



MENDOCINO  
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

367 North State Street~Ukiah~California~95482  
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite 206  
(707) 463-1859  
Transportation Planning: Suite 204  
(707) 234-3434

## AGENDA

**Monday, August 19, 2019 at 1:30 p.m.**

Primary Location:

County Administration Center, Board of Supervisors Chambers  
Room 1070, 501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah

Audioconference Location:

Caltrans District 1, 1656 Union St., Eureka

Additional Media

For live streaming and later viewing:

<https://www.youtube.com/>, search for Mendocino County Video, or  
YouTube link at <http://www.mendocinocog.org> under Meetings

**The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) meets as the Board of Directors of:**  
Mendocino Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and  
Mendocino County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

**NOTE: All items are considered for action unless otherwise noted.**

1. Call to Order / Roll Call
2. Convene as RTPA
3. Recess as RTPA – Reconvene as Policy Advisory Committee

### PUBLIC EXPRESSION

4. Participation is welcome in Council meetings. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person and not more than ten minutes per subject, so that everyone can be heard. “Public Expression” time is limited to matters under the Council's jurisdiction that may not have been considered by the Council previously and are not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Members of the public may comment also during specific agenda items when recognized by the Chair.

### REGULAR CALENDAR

5. Presentation: Introduction to the California Public Utilities Commission – *CPUC Local Government Liaison*
6. Adoption of Resolution No. M2019-\_\_\_\* Approving the Fiscal Year 2019/20 Project List for Funding in the California State of Good Repair Program – *Mendocino Transit Authority's Ukiah Transit Center Project*
7. Discussion: 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate
8. Discussion/Direction: SB 277 (Beall/Frazier) Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program –Local Partnership Program

### CONSENT CALENDAR

The following items are considered for approval in accordance with Administrative Staff, Committee, and/or Directors' recommendations and will be enacted by a single motion. Items may be removed from the Consent Calendar for separate consideration, upon request by a Director or citizen.

9. Approval of June 3, 2019 Minutes
10. Approval of May 2 and May 21, 2019 Transit Productivity Committee (TPC) Minutes
11. Approval of First Amendment to Fiscal Year 2019/20 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP)
12. Approval of Minor Amount (\$527) of Funding Share by Formula for Statewide Local Streets & Roads Needs Assessment

#### **RATIFY ACTION**

13. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee

#### **REPORTS**

14. Reports – Information
  - a. Mendocino Transit Authority
  - b. North Coast Railroad Authority
  - c. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
  - d. MCOG Administration Staff
    1. Upcoming Grant Program for Housing Related Planning – California Department of Housing & Community Development
    2. Miscellaneous
  - e. MCOG Planning Staff
  - f. MCOG Directors
  - g. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

15. Adjourn

#### **AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) REQUESTS**

To request disability-related modifications or accommodations for accessible locations or meeting materials in alternative formats (as allowed under Section 12132 of the ADA) please contact the MCOG office at (707) 463-1859, at least 72 hours before the meeting.

#### **ADDITIONS TO AGENDA**

The Brown Act, Section 54954.2, states that the Board may take action on off-agenda items when:

- a) a majority vote determines that an “emergency situation” exists as defined in Section 54956.5, **or**
- b) a two-thirds vote of the body, or a unanimous vote of those present, determines that there is a need to take immediate action and the need for action arose after the agenda was legally posted, **or**
- c) the item was continued from a prior, legally posted meeting not more than five calendar days before this meeting.

#### **CLOSED SESSION**

If agendized, MCOG may adjourn to a closed session to consider litigation or personnel matters (i.e. contractor agreements). Discussion of litigation or pending litigation may be held in closed session by authority of Govt. Code Section 54956.9; discussion of personnel matters by authority of Govt. Code Section 54957.

**POSTED 8/13/2019**

\* Next Resolution Number: M2019-08



## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

### STAFF REPORT

---

**Agenda # 5**  
Regular Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/19/2019

**TITLE:** Presentation: California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Liaison

**SUBMITTED BY:** Janet Orth, Deputy Director / CFO

**DATE:** 8/9/2019

---

**BACKGROUND:**

In July we were contacted by Naveed Paydar, PhD, who is the Local Government Liaison for the California Public Utilities Commission. He is conducting outreach and requested time on this agenda for a brief presentation.

The CPUC regulates a number of industries including electricity, natural gas, telecommunications, rail and transportation, and some private water companies in the state.

We are pleased to host Dr. Paydar and offer this opportunity to learn more about CPUC programs and policies that may affect the Mendocino County region.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:**

None, for information only.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:**

Not applicable.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Receive the CPUC presentation and take this opportunity for questions and discussion.  
No action is required.

**Enclosure:**

Copy of CPUC presentation slides




## Introduction to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)





**August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2019**  
**Mendocino COG**  
**Naveed Paydar, Ph.D.**  
**CPUC Local Government Liaison**






## About the CPUC

- The CPUC is the California state agency that regulates essential services including:
  - Electricity
  - Natural Gas
  - Telecommunications
  - Water
  - Rail and Transportation
- Headquartered in San Francisco with offices in Los Angeles and Sacramento
- Five Governor-appointed Commissioners serve staggered six-year terms
- Meet publicly at least once a month to decide on important policies in the industries we regulate







## Select CPUC Policies & Programs

<p><b>Policies</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Energy Efficiency</li> <li>• Renewable Energy</li> <li>• Demand Response</li> <li>• Dynamic Pricing / Time Varying Rates</li> <li>• Smart Grid</li> <li>• Electric Vehicles</li> <li>• Transmission Planning and Permitting</li> <li>• Energy Generation and Infrastructure Safety</li> </ul>	<p><b>Programs &amp; Public Assistance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• California Alternate Rates for Energy</li> <li>• California Lifeline</li> <li>• Deaf and Disabled Telecommunications Program</li> <li>• Low Income Energy Efficiency Program</li> <li>• Single-family and multi-family Solar program</li> <li>• Assistance with formal consumer complaints</li> <li>• Safety inspections &amp; investigations</li> </ul>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

❖ The CPUC is increasing outreach to all stakeholders in order to better educate them about these policies and programs and to learn more about their concerns and issues


3

## Business & Community Outreach

- Inform and educate communities, local governments, and businesses about policies and programs in the industries we regulate
- Create and foster sound relationships with local governments and community benefit organizations (CBOs)
- Enable two-way communication to implement the CPUC's policies externally and help shape policy internally

4





## Working Together

We would like to partner with you! Please contact me to:

- Have us present at an upcoming meeting or event
- Invite us to regular meetings or special events
- Obtain informational materials and handouts
- Ask questions and/or share concerns

**Naveed Paydar, Ph.D.  
Local Government Liaison  
CPUC, Executive Division**

Phone: (415) 703-1437  
Email: [Naveed.Paydar@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Naveed.Paydar@cpuc.ca.gov)

**Follow me on Twitter!  
@NaveedPaydar**



5



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Agenda # 6**  
**Regular Calendar**  
**MCOG Meeting**  
**8/19/2019**

## STAFF REPORT

---

**TITLE:** Approval of State of Good Repair Project List

**DATE PREPARED:** 8/8/19

**MEETING DATE:** 8/19/19

---

**SUBMITTED BY:** Nephele Barrett, Executive Director

---

**BACKGROUND:** The State of Good Repair (SGR) program is a transit capital funding program created by the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, also known as Senate Bill (SB) 1. This funding source is derived from a fee on vehicle registrations. SGR is a capital program, and cannot be used for operations or project development as a stand-alone project. Eligible uses of SGR funds include:

- Transit capital projects to maintain, repair or modernize a transit operator's existing transit fleet or facilities,
- Design, acquisition, and construction of new vehicles or facilities that improve existing transit services, and
- Services that complement local efforts for repair and improvement of local transportation infrastructure.

The draft 2019 SGR Guidelines were issued in May 2019 and are attached for reference. Prior to the 19/20 fund year, transit operators were able to submit project lists directly to Caltrans. Starting this year however, projects must be approved and submitted by the Regional Transportation Planning Agency. The deadline for submission of the FY 2019/20 SGR Project List is September 1, 2019.

The estimated SGR funds available for this fiscal year to Mendocino County total \$131,002, as identified in an August 2019 estimate. These funds are allocated quarterly. Up to four years of funding can be accrued for a project. Once the project is started, four years are allowed for expenditure.

The Mendocino Transit Authority has submitted their proposed project list for the FY 19/20 SGR funds. MTA plans to utilize these funds, along with the previous two years of funding for future construction of a new transit center in the Ukiah area, as identified in their Transit Asset Management Plan, revised in May 2019. The proposed Ukiah Transit Center project includes development and construction of a multi-modal transit center providing a linkage between MTA, Lake Transit Authority, Greyhound, AmTrak and other modes of transportation. The SGR funding will be combined with other sources for an estimated project total of approximately \$3,250,000.

A draft resolution has been prepared which approves the attached project list, as submitted by MTA. The total numbers included in the project list may be refined prior to the MCOG meeting to accurately reflect totals from previous years. A budget amendment will be prepared for a future meeting to reflect this approval once actuals have been received for the 18/19 SGR funds.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** By resolution, approve the proposed State of Good Repair Project List for FY 2019/20, authorize staff to submit the project list and resolution to Caltrans, and authorize the Executive Director to execute related grant applications, forms and agreements.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Do not approve the project list (not recommended due to the upcoming September 1 due date).
2. Approve the project list with modifications.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** By resolution, approve the proposed State of Good Repair Project List for FY 2019/20 allocating all available State of Good Repair funding to MTA's Ukiah Transit Center, authorize staff to submit the project list and resolution to Caltrans, and authorize the Executive Director to execute related grant applications, forms and agreements.

