



SGVCOG Planners TAC Approved Meeting Minutes

Date: April 26, 2018
 Time: 12:00 P.M.
 Location: Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District
 602 E. Huntington Dr., Monrovia, CA 91016

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:03 P.M.
2. Roll Call

Planners TAC Members Present

B. Lee; Covina
 M. Nakajima, Diamond Bar
 C. Hensley, J. Golding; Duarte
 B. Donovanik, El Monte
 M. Carnahan; Glendora
 B. Jones, E. Arreola; Irwindale
 C. Bowcock; La Verne
 M. Huntley, Monterey Park
 L. Stevens; San Dimas
 D. Whipple; San Gabriel
 V. Gonzalez; Sierra Madre
 S. Reimers; Temple City
 J. Anderson; West Covina
 M. Kim, J. Drevno, N. Ornelas; LA County
 DRP

Planners TAC Members Absent

Alhambra
 Arcadia
 Azusa
 Baldwin Park
 Claremont
 Monrovia
 Pomona
 Rosemead
 South Pasadena
 Walnut

SGVCOG Staff

P. Duyshart, Staff

3. Public Comment.

No public comment.

CONSENT CALENDAR

4. Planners TAC Meeting Minutes – 03/22/2018
There was a motion to approve the minutes (M/S: S. Reimers/M. Huntley).

[Motion Passed]

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

ACTION ITEMS

PRESENTATIONS

5. City of Monterey Park's South Garfield Village Specific Plan

Michael Huntley, the Director of Community and Economic Development for the City of Monterey Park first introduced this item and provided brief background on the South Garfield Village Specific Plan. Then, Shane Burkhardt, a Manager of Urban Planning and Community Design from the City's lead consultant on this project, Michael Baker International, gave the main presentation on this specific plan.

Mr. Burkhardt provided a background and history related to this specific plan, and remarked that much of the funding to update this specific plan came from transit-oriented development (TOD) funding from Metro. He identified the following objectives for the specific plan: encourage revitalization of the area, improve mobility and connectivity, provide guidance on development and improvement of buildings and structures, and guide infrastructure policies and priorities. Burkhardt also went over the elements of checkpoints of the overall schedule, which stretched from December 2013 to August 2015. Additionally, Mr. Burkhardt provided details and information on how public engagement was conducted.

Moreover, other elements of the plan, such as varying land use areas, the regulatory plan, conceptual vehicle circulation, parking alternatives, bicycle circulation, pedestrian circulation, mid-block crossings, and streetscape concepts, were touched upon. Burkhardt concluded the presentation by talking about business incentives for helping implement the plan, additional financing options, and actual City implementation.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- A TAC member asked about when the City implements the specific plan, did the plan itself become the zoning ordinance, or did the City have to create a separate zoning document?
- A second TAC member asked about the regulatory plan, and if the development standards are in the regulatory plan.
- After the specific plan was adopted, has the City seen a difference in the interest in development by property owners, at least by more than average? M. Huntley mentioned the integration of a Business Improvement District, and also added that the City is hoping to see a good faith effort for the business in the district to make improvements, including in the alleyways, too. City Staff is currently engaging with businesses regarding enhancement work.
- There was also a question regarding an openness to address the physical portions of the BIDs, too. To what extent do businesses do a cost-benefit analysis?
- A TAC member from a Gold Line Phase 2B city pointed out that when you look at infrastructure around the future nearby Gold Line station, you have to identify FLM improvements and infrastructure that you don't currently have. It was remarked that Monterey Park currently does not qualify for funding for FLM planning yet. This member warned that Metro will still require FLM plans and infrastructure before any Gold Line station opens, regardless of a City's funding situation. However, Metro might ease this requirement and policy due to a shortage of capital.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

INFORMATION ITEMS

6. Metro Open Streets Cycle Three Grant

P. Duyshart, SGVCOG Staff, presented on this item. He described the goals of the Open Street Program, explained the successes of implementation of Cycles One and Two of this program, and provided some information on program guidelines, rules, and application timelines. Mr. Duyshart also pointed out the civic and community benefits of Open Streets events as well. He also encouraged TAC members to attend an upcoming applicant workshop on this grant program that will be hosted by Metro planning staff, too.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- A member of the TAC remarked that Metro should revise their funding structure to a per mile structure.
- There were a couple questions regarding the deadline and the timeline for application submission.

UPDATE ITEMS

7. CicLAvia Heart of the Foothills Recap

P. Duyshart of the SGVCOG provided this recap, during which he showed the TAC photos from the very successful and well-attended open streets event through the northeastern SGV cities of San Dimas, La Verne, Pomona, and Claremont.

TAC members in attendance from the involved cities also spoke about the successes and aspects from this CicLAvia event, and made suggestions pertaining to Planning to other cities which might be interested in hosting an open streets event.

8. Update on Measure M Subregional Fund Programming

P. Duyshart provided an update to the TAC on this matter. He announced to the Planners' TAC that SGVCOG and ACE Staff will not be able to present a meticulous, thorough, and calculated list of projects for the first Measure M 5-Year plan for another one to two months, due to a couple issues: ambiguity of Gold Line Phase 2B local contribution requirements and a delay in receiving finalized results from an SGV Greenway Study.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- One TAC member stated how both Metro and the Gold Line Authority have been difficult to work with, and how they have also created delays in FLM planning.

9. ACE/COG Integration

P. Duyshart updated the TAC on this item. He provided a chart which showed the timeline of the various integration activities, projects, and aspects for the next year. He also reported that a compensation and classification study for the integrated agency is being conducted, and the initial results of the Classification portion of the study will be presented to the ACE Integration Ad Hoc Committee next week. Duyshart also reminded TAC members to please keep submitting public and stakeholder comments and input to the COG for the draft guidelines and draft LOI for the new COG/ACE Project Review and Selection process for capital construction projects.

10. Subcommittee on LA County Fire Department Compliance

P. Duyshart reported to the TAC that the Subcommittee on LA County Fire Department Compliance met earlier today for the first time. Duyshart reminded the TAC that this working group was created via a Planners' TAC motion, and that it was formed to identify the code compliance and customer service issues that are most negatively affecting cities which contract to LA County Fire to provide fire safety and prevention. The working group is also tasked with trying to develop solutions to some of these problems, and how the COG should present these issues to LA County Fire as a unified and persuasive voice. The subcommittee took steps toward identifying the issues which are worth pursuing, and tasked SGVCOG staff with developing a draft of a letter which will eventually be sent to key decision makers at LA County Fire.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS

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

CHAIR'S REPORT

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

May 24th, next Planning Directors' TAC Meeting.

ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 1:07 P.M.