



SGVCOG Planners TAC Meeting Minutes

Date: November 30, 2017
 Time: 12:00 P.M.
 Location: Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
 602 E. Huntington Dr., Monrovia, CA 91016

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:00 P.M.
2. Roll Call

Planners TAC Members Present

V. Reynoso; P. Lam, Alhambra
 L. Flores, Arcadia
 M. Nakajima, Diamond Bar
 C. Hensley; J. Golding, Duarte
 T. Bu; J. Mikaelian, El Monte
 J. Kugel; M. Carnahan, Glendora
 L. Seibert, La Verne
 M. Huntley, Monterey Park
 C. Hanh, Rosemead
 L. Stevens, San Dimas
 V. Gonzalez, Sierra Madre
 D. Watkins, South Pasadena
 S. Reimers, Temple City

Planners TAC Members Absent

Azusa
 Baldwin Park
 Claremont
 Covina
 Irwindale
 Monrovia
 Pasadena
 Pomona
 San Gabriel
 Walnut
 West Covina

SGVCOG Staff

M. Christoffels, Staff
 P. Duyshart, Staff

3. Public Comment.

No public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

4. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 10/26/2017
There was a motion to approve the minutes (M/S: L. Stevens/V. Reynoso).

[Motion Passed]

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

PRESENTATIONS

5. *Overview of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment Methodology (RHNA) / Local Input and Envisioning Process for the 2020 RTP/SCS: Presentation by Ma'Ayn Johnson, AICP Housing and Land Use Planner, and Dr. Frank Winn, Forecasting and Data Planner, SCAG*

M. Johnson, who is the RHNA Project Manager for SCAG, delivered the first part of the presentation, which was about the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). She explained that RHNA is the projection of future housing growth, and that the RHNA quantifies the need for housing with each jurisdiction. She also stated there has been an accumulation of decades of Southern California cities and counties not meeting housing need, and that this has resulted in a “housing crisis.” The SCAG Region is currently in the 5th Cycle of RHNA, which applies to October 2013 through October 2021. The 6th Cycle, which is currently being prepared and planned for, will cover October 2021 through October 2029. Currently, in the Fall of 2017, SCAG is starting the local outreach and input process for the 6th Cycle. M. Johnson also discussed the 110% social equity adjustment of RHNA, how it is applied using the median county income, and how it affects the final RHNA allocation.

M. Johnson also fielded questions from members of the TAC, questions regarding:

- SB 35 streamline parameters, and if any Cities have been subjected to these parameters.
- Whether 5th Cycle Methodology will affect the guidelines of the 6th Cycle of RHNA.
- If it is possible to remove the “Vacancy Credit” in the 4th and 5th Cycle of RHNA.
- Zoning requirements as a part of the Housing Element.
- A suggestion that funding be allocated based more on local jobs.
- The jobs vs. housing balance.
- The timelines and deadlines for the upcoming 6th Cycle RHNA process.
- Worries that the 6th Cycle will be adopted too early, before 2020 Census data is available to cities, counties, and the State.

Dr. F. Win presented the second part of SCAG’s presentation, and his portion of the presentation focused on the local input and envisioning process for the 2020 RTP/SCS. He talked about how the RTP/SCS development process involves input from local jurisdictions, input from partner agencies, and input from other stakeholders. He also went over the four main phases of the local input and envisioning process, which includes regular technical consultation, one-on-one outreach and local input on planned growth, regional collaboration on scenario development, and then engagement with the general public on potential options for the SCS. Furthermore, Dr. Win discussed the main guiding principles of this overall process.

6. *Metro Measure M Subregional Program Funds: Presentation by Mark Christoffels, Chief Executive Officer, ACE & Director of Transportation Planning, SGVCOG*

M. Christoffels gave a presentation which included a run-down of Measure M program funds that the SGV will receive from 2017-2022. Because of capital intensive projects, such as the Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B, which will be programmed in the early years, there is limited funding for other Measure M programs. Metro is allowing the COG to borrow money between subregional funds (certain project areas are assigned set monetary funds). As a result, staff recommended to the Committee to concur with interfund borrowing in the first five (5) years of Measure M funding in order to maximize the efficiency of projects. Under Staff’s proposal, funding has mainly been moved to active transportation and first/last mile projects.

Christoffels also informed the Planning Directors’ TAC that the Public Works TAC and the Transportation Committee agreed to move forward on this item as it was presented to them. The next step in this process is to receive further input from the Planning Directors’ TAC, along with

the City Managers' Steering Committee, and the Executive Committee. Staff is asking the Planning Directors' TAC for guidance and concurrence to Staff's proposed plan.