---

## Enclosures:

- Resolution with Exhibit A – Project List
- SGR program guidelines



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## BOARD of DIRECTORS

### RESOLUTION No. M2019-\_\_\_

#### APPROVING THE FY 2019/20 PROJECT LIST FOR THE CALIFORNIA STATE OF GOOD REPAIR PROGRAM

#### WHEREAS,

- The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Mendocino County;
- Senate Bill 1 (SB1), the Road Repair & Accountability Act of 2017, established the State of Good Repair (SGR) program to fund eligible transit maintenance, rehabilitation and capital project activities that maintain the public transit system in a state of good repair;
- MCOG is an eligible project sponsor and may receive and distribute State Transit Assistance and State of Good Repair funds to eligible project sponsors (local agencies) for eligible transit capital projects;
- Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) has submitted its Ukiah Transit Center project for consideration of SGR funding, as detailed in **Exhibit A**, FY 2019/20 SGR Project List;
- MTA's Transit Center project is included in MTA's capital budget and is a high priority in its federal Transit Asset Management (TAM) plan; and
- MCOG concurs with and approves the attached project list for State of Good Repair Program funds; therefore, be it

#### RESOLVED, THAT:

1. The Mendocino Council of Governments finds that the fund recipient agrees to comply with all conditions and requirements set forth in the Certification and Assurances document and applicable statutes, regulations and guidelines for all SGR funded transit capital projects.
2. The Executive Director is hereby authorized to submit a request for Scheduled Allocation of the SB1 State of Good Repair funds and to execute the related grant applications, forms and agreements.

ADOPTION OF THIS RESOLUTION was moved by Director \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Director \_\_\_\_\_, and approved on this 19th day of August, 2019, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINING:

ABSENT:

WHEREUPON, the Chairman declared the resolution adopted, AND SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTEST: Nephele Barrett, Executive Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dan Gjerde, Chair

**State of Good Repair Project Information**

#	Recipient/Region <i>Auto-Populated</i>	Sub-Recipient/Operator <i>Dropdown Selection</i>	Project Title <i>Project Titles must match if appearing on a previous list. Max 75 Characters</i>	Project Description <i>Max 300 Characters If you need more space place additional information in Notes</i>	Asset Type <i>Dropdown Selection</i>	Project Category <i>Dropdown Selection</i>	Current Condition of Asset <i>Dropdown Selection</i>	Useful Life If applicable <i>In Years</i>	Project Dates	
									Project Start Date <i>MM/DD/YYYY</i>	Project Completion Date <i>MM/DD/YYYY</i>
	<i>Auto-Populated from Regional Entity Info Tab</i>									
1	Mendocino Council of Governments	Mendocino Transit Authority	Ukiah Transit Center	Development and construction of a multi-modal transit center in the City of Ukiah in Mendocino County. Transit Center will collaborate transportation services for Mendocino Transit, Lake Transit, Greyhound, Amtrak and Walk-Bike Mendocino.	Passenger Facilities	Modernization	Poor	30	01/02/2019	06/30/2022
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
10										
11										
12										
13										
14										
15										
16										
17										
18										
19										
20										
21										
22										
23										
24										
25										
26										
27										
28										
29										
30										
31										
32										
33										
34										
35										
36										
37										
38										
39										
40										

#	Project Location City	Project Location County	Existing State of Good Repair Project	SGR Costs							Non-SGR Costs			Total Project	Legislative Districts			Notes, Comments, Additional Information
				2019-20 SGR Costs 99313	2019-20 SGR Costs 99314	Total SGR Costs 99313	Total SGR Costs 99314	Total Other SB1 Costs <i>Please Identify Program in Notes</i>	Total STA Costs - <i>Not Including SGR</i>	Total All Other Funds	Congressional	Senate	Assembly					
				<i>New</i>														
1	Ukiah CA	Mendocino	Yes	\$ 119,963	\$ 11,039	\$ 238,361	\$ 21,636		\$ 650,000	\$ 2,340,003	\$ 3,250,000	2	2	2				
2											\$ -							
3											\$ -							
4											\$ -							
5											\$ -							
6											\$ -							
7											\$ -							
8											\$ -							
9											\$ -							
10											\$ -							
11											\$ -							
12											\$ -							
13											\$ -							
14											\$ -							
15											\$ -							
16											\$ -							
17											\$ -							
18											\$ -							
19											\$ -							
20											\$ -							
21											\$ -							
22											\$ -							
23											\$ -							
24											\$ -							
25											\$ -							
26											\$ -							
27											\$ -							
28											\$ -							
29											\$ -							
30											\$ -							
31											\$ -							
32											\$ -							
33											\$ -							
34											\$ -							
35											\$ -							
36											\$ -							
37											\$ -							
38											\$ -							
39											\$ -							
40											\$ -							

California Department of Transportation

2019

# State of Good Repair Program Guidelines

Formal Draft Update  
May 2019

# Guidelines for the State of Good Repair Program

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	1
I. Introduction .....	2
1. Program Background and Purpose .....	2
2. Program Objectives and Statutory Requirements .....	2
3. Program Roles and Responsibilities .....	3
4. Program Schedule .....	5
II. Eligibility .....	6
1. Eligible Recipient Agencies .....	6
2. Eligible Projects .....	7
3. SGR and Federal Transit Asset Management Plans .....	8
III. Project List Submittal .....	8
1. Project List Submittal Information .....	8
2. Required Documents from Potential Recipient Agencies .....	9
3. Content and Format of Project List .....	10
4. Fund Accruals .....	11
IV. Project List Approval, Allocation, and Revisions .....	11
1. Project List Approval .....	12
2. Allocation .....	12
3. Project Revisions .....	12
V. Project Status and Expenditure Reporting .....	12
1. Annual Project Status/Expenditure Report .....	13
2. Performance Measures and Quantitative Benefits .....	14
3. Final Delivery .....	15
4. Financial Audit Report .....	15
5. Senate Bill 1 Accountability Reporting .....	16
VI. Spot Audits .....	16

## **Executive Summary**

On April 28, 2017, Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr. signed Senate Bill 1 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2017), known as the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017. Senate Bill 1 provides over \$5 billion in new transportation funding each year to repair highways, bridges and local roads, to make strategic investments in congested commute and freight corridors, and to improve transit service. These guidelines address the portion of Senate Bill 1 providing approximately \$105 million annually to transit operators in California for eligible transit maintenance, rehabilitation, and capital projects. This investment in public transit is referred to as the State of Good Repair Program.

The State of Good Repair Program is funded from a portion of the new Transportation Improvement Fee on vehicle registrations due on or after January 1, 2018. A portion of this fee will be transferred to the State Controller's Office for the State of Good Repair Program. Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99312.1, these funds will be distributed to eligible agencies using the State Transit Assistance Program formula. This formula distributes half of the State of Good Repair funds according to population and half of the State of Good Repair funds according to transit operator revenues.

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is tasked with the management and administration of the State of Good Repair Program. While Senate Bill 1 addresses a variety of transportation needs, this program has the specific goal of keeping transit systems in a state of good repair. This can include both the purchase of new transit vehicles and maintenance and rehabilitation of existing vehicles and transit facilities. These new investments will lead to cleaner transit vehicle fleets, increased reliability and safety, and reduced greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants.

These State of Good Repair Program Guidelines will describe the policies and procedures to determine the list of projects eligible to receive allocation of State of Good Repair funding each year, allocating such projects, reporting on project status and expenditures, and project closeout and audit (if needed). In carrying out the reporting requirements and other statutory objectives of the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, Senate Bill 1 emphasizes the importance of accountability and transparency in the delivery of California's transportation programs. Therefore, eligible agencies receiving State of Good Repair funds will need to comply with all reporting requirements.

## **I. Introduction**

### **1. Program Background and Purpose**

The State of Good Repair Program provides approximately \$105 million annually to transit operators in California for eligible transit maintenance, rehabilitation, and capital projects. The State of Good Repair Program will benefit the public by improving transportation services in providing public transportation agencies a consistent and dependable revenue source to invest in the upgrade, repair, and improvement of their agency's transportation infrastructure.

Public Utilities Code Section 99312.1 continuously appropriates revenues received from the State Transit Assistance Program to the State Controller's Office. The State of Good Repair Program is funded from the Transportation Improvement Fee portion of this revenue.

The State Controller's Office publishes annually estimated State of Good Repair funding levels per Public Utilities Code Section 99313 and Public Utilities Code Section 99314 according to population and farebox revenues. Per Public Utilities Code Section 99312.2 (c), only Regional Entities—transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, and the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System—shall be eligible to receive direct allocations from the State Controller's Office. Funds allocated per Public Utilities Code Section 99314 shall then be sub-allocated by the Regional Entities to those public transit operators in their purview which have submitted the required project information to their respective Regional Entities for review and have been evaluated to be eligible to receive State of Good Repair funding and determined to best meet local transportation needs.

Senate Bill 1 emphasizes the importance of accountability and transparency in the delivery of California's transportation programs. To be eligible for State of Good Repair funding, statute requires all potential recipient agencies to provide basic State of Good Repair project reporting to Caltrans. These guidelines outline the process to request and report on the State of Good Repair Program funding. Caltrans may revise these guidelines in future years.

### **2. Program Objectives and Statutory Requirements**

The goal of the State of Good Repair Program is to provide funding for capital assistance in rehabilitating and modernizing California's existing local transit systems.

Each Fiscal Year, regional entities, working in conjunction with their local transit operators, will compile and forward to Caltrans a list of project submittals proposed to



be funded with an apportionment of State of Good Repair funds. The project submittals must include:

- Project scope and description
- Project overall funding plan
- Project schedule
- Estimated useful life of the project

Caltrans will provide the State Controller's Office the list of eligible recipients after having determined all required information was provided and the projects listed are eligible to receive an apportionment of funds.

Each recipient agency is required to submit an Annual Status and Expenditure Report on all activities completed for each project having received State of Good Repair funds Caltrans.

Each recipient agency must also report the State of Good Repair revenues and expenditures in their annual Transportation Development Act Audit or Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

### **3. Program Roles and Responsibilities**

In collaboration with the State Controller's Office, Caltrans is tasked with the management and administration of the State of Good Repair Program.

#### Caltrans shall:

- Report to the State Controller's Office the list of eligible recipients the regional Entities have submitted and are eligible to receive an apportionment of funds for the applicable fiscal year.
- Report project status, progress, and expenditures as supplied by recipient agencies through the California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool .
- Perform audit of project expenditures and outcomes.
- Develop, maintain, and revise these program guidelines as necessary.

#### The State Controller's Office shall:

- Establish a uniform system of accounts and records and reporting mechanism, as required.
- Calculate and publish the State of Good Repair allocation amounts per Public Utilities Code Section 99313 and Public Utilities Code Section 99314.

- Upon receipt of the list of approved recipients from Caltrans, the State Controller's Office shall allocate funds on a quarterly basis to the regional entities (unless determined otherwise).

