b>PROVIDERS</b>
Transit Munis	Municipal Transit Providers (LACMOA)
CalTrans*	CalTrans*
Metrolink*	Metrolink* (SCRRA)
Access Services*	Access Services*
Ports	Ports of Long Beach & Los Angeles
Airports	Bob Hope Burbank Airport, Long Beach Airport, LAX, Palmdale Regional Airport
Federal	DOT, FTA, FHWA, FRA
Auto Club*	Auto Club*
Bike/Pedestrian Programs	E.g., Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition, CicLAvia
<b>JURISDICTIONS</b>	<b>JURISDICTIONS</b>
County of LA*	County of LA*
City of LA*	City of LA*
COGs (7 members)*	San Gabriel, San Fernando Valley, Gateway, South Bay, Westside, North County, Las Virgenes/Malibu

*\*Indicates agency member that does not have to rotate membership.*

Each member position will rotate every two years, except where the position is designated for a specific agency (as noted in the above table). The possible constituency sources listed are intended to be examples and not an exhaustive list.

**TIMELINE:**

December 2016 – Staff will compile list of potential consumers/providers/jurisdictions for participation;

January-February 2017 – Staff will contact entities for representation;

March 2017 – Staff will finalize Advisory Council membership and schedule participation opportunities;

April-May 2017 – Advisory Council review and outreach process for Master Guidelines;

June 2017 – Board consideration of and action on Master Guidelines.