M. Christoffels concluded his staff report by informing TAC members that the next step of the process is to work with the TAC to develop a selection of projects for each of the Measure M programs.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One TAC member was concerned about the disconnects created by Metro's First/Last Mile construction rules and how they relate to the construction of Metro stations.
- A TAC member thinks that First/Last Mile funding for Gold Line Phase 2B cities is underfunded.
- A TAC member also expressed concerns about tapping into, or shifting around, subregional programming funds, and the misallocation that could result.

The Planning Directors' TAC concurred with staff's Measure M funding proposal as presented, and there were no objections. However, there was no formal motion on this item.

7. *Metro Measure M Subregional Administrative Funds: Presentation by Mark Christoffels, Chief Executive Officer, ACE & Director of Transportation Planning, SGVCOG*

The second component of this item was a staff report and recommendation regarding Metro Measure M Subregional Administrative Funds, and M. Christoffels also presented this topic to the TAC. Metro's Measure M guidelines allow for 0.5% of the funding from each subregional sub-program to be used for administration, outreach, and coordination purposes. However, based on draft revenue forecasts for the San Gabriel Valley during the first five years of Measure M, the SGVCOG's programs will be underfunded, as current funding projections will only fund \$37,600 per year towards an administrative Transportation Planner position. This funding falls far short of the necessary \$120,000 to fund this position.

As a result of this administrative funding shortage, SGVCOG staff is proposing three alternatives for consideration and direction. The first option (Option A) would be to utilize the available \$37,600 to offset the cost of existing staff, or in other words, have current COG staff work on transportation planning and outreach projects. The second option (Option B) would be to utilize the funding to acquire the services of a transportation consulting firm to develop a five-year programming plan. Additionally, the third and final option (Option C) would be to have the Governing Board approve a special assessment of 0.5% of cities' Measure M local return dollars to fund a full-time SGVCOG transportation planning position; this staffer would be solely dedicated to working on implementation, coordination, and outreach pertaining to regional transportation projects.

M. Christoffels pointed out to the committee members that, in order to handle the Measure M programmatic projects funds properly and efficiently, the SGVCOG staff will have to take more time to work on the pertaining projects, assignments, and active transportation grant applications.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One TAC member expressed that Option C is worth the investments, because cities only have to give a modest amount of money in order to have a dedicated transportation project and programming manager for the SGV region. This member also thinks that cities would lose in the long run if there is not adequate subregional staffing for transportation projects.

- A TAC member thinks that the special assessment of 0.5% pays for itself and will have a solid return on investment.
- It was also mentioned that the SGVCOG can apply for transportation grants on behalf of multiple cities simultaneously and more efficiently with this new transportation staffer.

There was a motion for the Planning Directors’ TAC to indicate a preference for Option C and a fully funded, full-time SGVCOG Transportation Planner/Program Manager position. (M/S: L. Stevens / S. Reimers).

[Motion Passed]

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

ACTION ITEMS

DISCUSSION ITEMS

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. *Housing Element Open Data Project*
P. Duyshart briefly announced that there is still an opportunity for local governments to provide feedback for the Housing Element Open Data Project. While the due date for local governments to ask questions and submit or correct information is today, November 30th, corrections, and new housing elements and annual progress reports may also be submitted after this date. P. Duyshart also showed a memo on this matter from the California Department of Housing and Community Development; this memo provides background and an overview of the project.

UPDATE ITEMS

9. *ACE/COG Integration*
M. Christoffels provided a brief update on this item. He informed the TAC members that six SGVCOG cities had already adopted the SGVCOG’s updated JPA, and that an additional 17 cities have scheduled consideration of the amended JPA. He let TAC members know that the SGVCOG and ACE could be fully integrated by as early as mid-January. There is also an ACE Ad Hoc Integration Committee which is assisting with feedback and suggestions for the integration.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S COMMENTS

P. Duyshart reminded members of the TAC that the cities of Claremont, El Monte, Industry, Irwindale, La Puente, Pomona, Rosemead, and West Covina still have not registered for the 2020 Census Local Update of Census Addresses (LUCA), and that the deadline to do so is rapidly approaching: December 15, 2017. LA County is strongly recommending that Cities apply for this program, in order to have the most accurate census data. P. Duyshart announced that he has further information, too.

CHAIR’S REPORT

10. *Solicitation of presentation topics*

C. Hensley addressed S. Reimers of Temple City, and suggested to him that the Planning Directors' TAC move discussion and solicitation of issues regarding compliance problems with LA County Fire Department's Fire Code Requirements to the January TAC meeting.

11. *Current City Projects*

There was no discussion of city projects.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Jan. 25th, Next Planning Directors' TAC Meeting.

Additionally, a TAC member expressed general concern about Metro's Gold Line paid parking policies, as well as a recent Gold Line parking study that a Metro consultant recently published.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:13 P.M.