Eligible Regional Entities shall:

- Receive project submittals from eligible transit operators and review to ensure the proposed project(s) meets the following criteria:
  - The project meets the State of Good Repair eligibility requirements.
  - Confirm that the project is appropriate for overall transit plan designed for the region.
  - Verify estimated amount of State of Good Repair funds to be made available to the project/operator based on the State Controller's Office's State of Good Repair Allocation Estimate letter.
  - Include any requirements the regional entity determines best to suit their respective regions and transit/transportation needs.
- Provide Caltrans with the list of projects proposed to be funded with State of Good Repair apportionment:
  - Made available to the region per Public Utilities Code Section 99313. This list should include all proposed sub-allocations.
  - The list of projects submitted by the transit operators within their regional jurisdiction to be funded with the State of Good Repair apportionment made available to the operators per Public Utilities Code Section 99314.
  - This list is to be submitted to Caltrans by September 1.
- Receive and allocate State of Good Repair funds to projects in their region based on their local transit/transportation needs (Public Utilities Code Section 99313).
- Receive and sub-allocate State of Good Repair funds to the transit operators under their jurisdiction according to the amounts published by the State Controller's Office (Public Utilities Code Section 99314).
- Submit annually the region's State of Good Repair project status and expenditures to Caltrans, ensuring funds have been expended on State of Good Repair eligible activities.
- Comply with all relevant federal and State laws, regulations, and funding policies.

Eligible Transit Operators shall:

- Provide to the respective regional entity the proposed list of projects to be funded with State of Good Repair apportionment made available per Public Utilities Code Section 99314 and/or on a regional basis per Public Utilities Code Section 99313, by the deadline set by the respective regional entity.
- Submit annually to Caltrans and the respective regional entity all pertinent information on projects and expenditures each fiscal year, ensuring funds have been expended on State of Good Repair eligible activities
- Comply with all relevant federal and State laws, regulations, guidelines, and funding policies.

**4. Program Schedule**

The following schedule lists the annual timeline for the State of Good Repair Program:

<b>Annual State of Good Repair Timeline</b>	
The State Controller’s Office releases estimated amounts for each potential recipient agency for the upcoming Fiscal Year	No later than January 31
Project lists due to regional entities	TBD by Regional Entities*
The State Controller’s Office releases revised estimate for the current Fiscal Year	August 1
Project Lists submitted by Regional Entities to Caltrans through the California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool (use estimates provided by SCO in January)	September 1
List of Agencies with approved projects due from Caltrans to the State Controller’s Office	October 1
Quarterly Payments made	1 <sup>st</sup> Quarter - November 2 <sup>nd</sup> Quarter - February 3 <sup>rd</sup> Quarter- May 4 <sup>th</sup> Quarter- August
Recipient agencies to report project status, progress, and expenditures through California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool	December 31 <sup>st</sup>
Annual Financial Audit Report and/or Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) Due from each Eligible Agency (pursuant to PUC 99245)	December 31 <sup>st</sup>

\*Each regional entity shall establish their own deadline for transit operators to submit project lists to meet the September 1 deadline to Caltrans.

## **II. Eligibility**

### **1. Eligible Recipient Agencies**

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99312.2(c), the only entities eligible to receive a direct allocation of State of Good Repair funds from the State Controller's Office are:

- A transportation planning agency, county transportation commission, and Metropolitan Transit System.

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99314, the regional entities listed above shall then sub-allocate funds to:

- Transit operators listed on the State of Controller's Office's State of Good Repair Allocation Estimate letter. (For purposes of these guidelines, these transit operators are also eligible recipient agencies.)
- In addition, pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99313, any entity defined as eligible to receive State Transit Assistance Program funds pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99313 is eligible to participate in the regional process, as determined by the applicable regional entity, and may therefore also be an eligible recipient agency of Public Utilities Code Section 99313 funding.

All eligible recipient agencies for funding pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99313 and Public Utilities Code Section 99314 and included in the State Controller's Office's annual State of Good Repair Allocation Estimate letter, must prepare and submit a project list to qualify for funding. Eligible recipients should prepare and submit their project list to their respective regional entity.

The regional entity shall collect and compile all project lists from the eligible recipient agencies in their region and submit one master list—that includes all Public Utilities Code Section 99313 and Public Utilities Code Section 99314 projects for the region—to Caltrans for review.

Eligible recipients assume responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of State of Good Repair Program funds and must comply with all relevant federal and State laws, regulations, policies and procedures.

## 2. Eligible Projects

State of Good Repair funds are made available for capital projects that maintain the public transit system in a state of good repair. PUC Section 99212.1 (c) lists the projects eligible for State of Good Repair funding, which are:

- Transit capital projects or services to maintain or repair a transit operator's existing transit vehicle fleet or transit facilities, including the rehabilitation and/or modernization of the existing vehicles or facilities.
- The design, acquisition, and construction of new vehicles or facilities that improve existing transit services.
- Transit services that complement local efforts for repair and improvement of local transportation infrastructure.

Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Replacement or rehabilitation of:
  - Rolling stock
  - Passenger stations and terminals
  - Security equipment and systems
  - Maintenance facilities and equipment
  - Ferry vessels
  - Rail
- Transit Preventative Maintenance
  - Public and Staff Safety
- New transit facilities or equipment needed to maintain existing transit service(s)

To the extent possible and cost effective, and where feasible, the State of Good Repair Program encourages eligible recipients to promote "fix-it-first" transit capital projects that reduce greenhouse gases and help achieve the state's environmental goals. Examples of such projects may include replacement of vehicles with partial and/or zero emission vehicles, green technology equipment enhancements, or transit facility upgrades to improve energy efficiency.

Caltrans may approve other appropriate replacement and rehabilitation projects not listed here. Projects that solely expand capacity or service are not eligible projects. However, the expansion of capacity within a replacement project to address current or projected short-term service needs--replacing a maintenance facility with a larger facility or replacing a bus with a larger bus -are eligible.

The State of Good Repair Program is a transit capital program. Transit operations (except for preventative maintenance), transit agency administration, and program management are not allowable. Also, the following project construction development phases are not allowable as a stand-alone project:

- Pre-planning
- Planning
- Environmental

However, expenditures on these project construction development phases are allowable when included as part of a capital project. Project development costs should not exceed 20 percent of the total estimated project cost.

Eligible recipients must have the financial means to maintain and operate project services and the ability to accept their legal liabilities and fulfill financial obligations for the project's useful life.

### **3. State of Good Repair and Federal Transit Asset Management Plans**

With the national mandate to implement transit asset management plans and systems, in the future, the State of Good Repair Program envisions its projects should be included in a prioritized listing and/or a program of transportation projects consistent with the regional transportation plans within each region.

### **III. Project List Submittal**

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99312.1(d)(1), prior to receiving an apportionment of the State of Good Repair funding from the State Controller's Office in a given Fiscal Year, a potential recipient must submit a list of projects proposed to be funded with State of Good Repair funds.

#### **1. Project List Submittal Information**

To be eligible for funding, all agencies listed on the State Controller's Office Allocation Estimate letter must submit a project list with all supporting documentation each year.

Each regional entity shall collect and compile all project lists from the operators within their region and submit one project list including the anticipated use of Public Utilities Code Section 99313 and Section 99314 funds to Caltrans. In anticipation of the State of Good Repair Program's September 1 deadline, the regional entity shall establish its own timelines in its efforts to collect project lists from transit providers within their region. The regional entity is responsible for submitting the combined project list to Caltrans by September 1.

Fiscal Year 2019-20 project lists and all supporting documentation may be submitted through California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool or electronically via: SB 1SGRcomments@dot.ca.gov.

Please note, for all future years (Fiscal Year 2020-21 and beyond), Caltrans will require all information and reporting to be submitted electronically through California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool

If a potential recipient misses the deadline for submittal, or submits incomplete/inaccurate project information, the potential recipient may submit a project list to be eligible for inclusion in the allocation of funds, or revise/correct project information, the following quarter by submitting the information electronically through California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool .

Note: The State Controller's Office will allocate all the revenue each quarter only to those potential recipients that have submitted timely and complete information. Funds will not be held for allocation to agencies who have submitted late project lists.

## **2. Required Documents from Potential Recipients**

All potential recipients listed in the State Controller's Office Allocation Estimate letter must submit the following two documents to Caltrans prior to receiving their initial State of Good Repair allocation. This is a one-time requirement. However, a re-submittal of an amended Authorized Agent form is required should the local agency have a personnel change.

- **Authorized Agent Form**

The executive authority of the potential recipient must submit a signed and dated Authorized Agent Form identifying the agent who has the authority to act on behalf the Agency.

- **Certifications and Assurances**

Each potential recipient must submit a signed, dated, and Board Approved Certifications and Assurances document.

All regional entities and transit operators who expect to receive State of Good Repair funds are required to submit both the Authorized Agent and Certifications and Assurances documents to Caltrans prior to receiving State of Good Repair funding. A Board Resolution or equivalent verifying approval should accompany the Certifications and Assurances.

Original signed documents should be mailed to:

The State of Good Repair Program  
The California Department of Transportation  
Division of Rail and Mass Transportation, MS 39  
P.O. Box 942874  
Sacramento, CA 94274-0001

### **3. Content and Format of Project List**

Each potential recipient as listed in the State Controller's Office Allocation Estimate letter shall submit a list of projects to their respective regional entity including the following:

- A proposed list of projects to utilize, at a minimum, the estimated amount of State of Good Repair funding programmed for the recipient for the upcoming Fiscal Year (use estimates provided by SCO in January). The recipient may include project information for future fiscal years but are expected to update the project list as needed each Fiscal Year and submit each year to Caltrans. This list must include the following information:
  1. Project Title
  2. Proposed Project Description (Scope of Work)
    - a. Vehicle or rolling stock projects should indicate the number of vehicles, size, passenger count, accessibility, and fuel type
    - b. Estimated benefits provided by project
  3. Proposed Project Schedule (Start to Completion)
  4. Project Location
  5. Estimated Project Cost by Fiscal Year
  6. Estimated Useful Life of the Improvement
  7. Additional Project information required on the Project List template.

An eligible recipient may choose to contribute its funding apportionment (partial or whole) to another qualifying eligible recipient to carry out a project consistent with the State of Good Repair Program's goals and objectives. The contributing agency must notify the regional entity of their intention indicating the operator the funding will be transferred to. The regional entity would incorporate the contribution into their own project list. Funds can only be allocated from the State Controller's Office to the contributing agency's designated regional entity. The local agency must make arrangements for the transfer of funds to the alternate agency. Caltrans is not responsible for tracking funding agreements (borrowing, loaning, delegating, relinquishing funds, etc.) between the contributing and recipient agencies.



A pass-through arrangement to another recipient does not relieve the contributing agency of its responsibilities to carry out the terms and conditions of the Program. The contributing agency is responsible for ensuring the project is completed as described on the project list and in compliance with all items in the Certifications and Assurances document.

Each regional entity shall collect and compile all project lists from the transit operators in their region and submit one project list on their behalf. For Fiscal Year 2019-20, should the online California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool be unavailable, Caltrans will require one cover letter and one approving Board Resolution or equivalent from the regional entity. Please note, however, that for all future years (Fiscal Year 2020-21 and beyond), Caltrans will require all information and reporting to be submitted electronically through California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool .

The regional entities are expected to verify the local operator's approval of their individual project lists. This could include requiring a signed cover letter on agency letterhead, with original signature authorizing and approving the list of projects for funding, a signed and dated Board Resolution, or equivalent, authorizing the list of projects for State of Good Repair funding commitment, or a copy of a publicly adopted document listing the applicable projects (for example the Short-Range Transit Plan). Each regional entity shall establish their own requirements for supporting documentation.

#### **4. Fund Accruals**

Potential recipients must submit a project list every year. Failure to submit an annual project list may result in loss of the year's State of Good Repair apportionment. The State Controller's Office will allocate each year's funding according to the regular quarterly payment schedule allowing the agency to accrue the needed funds and then begin on the project. If a potential recipient is not prepared to start the project in the current fiscal year, it may submit a project list that includes a project scheduled to begin later and may accrue funding for up to four years to be used for a future project.

Eligible agencies who do not submit an annual project list may risk losing their apportionment for that specific fiscal year to other operators within the State.

### **IV. Project List Approval, Allocation, and Delivery**

#### **1. Project List Approval**

Caltrans will review the proposed project list to ensure compliance with the requirements and objectives of the State of Good Repair Program. Once the proposed project list is approved, Caltrans will provide the list of eligible recipients to the State Controller's Office. This list of approved recipient agencies and projects will be posted on Caltrans' [State of Good Repair website](#).

## **2. Allocation**

After receiving the approved list of eligible recipients from Caltrans, the State Controller's Office will apply the formula pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99313 and Public Utilities Code Section 99314 to those recipient agencies eligible to receive an apportionment of State of Good Repair funds for that applicable Fiscal Year. The State Controller's Office will issue and release payments to the eligible recipient's County Treasurer's Office on a quarterly basis. The regional entities are responsible to sub-allocate the funding pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99314 to the applicable transit operators according to the amounts provided by the State Controller's Office.

Upon the receipt of funds, eligible recipient agencies should deposit their State of Good Repair funds into a bank account dedicated only to State of Good Repair funds for transparency of fund receipt. If a separate account is not possible, the recipient agency must provide documentation, or a subaccount dedicated to State of Good Repair funds. All recipient agencies will be asked to report the amount of accrued interest on allocated State of Good Repair funds. Earned interest on State of Good Repair funds can only be encumbered and liquidated on approved State of Good Repair projects.

## **3. Project Revisions**

Each region's project list shall not limit its flexibility to fund listed projects in accordance with local needs and priorities. If a recipient agency determines it wants to spend an allocation on a different project that was not included on an approved project list, it shall submit a modified project list and supporting documentation to the regional entity for approval. The regional entity must notify Caltrans of the project change and provide an updated project list. Caltrans shall respond within 30 days to the region and recipient agency, and once approved by Caltrans, the recipient agency may expend funds on the substitute project.

Any funds left unexpended at the end of the Fiscal Year should be applied to a project on the subsequent year's project list. Unexpended funds must be listed on the project list submitted each year until fully expended. Once a project has started the funds should be fully liquidated within four years. In certain situations, an extension may be granted for delays beyond the four years. The agency must provide a signed letter from their designated authority to the State of Good Repair Program Manager, addressing the special circumstances requiring an extension.

## **V. Project Status and Expenditure Reporting**

Each year recipient agencies are required to submit a report on the activities and progress made toward implementation of State of Good Repair funded project(s) to Caltrans. The purpose of these reports is to ensure State of Good Repair funded

projects achieve the intended goals of the State of Good Repair Program, are executed in a timely manner, and are within the identified and approved scope and budget.

Recipient agencies will provide status and expenditure reporting through the online [California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool](#)

The California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool User Guide shall be made available upon request.

## **1. Annual Project Status/Expenditure Report**

Using the California State Multi-Modal Accountability Reporting Tool reporting tool, recipient agencies must report on project status and all State of Good Repair expenditures by December 31 each year. The report must include the total amount of State of Good Repair funding received during the Fiscal Year and the amount of funding expended or carried over. If a balance of State of Good Repair funds is carried over to a future year, that balance must be listed on each year's report until fully expended. The report must include yearly progress on each funded project and the benefits achieved once that project is completed. This includes:

- Project Title
- Detailed Project Description (Scope of Work)
  - a. Vehicle or Rolling Stock projects should indicate the number of vehicles, size, passenger count, accessibility, and fuel type
  - b. Preventative maintenance projects should include details on how/what these funds were expended and the asset(s) that were maintained
- Updated Project Schedule of Completion
- Project Location
- Actual Expenditures per Project
- Useful Life of the Project Improvement
- Unexpended Balances and earned interests
- For completed projects, provide the Performance Measure(s) and Quantitative Benefit(s) as outlined in the project submittal section (see Table A, page 15) which may include one or more the following elements:
  - a. Improved safety
  - b. Increased useful life of asset
  - c. Efficiency
  - d. Reduce operating/maintenance costs
  - e. System Preservation - Increase reliability
  - f. Reduce emissions

To conform to State regulation, compliance and accountability, Caltrans may adopt additional performance targets of capital assets in the future. The program will provide notification of change.

Each regional entity shall submit an annual status and expenditure report to Caltrans including the above information for any projects in which the regional entity is designated as the applicant agency. In addition, the regional entity must identify both the actual amount of funding sub-allocated to each operator in their region and the actual amount retained by the regional entity each Fiscal Year.

Each transit operator shall submit an annual status and expenditure report including the above information on all funded projects and identifying the actual State of Good Repair funding received each Fiscal Year.

## 2. Performance Measures and Quantitative Benefits

In addition to reporting on project status and expenditures, information regarding the project’s performance measure(s), and resulting quantitative benefit(s), is also to be provided. The benefit(s) reported at this time will again be verified at the end of the project. Note, a quantifiable performance measure and benefit shall be required for projects submitted for approval in Fiscal Year 2020 and all subsequent years after.

The table below to assist the applicant in determining whether their project already meets a particular requirement but is not intended to be all inclusive:

TABLE A

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	QUANTITATIVE BENEFITS
Improved Safety	Reduction in related incidents, improved security at facilities or onboard
Increased Useful Life	Preventative maintenance (identify asset, time and investment made, amount of downtime reduced, expected increased life expectancy of the asset)
Efficiency	Improved farebox recovery, reduced cost per trip or passenger mile, reduced vehicle miles traveled, improved on-time performance, increased ridership
Environmental Resources Conservation	Reduced emissions or fuel consumption, purchase of rolling stock that use alternative fuels, “green” facilities purchase or upgrade
System Preservation - Increase reliability	Reduced average age of fleet and/or reduced maintenance costs

PERFORMANCE MEASURE	QUANTITATIVE BENEFITS
Accessibility	Improve geographic coverage in populations served
Mobility	Connectivity to other modes, improved quality of services such as connectivity, reliability, and amenities
Economic Impacts	Direct impacts include jobs created directly by the transit system, indirect impacts result from jobs and income spent in industries that supply inputs to the transit system (fuel, repairs, insurance, etc.), and induced impacts, which occur when people who work for the transit system or earn income by providing indirect inputs to the transit agency spend their new income in the community, which create new jobs in the local economy.

**3. Final Delivery**

With the conclusion of all remaining project activities, the recipient agency shall provide final delivery outcomes during the December reporting period within that year of project completion. The final delivery outcomes must reflect final project expenditures, any changes that occurred after submittal of the Completion Report, and an updated evaluation of the benefits. Caltrans may include this information in its reporting.

**4. Financial Audit Report**

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99245, the annual audit of public transportation operators required under the Transportation Development Act must include verification of the receipt and appropriate expenditure of State of Good Repair funds.

Agencies having received an allocation of State of Good Repair funds in a Fiscal Year a TDA Audit is conducted must submit a copy of that audit, or Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (if applicable), to Caltrans within six months after the close of the Fiscal Year (December 31). A 90-day extension (from the December 31 deadline to March 31) may be requested but the recipient agency must notify Caltrans in writing, via email or formal letter, if such an extension is needed.

## **5. Senate Bill 1 Accountability Reporting**

It is important for Caltrans to receive timely reports from each eligible recipient agency to demonstrate the performance outcomes and benefits of the State of Good Repair Program. Additional reporting requirements may be added as needed to meet accountability measures.

Recipients of State of Good Repair funding agree to submit reports in timely manner in accordance with the terms and provisions of these Guidelines cited herein.

Recipient agencies must ensure that projects and/or project component(s) programmed to receive State of Good Repair funding will be administered in accordance with both these Guidelines and with the Senate Bill 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines as adopted (and amended) by the California Transportation Commission.

Failure to comply with all applicable guidelines, including the Senate Bill 1 Accountability and Transparency Guidelines, could result in actions against the recipient agency. Caltrans will determine appropriate corrective action for noncompliant recipient agencies. These actions may include but are not limited to the following:

- A written warning to the recipient agency.
- Placement on a watch list posted to the State of Good Repair website.
- Be recommended that the project undergo an audit performed by the Bureau of State Audits.

## **VI. Spot Audits**

All recipients and sub recipients of State of Good Repair funds are subject to audits. Caltrans, the Department of General Services, the Department of Finance, the Bureau of State Audits, the California State Legislature, and their designated representative shall have the right to review and to copy any records and supporting documentation pertaining to the performance of the State of Good Repair Program's recipients and sub recipients. All recipients and sub recipients must maintain program records for possible audit for a minimum of three years after final payment, unless a longer period of record retention is stipulated. Recipients and sub recipients shall allow the auditor(s) access to such records during normal business hours and allow interviews of any employees who might reasonably have information related to such records. Further, recipients and sub recipients must agree to include a similar right of the State to audit records and interview staff in any subcontract related to projects under the State of Good Repair Program.



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## STAFF REPORT

**Agenda # 7**  
Regular Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/19/2019

---

**TITLE:** Discussion of 2020 STIP Fund Estimate & RTIP

**DATE PREPARED:** 08/9/19

**MEETING DATE:** 08/19/19

**SUBMITTED BY:** James Sookne, Program Manager

---

**BACKGROUND:**

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System. STIP programming generally occurs every two years. The programming cycle begins with the release of a proposed fund estimate in July of odd-numbered years, followed by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adoption of the Fund Estimate (FE) in August. The fund estimate serves to identify the amount of new funds available for the programming of transportation projects.

The CTC is scheduled to adopt the FE for the 2020 STIP at their August 14 meeting. The estimate identified a STIP programming target through FY 2024/25 of \$3,134,000 for the Mendocino County region. That total includes Planning, Programming & Monitoring funds in the amount of \$235,000, leaving \$2,899,000 available for new or existing projects.

Over the next few months, MCOG staff, in conjunction with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), will be preparing the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) which is the document that MCOG develops and submits to the State in order to program available funding. The RTIP is developed biennially by the regions and is due to the CTC by December 15 of every odd numbered year.

In the 2018 RTIP, future funding commitments, when capacity allows, were identified for the following projects:

- N. State Street Intersection/Interchange – RW & CON \$1,602,000 (County of Mendocino)
- Low Gap Road/N. Bush Roundabout – CON \$703,000 (City of Ukiah)

If funds from the 2020 STIP are used to fully program the two projects identified for future funding, there would be \$594,000 left to program towards a new or existing project. Alternatively, only a portion of those funding commitments may be programmed in this RTIP. Both the City of Ukiah and County of Mendocino are currently conducting studies that will help determine the preferred design for these projects. It may be premature to program funds for the construction phase until those studies are finalized and preferred designs with more accurate cost estimates are identified. Once the exact amount of available STIP funds is determined, agencies can compete for them funds using MCOG's adopted application and criteria.

We anticipate presenting a draft RTIP to the MCOG Board in November and the final RTIP in December. If any additional information becomes available prior the meeting, staff will provide an updated verbal report.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** No action required.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** None identified.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Discuss the 2020 STIP Fund Estimate and RTIP development.



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## STAFF REPORT

Agenda # 8  
Regular Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/19/2019

---

**TITLE:** SB 277 Discussion & Approval of Comment Letter

**DATE PREPARED:** 08/12/19

**MEETING DATE:** 08/19/19

---

**SUBMITTED BY:** Nephele Barrett, Executive Director

---

**BACKGROUND:** The SB 1 Local Partnership Program provides funding annually to “self-help” agencies that have approved transportation sales tax measures. In Mendocino County, this includes the cities of Fort Bragg, Willits and Point Arena. Current law continuously appropriates \$200,000,000 annually from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account for allocation by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Current law requires the commission, in cooperation with the Department of Transportation, transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, and other local agencies, to develop guidelines for the allocation of those moneys. Current guidelines have established a funding distribution that allocates 50% of funds to self-help agencies on a formula basis with a \$100,000 minimum threshold. All of our local self-help cities currently receive the \$100,000 minimum. The other 50% of funding is made available to self-help agencies through a competitive program.

Senator Beall and Assembly Member Frazier (the primary authors of SB 1) have coauthored legislation to modify the distribution of this LPP funds. SB 277 would require the commission to annually deposit 85% of these funds into the Local Partnership Formula Subaccount for formula distribution, which the bill would create, and 15% of funds in the Small Counties and Uniform Developer Fees Competitive Subaccount, which would be available to eligible entities with populations under 750,000. This would make the SB 1 LPP more closely mirror the previous Prop 1B State and Local Partnership Program.

Although the authors of the bill believe that this more accurately reflects the intent to reward self-help agencies when the program was created as part of SB 1, there is one significant item of concern. While a funding distribution method is described in the legislation, there is no mention of a guaranteed minimum. Current statute does not establish a guaranteed minimum either, but it requires that the distribution be established in guidelines. This has allowed CTC the discretion to address the needs of very small agencies by establishing the minimum guarantee and including provisions for agencies that aren't able to meet the dollar for dollar matching requirement. Staff recommends that a comment letter be submitted to the authors of the bill and other relevant legislators that explains the potential impact on the very small agencies and requests that the bill be modified to specify that the guidelines can, among other things, establish a guaranteed minimum and address the needs of small agencies.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Discuss the proposed legislation and authorize the Executive Director to prepare and submit a comment letter to the authors and relevant legislators.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:**

1. Do not submit a comment letter.
2. Formally support or oppose the proposed legislation.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the MCOG Board discuss the proposed Senate Bill 277 (Beall) and authorize the Executive Director to prepare and submit a comment letter to the authors and relevant legislators.



August 9, 2019

**To:** MCOG Board of Directors  
**From:** Janet Orth, Deputy Director / CFO  
**Subject:** Consent Calendar of August 19, 2019

The following agenda items are recommended for approval/action.

9. Approval of June 3, 2019 Minutes – *attached*
10. Approval of May 2 and May 21, 2019 Transit Productivity Committee (TPC) Minutes – *attached*
11. Approval of First Amendment to Fiscal Year 2019/20 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) – This routine amendment would carry over to FY 2019/20 and reprogram unexpended state Planning, Programming & Monitoring (PPM) funds among Work Elements 2, 7 and 8 as well as the set-aside for the triennial Pavement Management Program update. Total OWP funding would increase from \$989,346 to \$1,064,430 (increase of \$75,084).  
*- Staff report and amended funding tables are attached.*
12. Approval of Minor Amount (\$527) of Funding Share by Formula for Statewide Local Streets & Roads Needs Assessment – This would share proportionately in the cost of the next two reports, 2020 and 2022. The California State Association of Counties (CSAC) and League of California Cities have again requested contributions from regional partners. According to their letter, "*The Report is a comprehensive and systematic statewide assessment of the state's local street and road network....The goal of the Report is to educate the public, and policy- and decision-makers at all levels of government about the infrastructure investments needed to provide California with a seamless, safe, and efficient multi-modal transportation system.*" MCOG contributed in 2011 and 2015.  
*- Staff report and letter are attached.*

# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Agenda # 9**  
Consent Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/19/2019

## MINUTES

**Monday, June 3, 2019**

County Administration Center, Board of Supervisors Chambers

### ADDITIONAL AUDIOCONFERENCE LOCATION:

Caltrans District 1, 1656 Union St., Eureka

### ADDITIONAL MEDIA:

*Find YouTube link at <http://www.mendocinocog.org> under Meetings  
or search Mendocino County Video at [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com)*

### **The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) meets as the Board of Directors of:**

Mendocino Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and  
Mendocino County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

**1. Call to Order / Roll Call.** The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m. with Directors Jim O. Brown, Larry Stranske, Tess Albin-Smith, Michael Carter (Alternate), John Haschak, Scott Ignacio (Alternate), Rex Jackman (Caltrans/PAC), and Dan Gjerde present; Chair Gjerde presiding. Director Albin-Smith was excused after Agenda #6, due to a schedule conflict.

Staff present: Nephela Barrett, Executive Director; Janet Orth, Deputy Director/CFO; Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner; Marta Ford, Administrative Assistant, and James Sookne, Program Manager.

**2. Convene as RTPA**

**3. Recess as RTPA - Reconvene as Policy Advisory Committee.**

**4. Public Expression.** Ms. Barrett announced Marta Ford's departure from Dow & Associates.

**5-9. Regular Calendar.**

**5. Acceptance of Plan and Presentation: Zero Emission Vehicle & Alternative Fuels Readiness Plan Update – W-Trans.** Ms. Ellard referred to her written staff report and gave a brief review of history developing the program and the update. A copy of the draft plan was on hand and available on the MCOG website. As the project's initiator, Ms. Orth extended her appreciation for the support throughout from the Council, staff, and ZEV Advisory Group. She noted the consultant team's expertise and product delivery in a compressed timeframe, as well as a goal to continue working toward implementation. Barry Bergman, Senior Planner and Nick Bleich, Associate Engineer/Planner, both of W-Trans, gave a presentation on the plan's update. After the presentation and extensive questions and comments from board members, the Council concurred with staff's recommendation to accept the plan, including an additional appendix listing action items from the Northwest California Alternative Fuels Readiness Plan. Chair Gjerde also supported approaching the North State Super Region as recommended to help foster formation of an ongoing advisory council.

**Upon motion** by Carter, second by Ignacio, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (8 Ayes – Brown, Stranske, Carter/Alt., Haschak, Ignacio/Alt., Albin-Smith, Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining, 0 Absent): IT IS ORDERED THAT the Zero Emission Vehicle & Alternative Fuels Readiness Plan Update is accepted, and staff is directed to work with the consultant to incorporate any desired edits and finalize the plan by June 30, 2019, including Appendix D.

**6. Acceptance of Report and Presentation: Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory & Engineered Feasibility Study – TrailPeople.** Ms. Ellard referred to her written staff report and gave a brief history on the process to develop this project. The countywide project consisted of two components, South Coast/Greater Point Arena and Inland/North Coast. A copy of the draft plan was on hand for review and available on the MCOG website; final copies, once approved, would be sent to each of the MCOG member agencies, i.e. cities and the County. Ms. Ellard introduced Sofia Zander, Lead Designer, and her colleague, Rourke Healey, Assistant Planner, both of TrailPeople. Ms. Zander gave a presentation to the Council. She noted 68 projects were ranked, after reviewing twice as many; those not ranked were either in progress already, too long-term for this scope, or recreational rather than transportation related. After the presentation and questions and comments from board members, the Council concurred with staff's recommendation to accept the study report.

**Upon motion** by Brown, second by Carter, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (8 Ayes – Brown, Stranske, Carter/Alt., Haschak, Ignacio/Alt., Albin-Smith, Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining, 0 Absent): IT IS ORDERED THAT the draft final Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory & Engineered Feasibility Study report is accepted as presented.

Director Albin-Smith left the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

## **7. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Recommendations of May 22, 2019:**

- a. Adoption of Final Fiscal Year 2019/20 Planning Overall Work Program (OWP). Ms. Ellard referred to her written staff report and reviewed the final program that included 15 work elements for a total of \$989,346. The Chair invited public comment; none forthcoming.

**Upon motion** by Haschak, second by Carter, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (7 Ayes – Brown, Stranske, Carter/Alt., Haschak, Ignacio/Alt., Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining, 1 Absent – Albin-Smith): IT IS ORDERED THAT 1) the FY 2019/20 Final Overall Work Program is adopted as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee; 2) Task 2.1 of Work Element 8 (Mendocino County Fire Vulnerability Assessment & Emergency Preparedness project) is amended to add representation on the Technical Advisory Group from Caltrans District One and Caltrans Headquarters; and 3) the Executive Director or designee is authorized to sign certifications and the OWP Agreement and to forward to Caltrans, as required.

- b. Allocation of Additional Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) – Partnership Program Funds for the Covelo SR 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail Project to Supplement State Active Transportation Program (ATP) Grants, Not to Exceed \$200,000. Ms. Barrett reviewed the RSTP program, funds that were previously approved, and tasks covered for this project. Mr. Sookne referred to his written staff on the final design and right-of-way (ROW) phase of the SR 162 Multi-Use Trail in the Covelo area. MCOG had approved prior funding of \$250,000 that was used for the environmental and design phases. He reported on issues that have occurred and reasons why additional funding is needed to complete this phase of the project. The TAC unanimously recommended that MCOG allocate an additional \$200,000 of RSTP Partnership Program funds. Mr. Sookne answered questions relative to reasons for the long timeframe of this project, including wetland mitigation, presence of oak trees and endangered plants, and the permitting process.

**Upon motion** by Stranske, second by Haschak, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (7 Ayes – Brown, Stranske, Carter/Alt., Haschak, Ignacio/Alt., Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining, 1 Absent – Albin-Smith): IT IS ORDERED THAT an additional \$200,000 of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Partnership Program funding is approved for the State Route 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail project, for a total of \$450,000 allocated to date from this funding source.

- c. Programming and Award of Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Funds to City of Ukiah’s Downtown Streetscape Project in the Amount of \$548,913. Ms. Barrett referred to her written staff report. Caltrans had sent out a notice of HIP funds available to the region. Funds must be used on facilities on the Federal Aid System and classified higher than a rural minor collector. The City of Ukiah’s Downtown Streetscape Project meets the criteria to receive these funds and is in the final stages of project development, with award of a construction contract anticipated in early fall of this year. The TAC recommended that the Board approve the award of FY 2017/18 and 2018/19 HIP funds totaling \$548,913 to the City of Ukiah for their Downtown Streetscape Project. Rick Seanor, Deputy Director, City of Ukiah Public Works Department, was available for questions and discussion from the Board. Questions from board members included:

- What is the timeline of this project? (*Gjerde*) – Mr. Seanor reported the City anticipates advertising for bids later this fall with construction to start January 2020.
- From the community meetings, what is the community’s reaction towards this project? (*Haschak*) – Mr. Seanor explained that generally the community’s responses have been positive. There were concerns about reducing four lanes to three. In the beginning, response was more skeptical about the changes, but after more active communication and addressing the community’s concerns the project has been received more positively. Director Brown agreed it was a tough sell, but public now sees it can be successful, with safety as the main benefit; about 90 percent accept the project. Ms. Barrett concurred.

**Upon motion** by Ignacio, second by Haschak, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (*7 Ayes – Brown, Stranske, Carter/Alt., Haschak, Ignacio/Alt., Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining, 1 Absent*): IT IS ORDERED THAT programming of the available FY 2017/18 and 2018/19 Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) federal funding for the City of Ukiah’s Downtown Streetscape Project is approved, for an award of \$548,913.

**8. Fiscal Year 2019/20 RTPA Budget.** Ms. Orth reported on the final budget proposal, the result of all recommendations by the Executive Committee, Ad Hoc Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, Transit Productivity Committee, Social Services Transportation Advisory Council and staff. She identified changes since the May budget workshop and the action required to adopt the budget, as written in her staff report. Total revenues are estimated at \$8.5 million, and total allocations are recommended at \$7.7 million.

**Upon motion** by Brown, second by Haschak, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (*7 Ayes – Stranske, Brown, Carter/Alt., Haschak, Ignacio/Alt., Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent*); IT IS ORDERED that the following four resolutions are adopted as recommended by staff and committees:

- a. Adoption of Resolution Allocating Fiscal Year 2019/20 Funds and 2018/19 Carryover Funds for Administration, Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities, Planning and Reserves.

**Resolution No. M2019-02**

Allocating Fiscal Year 2019/20 Funds and 2018/19 Carryover Funds for Administration, Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities, Planning and Reserves  
(Reso. #M2019-02 is incorporated herein by reference)

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)		
Reserved LTF prior-year unallocated revenue	29,135	
MCOG Administration & Other Direct Costs	464,066	
2% Bicycle & Pedestrian	67,772	
Planning Program – new funds	147,816	
LTF carryover – Planning program	12,884	

Total LTF		721,673
Regional Surface Trans. Program – Admin.		90,000
ATP Infrastructure Grants – Admin.		200,000
PPM Funds - Planning		166,361
RPA Funds - Planning		294,000
Sustainable Communities Planning Grant		119,516
Climate Adaptation Planning Grant		248,769
<b>Total Allocations</b>		<b>1,840,319</b>

- b. Adoption of Resolution Finding That There Are Unmet Transit Needs That Are Reasonable To Meet for Fiscal Year 2019/20.

**Resolution No. M2019-03**

Finding That There Are Unmet Transit Needs  
That Are Reasonable To Meet for Fiscal Year 2019/20  
(Reso. #M2019-03 is incorporated herein by reference)

- c. Adoption of Resolution Allocating Fiscal Year 2019/20 Local Transportation Funds, State Transit Assistance, and FY 2018/19 Carryover Capital Reserve Funds to Mendocino Transit Authority.

**Resolution No. M2019-04**

Allocating Fiscal Year 2019/20 LTF, STA, and 2018/19 Carryover  
Capital Reserve Funds to Mendocino Transit Authority  
(Reso. #M2019-04 is incorporated herein by reference)

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)		
MTA Operations	2,993,124	
Unmet Transit Needs	0	
Senior Center Operations	555,499	
Capital Reserve Fund	0	
Total LTF		3,548,623
State Transit Assistance (STA)		
MTA Operations	946,179	
MTA & Senior Center Capital	0	
Capital Reserve Fund	0	
Total STA		946,179
Capital Reserve Program		
Current Year - MTA	0	
Current Year – Senior Centers	0	
Long Term – MTA and Seniors	674,846	
Total Capital Reserve		674,846
<b>Total Transit Allocations</b>		<b>5,169,648</b>

- d. Adoption of Resolution Allocating Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds for Fiscal Year 2019/20 MCOG Partnership Funding Program, Local Assistance, and Distribution By Formula To Member Agencies.

**Resolution No. M2019-05**

Allocating RSTP Funds for Fiscal Year 2019/20 MCOG Partnership Funding  
Program, Local Assistance, and Distribution by Formula To Member Agencies  
(Reso. #M2019-05 is incorporated herein by reference)

MCOG Partnership Funding Program		100,000
Local Assistance – Project Delivery		90,000
Formula Distribution to Members		

Mendocino County DOT	127,229	
City of Ukiah	171,222	
City of Fort Bragg	114,321	
City of Willits	107,301	
City of Point Arena	70,919	
Total Formula Distributions		590,992
<b>Total RSTP Allocations</b>		<b>780,992</b>

**9. Transit Productivity Committee Recommendation of May 2, 2019: Approval of Resolution Adopting a Farebox Standard of Ten Percent Consistent With the Minimum State Requirement for Non-Urban Transit Operators.** Ms. Orth referred to her written staff report.

Upon motion by Haschak, second by Carter, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (7 Ayes – *Stranske, Brown, Carter/Alt., Haschak, Ignacio/Alt., Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde*; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent); IT IS ORDERED that the Transit Productivity Committee’s recommendation to update MCOG’s transit performance standard for Farebox Ratio to 10% (ten percent), consistent with the state’s minimum requirement, is approved by resolution.

**Resolution No. M2019-06**

Adopting a Farebox Standard of Ten Percent  
Consistent With the Minimum State Requirement  
for Non-Urban Transit Operators  
(Reso. #M2019-06 is incorporated herein by reference)

**10-12. Consent Calendar.** Upon motion by Carter, second by Stranske, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (7 Ayes – *Stranske, Brown, Carter, Haschak, Ignacio/Alt., Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde*; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent); IT IS ORDERED that consent items are approved:

**10. Approval of May 6, 2019 Minutes – as written**

**11. Adoption of Resolution Approving the Programming of FTA Section 5311(f) Intercity Bus Program Funds for Mendocino Transit Authority’s Project Proposal: Continuation of Route 65 Service**

**Resolution No. M2019-07**

Approving the Programming of FTA Section 5311(f)  
Intercity Bus Program Funds for Mendocino Transit Authority’s  
Project Proposal: Continuation of Route 65 Service  
(Reso. #M2019-07 is incorporated herein by reference)

**12. Appointments to Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC)**

- *Jill Rexrode, Redwood Coast Seniors, as “Local social service provider for seniors that provides transportation”*
- *Laurie Hill, Redwood Coast Seniors, as Alternate*

**13. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee - Reconvene as RTPA - Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee.** Upon motion by Carter, second by Haschak, and carried unanimously (6 Ayes; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent); IT IS ORDERED that the actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committee are ratified by the MCOG Board of Directors.

**14. Reports - Information**

- a. Mendocino Transit Authority. Ms. Ellard reported the May meeting was cancelled.
- b. North Coast Railroad Authority. There was no report.

- c. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings. Ms. Ellard made one correction to the written report: the May 28 grant workshop was held in Sacramento, but she had attended by webcast rather than in person.
- d. MCOG Administration Staff. Ms. Barrett reported that Senate Bill 152, which would have affected the Active Transportation Program (ATP) funding distribution, had died in committee. SB 127, which would change the State Highway Operation & Protection Program (SHOPP) was moving forward but with an amendment to the previous draft. The amendment changes conditional requirements to be more appropriate and acceptable in the bill. Another item that was discussed at the last CalCOG meeting, a proposal to allow COGs funding to complete the required Regional Housing Need Assessment (RHNA) plans; for the Mendocino County region, it could come to \$410,000. Details will follow in the months to come.  
Ms. Orth announced that Dow & Associates would be recruiting for the open position of Administrative Assistant, as Ms. Ford had given her notice.
- e. MCOG Planning Staff. There were no further reports.
- f. MCOG Directors. Director Gjerde reported on a Lost Coast Trail meeting coming up to discuss a 12-mile trail through Sinkyone Wilderness State Park in Northern Mendocino County. The project is in the conceptual stage and could move forward with funding (unrelated to MCOG). Ms. Barrett will contact Chair Gjerde with information on Proposition 68 grant funds; applications are due in June and August.
- g. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates. It was reported that Director Albin-Smith had attended the most recent meeting.

**15. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Submitted: NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

By Marta Ford, Administrative Assistant

# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Agenda # 10**  
Consent Calendar  
MCOG  
Meeting  
8/19/2019

## MINUTES

Transit Productivity Committee - TPC  
May 2, 2019

Dow & Associates Conference Room, Ukiah

### PRESENT:

MCOG Board Members: Mike Carter  
MTA Board Members: Jim Mastin  
Senior Centers Rep.: Diana Clark, Ukiah Senior Center  
Staff: Janet Orth, Nephela Barrett and Marta Ford, MCOG  
Carla Meyer, MTA  
Marilyn DeFrange, Ukiah Senior Center

### ABSENT:

Jim O. Brown, MCOG  
Jim Tarbell, MTA

**1. Call to Order.** MCOG Director Carter called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. Director Brown was excused by prior arrangement. Self-introductions were made.

**2. Public Expression.** None.

**3. Review and Recommendation on MCOG Transit Performance Standards.** Janet introduced the issue, with reference to her written staff report. The standards were last revised in 2014, when the Cost per Vehicle Service Hour was set to a “CPI Adjusted Rolling Average” that is updated annually. Since then, State Senate Bill 508 was signed into law, effective July 1, 2016. Staff recommended revising MCOG’s existing Farebox standard of 15 percent, and 12 percent for senior center contracts, to ten percent (10%), consistent with the new state law. This recommendation follows last year’s TPC advice that “MCOG consider reducing its farebox standard to ten percent over the next few years and revisit the issue this time next year with another year or two of performance data.” At that time (May 2018), the higher standard was considered counterproductive to maintaining ridership. Discussion included:

- What is farebox ratio? What would be the benefit of keeping it at the higher level? Carla gave background and noted that nationally, ridership is dropping, so it is more difficult to meet fare targets. No one supported the higher farebox standards.
- As seniors’ health care costs rise, they spend more of their social security income, so have less available for transportation costs. (Diana)
- How would the change affect the senior centers’ contracts with MTA? (Diana) A discussion of senior center issues was started and deferred to Agenda #7.

After discussion, MCOG’s staff recommendation was approved as follows.

### Recommendation:

Upon motion by Carter, seconded by Clark, and carried unanimously (*3 Ayes; 0 Noes; 2 Absent*), the TPC recommended that 1) MCOG update MCOG’s Farebox transit performance standard to ten percent, consistent with SB 508 and 2) apply the new standard to the 2018-2019 (next year’s) performance review.

**4. Annual Review of MTA Performance Reports Against MCOG Standards.** Janet reviewed her written staff report with initial review of performance using the adopted “CPI Adjusted Rolling Average” with both one-year and three-year results. The data was still a year behind schedule for review.

Service Type	2017/18	3-Year Average
Dial-A-Ride (DAR) improved Cost/Hour, declined in Passengers/Hr., Farebox	1 of 4	1 of 4
Short Distance Bus Routes met just Cost/Hour, no significant changes	1 of 4	1 of 4
Long Distance Routes improved Passengers/Hr., Cost/Pass. for current year	4 of 4	4 of 4
Senior Centers declined in Farebox, met all other standards	3 of 4	3 of 4



Discussion included:

- What are Long Distance Bus Routes? MTA’s footnote lists “60 Coaster, 65/66 CC Rider, 75 Gualala/Ukiah, 95 Point Arena/Santa Rosa.” Review of these routes. (All)
- Why is Route 20 Willits/Ukiah called Short Distance? This route includes local Willits service as well as to-from Ukiah. Many school children used to ride to Ukiah, no longer the case. Perhaps school districts can explain. Would results change if #20 were moved to Long Distance? Data should be reported accurately, even if it brings down ridership totals for local services. Consensus to move Route 20 to Long Distance Routes; assuming this can be done internally without Board approval, agreed to start in July 2019. (Carla, Jim, Nephele, Janet, group)
- Farebox dropped significantly for Seniors in the most recent year of review. Passengers per Hour remains level. The Centers give out some free fares. How was Passengers/Hour established by MCOG? Can it be changed to Passengers per Trip? No, established in Transportation Development Act (TDA), also in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 program rules. Discussion of how to address Senior Centers farebox drop-off. How are free fares reported—does it reduce Farebox numbers? No, does not increase cost. Appears to be in Winter when seniors are not going out as much. Continue to watch. (Janet, Nephele, Diana, Carla, group)
- MCOG and MTA are currently undergoing triennial performance audits, with compliance reviews; the independent auditor consultant is an excellent resource for issues like this. Can MCOG reduce the standard for passengers/ridership? Staff will research how established and consult with the performance auditor, then report back to TPC. (Janet, Nephele)
- Under the previous (long-time) General Manager, MTA made a conscious effort to move able riders from Dial-a-Ride (DAR) to fixed route service, so DAR performance is not ideal. Agreement that DAR is not expected to perform well. Also this strategy did not improve fixed route performance. Discussion of DAR serving general public or only disabled riders (paratransit); some operators have eliminated the public service, MTA has not yet. More people are using rideshare services such as Uber and Lyft. (Jim, Janet, Nephele, group)

**Recommendation:**

No formal recommendation. Consensus of participants to take the following interim steps:

- Move Route 20 Willits/Ukiah performance reporting to Long Distance Bus Routes category. (MTA staff)
- Continue to watch Farebox Ratio performance of Senior Centers. (TPC)
- Research options for Passengers per Hour standard. (MCOG staff)

– *Annual Transit Performance Reviews (one year and three years) are attached*

**5. Review and Recommendation on MTA’s Analysis and Prioritization of 2019/20 Unmet Transit Needs.**

Janet explained the process and expressed appreciation for MTA’s Route Committee report, provided in follow-up to last year’s Unmet Transit Needs finding. Carla reported the committee was delayed by some staff turnover and now meeting more often. Pending MTA’s analysis of the 2019/20 list, this agenda item was continued to the next meeting.

**6. Review and Recommendation on Fiscal Year 2019/20 Transit Claim.** Carla handed out a revised annual claim and apologized for an error, so that the senior centers will receive the same Local Transportation Fund (LTF) increase as MTA does, as is customary. She also reported that MTA employee Dawn White was promoted to Mobility Manager.

Janet reviewed her written staff report, noting estimated revenues are up by an unprecedented rate. LTF is up from sales taxes, including prior-year excess, resulting in a 12.5% increase available for MTA. State Transit Assistance (STA) is up from Senate Bill 1, the Road Repair & Accountability Act of 2017, tripled since 2017. Nephele explained how SB 1 is bringing funds to Mendocino County through several programs. Janet reviewed MTA’s claim for Operations and explained the new SB 508 law, which relaxed STA qualifying criteria.

Carla reported how MTA is meeting its retirement liability with other funds than LTF and STA. She noted grants for the new Ukiah transit center, a high priority for her, which she believes will increase ridership. Location is still under review. MTA is applying for a grant to fund six electric cutaway buses.

Questions and discussion included:

- No funds were claimed for Unmet Transit Needs; would that come from Operations funds? Yes. (Mike, Carla)
- Will seniors use some of the funding increase for needs on the list? Ukiah Senior Center is looking at whether to do that and/or increase driver salaries. (Mike, Diana)
- Comments on mobility management and FTA 5310 opportunities. (Carla)
- Sometimes MCOG’s Unmet Needs finding is made contingent on other factors than funds. (Nephele)
- If new services are started, they should be sustainable. (Marilyn)
- MTA may need to revise its Capital Reserve claim during the fiscal year, depending on potential outside grants requiring local match funds. (Carla, group)

After discussion, MCOG’s staff recommendation was revised as follows, reflecting the revised claim.

**Recommendation:**

Upon motion by Carter, seconded by Clark, and carried unanimously (3 Ayes; 0 Noes; 2 Absent), the TPC recommended that MCOG:

- 1) Allocate full funding of MTA’s current-year claims for FY 2019/20 Local Transportation Funds, and
- 2) Allocate Long-Term Capital from the Reserve fund balance if MTA’s five-year capital program can identify projects for this funding source.

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)		
MTA Operations	2,993,124	
Unmet Transit Needs	0	
Senior Center Operations	555,499	
Transit Capital Reserve	0	
Total LTF		3,548,623
State Transit Assistance Fund (STA)		
MTA Operations	946,179	
MTA & Seniors Capital	0	
Transit Capital Reserve	0	
Total STA		946,179
Capital Reserve Fund (CRF)		
MTA Capital, Current Year	0	
Senior Capital, Current Year	0	
Long-Term Capital Reserve	674,846	
Total CRF		674,846
<b>Total Recommended FY 2019/20 Transit Allocation</b>		<b>5,169,648</b>

**7. Consideration of Updates to Senior Centers TDA Funding Formula.** Nephele introduced the item and produced a historic MTA staff report (c. 1996/97) documenting the agreement that MTA and senior centers would share in annual LTF revenue increases equally, and how the base formula was established (copies distributed). Discussion included:

- When the contracts were designed 20 or so years ago (with Jim Mastin and Gordon Logan), the formula was set. It is difficult now for the centers, which used to have more state funding. The level of transportation services of each center has changed over time. (Jim, Carla, Diana)
- Auditors have mentioned this agreement to fund senior centers transportation programs is unusual; mostly transit operators provide the services themselves. Under this agreement, it was assumed the centers could do it more cheaply, (Carla, Janet)
- Suggestion to form a work group to analyze, start fresh with a new basis of performance. The centers have extensive data available. Diana volunteered to bring her experience and aptitude to the task. (Diana, Jim, Carla)
- MTA’s most recent reimbursement claim annual report shows that subsidy versus operating costs varied widely among the five centers, from 35% to 84%. (Janet)

- Discussion of history with Indian Senior Center and Long Valley Health Center, from the old document, recalling they had dropped out of the program due to reporting requirements. Recently there were FTA 5310 grant awards to tribal agencies. Also they have other sources of funds. (Mike, Janet, Nephela)
- Opportunities for FTA 5310 grants, with a new Call for Projects in July. Discussion of specific vehicle needs for seniors programs, such as four-wheel drive vans with wheelchair lift, and whether these could be procured through the state's resources or qualify under 5310. Staff agreed to research. (Carla, Nephela, Mike)
- Next steps include 1) request advice from the performance auditor (MCOG staff), 2) find out whether the Cities are able to help subsidize the centers (Diana), 3) look at 5310 operating grants (Carla).
- Carla and Diana volunteered to meet prior to the next TPC meeting to research a revised funding formula for the senior centers as a starting point for further discussion.

After discussion, MCOG's staff recommendation was approved as follows.

**Recommendation:**

Upon motion by Carter, seconded by Brown, and carried unanimously (*3 Ayes; 0 Noes; 2 Absent*), the TPC recommended that MCOG acknowledge the need to revise the long-standing formula for the senior centers' transportation programs from allocations of the Local Transportation Fund, and continue this item to the next TPC meeting.

**8. Miscellaneous / Members' Concerns/ Announcements.** None.

**9. Adjournment.** It was agreed to meet again after May 14; Janet will issue a poll for available dates. The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Submitted by Janet Orth, Deputy Director / CFO

# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## MINUTES

Transit Productivity Committee - TPC  
May 21, 2019

Dow & Associates Conference Room, Ukiah

### PRESENT:

MCOG Board Members: Michael Carter and Jim O. Brown  
MTA Board Members: Jim Mastin  
Senior Centers Rep.: Diana Clark and Marilyn DeFrange, Ukiah Senior Center  
Staff: Janet Orth, Nephele Barrett and Marta Ford, MCOG  
Carla Meyer, MTA

### ABSENT:

Jim Tarbell, MTA

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m. Self-introductions were made.

2. **Public Expression.** None.

3. **Review and Recommendation on MTA's Analysis and Prioritization of 2019/20 Unmet Transit Needs – continued from May 2, 2019.** Janet briefly reviewed the annual process, status and adopted definitions.

Carla reviewed status of last year's seven needs found reasonable to meet, contingent on three factors (MTA's review of existing routes; update of seniors transportation funding formula; potential federal 5311 grants). Five needs are in various stages of being met, and the other two are not able to be met in the near term. In discussion, it was agreed to drop the five of these seven needs that appear on the new list as High Priority, since they are already in progress.

Carla confirmed that any needs not found reasonable to meet in the coming year can still be addressed by MTA as opportunities arise from changing conditions. Discussion followed on MTA's newly funded Mobility Management position and potential volunteer driver programs.

MTA's analysis of the list of all testimony compiled by MCOG from the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC), Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) and the December public hearing was included in the agenda packet. The report was ranked by five categories: *Already Exists* (1), *High Priority–Consider for FY 2019/20* (8), *Medium Priority* (3), *Low Priority* (15), and *Not an Unmet Need* (0), for a total of 27 needs. Carla's review and group discussion included the following (excluding prior-year needs).

- “Already Exists” – #M-15, service to Eagle Peak school in Redwood Valley as requested by parents is provided by an MTA stop within three blocks. MTA is prohibited by law from providing school bus service.
- “High Priority–Consider for FY 2019/20” – MTA's route committee is addressing issues of these needs: #M-7, addition of a bus stop on East Gobbi Street in Ukiah to serve a seniors' mobile home park is contingent on revisions to MTA's Dial-A-Ride program (DAR). #M-9, evening transportation for workers returning from Ukiah to Willits, will not be an expansion of service but could involve a timing adjustment of Route 20. #M-14, a pulse system at Navarro Junction for buses to Fort Bragg, Ukiah, and Point Arena, would time buses to meet together for ride transfers.
- “Medium Priority” – #S-9 and PH-2, to increase Ukiah-Hopland service, was tried years ago but demographics have changed, with more workers in town, so enough riders could now be anticipated. While Hopland is served by Route 65, this is a grant-funded service with restrictions such as meeting Greyhound connections in Santa Rosa; also there is no funding available. #M-10, service on Talmage Road in Ukiah also is constrained by lack of funds, but should be kept in mind for future expansion. DAR service would be more efficient than fixed route for this need.
- “Low Priority” – Each of these 15 needs were reviewed. Most lacked available funding resources. Others were logistically impractical (e.g. Golden Rule Park outside Willits has no safe way to drop off passengers on US-101 northbound). Others were inequitable (e.g. “general public service” by paratransit DAR is being eliminated; since not offered in Ukiah, should not be offered in Brooktrails).

“Unexpected medical emergencies after hours/weekends” should be addressed by 911 call, not transit. Mendocino College service would not be justified on Saturdays, for lack of classes and therefore riders. So for various reasons, these needs did not rise to the top as “reasonable to meet” by definition.

**Recommendation:**

Upon motion by Carter, seconded by Brown, and carried unanimously (4 Ayes; 0 Noes; 1 Absent): The TPC recommended a finding that there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet for Fiscal Year 2019/20, as identified on the list:

- #M-7 Bus stop on East Gobbi Street at senior mobile home park (Ukiah area)
  - #M-10 Add more service on Talmage Road for those who cannot walk very far
  - #M-14 Reconsider a pulse system at the Navarro Junction for buses to Fort Bragg, Ukiah, Gualala and Point Arena.
- [M=MTA; PH=Public Hearing; S=SSTAC]

**4. Consideration of Updates to Senior Centers TDA Funding Formula – continued from May 2, 2019.**

Nephele proposed again continuing this item and scheduling a larger meeting with all of the senior centers. MCOG staff can poll for dates. She noted this is too large of a project to complete in time for the FY 2019/20 budget. Discussion included:

- Agreement with Nephele’s statement. How vehicles are being used by Ukiah Senior Center, i.e. types of trips, to qualify for the funding and apply costs appropriately. Recap of the May 2 TPC discussion. A challenge for USC is pay raises, benefits for drivers; they met the minimum wage requirement but have no new funds to cover it. There are various moving parts to be taken into consideration. (Diana)
- Agree there is a need to look at history, performance, other issues. (Carla)
- Importance of bringing other senior centers in to this review. (Nephele)
- Reported talks with several of the center directors to date introducing the issue, letting them know it is under review. (Diana)
- Logistics of facilitating one or more meetings on this topic in the near future, likely a separate meeting with the centers followed by reconvening the TPC. (Nephele, Mike)
- Brief discussion of related Anderson Valley Senior Center transportation program issues. All agreed to a need to investigate.

No action was taken; the issue was continued to a future meeting.

**5. Miscellaneous / Members’ Concerns.** Nephele announced planning grants recently awarded by Caltrans to MCOG for 1) SB 743 Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Regional Baseline Study and 2) Mendocino County Fire Vulnerability Assessment & Emergency Preparedness, to start in July. Discussion included:

- In reference to a previous event, Carla stated that public transit has better equipment and training than school busses to evacuate people in emergencies. Mike agreed and reported on prior calls and how responses were handled.
- Q&A about Office of Emergency Services (OES) and related matters. As a countywide coordinator, Mike reported new interest in Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) training, ham radio, and fire-wise communities.
- Carla noted MTA is always ready to respond to emergencies and confirmed that emergency calls should go through Mendocino County OES, then MTA will respond. City of Ukiah has its own OES officer. Discussion followed on which cities come under the County Sheriff’s OES.

Nephele announced a new cycle of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 program funds coming up in July.

Carla reported MTA’s submittal of a grant application for \$1.4 million of FTA Section 5339 funds to include a 35-seat electric bus. Also they are applying for 5-6 electric cutaway vehicles under the Volkswagen legal settlement.

**6. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Agenda # 11  
Consent Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/19/2019

## STAFF REPORT

---

**TITLE:** First Amendment to FY 2019/20 Overall Work Program

**DATE PREPARED:** 8/7/19

**SUBMITTED BY:** Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner

**MEETING DATE:** 8/19/19

---

### BACKGROUND:

The Final FY 2019/20 Overall Work Program (*totaling \$989,346*) was adopted by MCOG on June 3, 2019. Now that the FY 2018/19 books have closed, we need to carry over and reprogram some unexpended PPM funds, some of which expire 6/30/20. Unexpended RPA funds will also need to be carried over in a second amendment, however, that cannot be done until RPA fund balances are certified by Caltrans, which has not yet been completed.

The purpose of this proposed First Amendment is to carry over and reprogram PPM funds as follows:

W.E.2 (MCOG) Planning Management & General Coordination (Non-RPA) – There is no change to the overall total in this work element (\$94,999), however, the fiscal year of PPM funds is being revised to utilize \$9,056 in FY 2017/18 PPM carryover funds (under-expended in FY 2018/19 W.E. 9) which will soon expire on 6/30/20. This will free up \$9,056 in FY 2019/20 PPM funds, which will be transferred to the Pavement Management Program (PMP) Triennial Update RESERVE. *See below.*

W.E. 7 (MCOG) Planning, Programming & Monitoring – A total of \$60,520 in carryover PPM funds (\$37,154 – FY 2017/18; \$23,366 - FY 2018/19) is being carried over and added to this work element, increasing the total from \$66,864 to \$127,384.

W.E. 8 (MCOG) Mendo. Co. Fire Vulnerability Assessment & Emergency Preparedness Grant – The funding in this grant project is being reduced by \$1,000 to correct an error and match the programmed funding to the amount included in the 7/2/19 grant award letter from Caltrans. The local match (LTF) will be revised from \$32,231 to \$31,116 (a decrease of \$115) and the grant amount will be revised from \$248,749 to 247,884 (a decrease of \$885). The total funding will be revised from \$281,000 to \$280,000.

Pavement Management Program Triennial Update – RESERVE – A total of \$6,508 in FY 2018/19 PPM carryover funds is being added to this RESERVE, from under-expended FY 2018/19 Work Elements 10 (\$4,659) and 18 (\$1,849). In addition, \$9,056 in FY 2019/20 PPM funds are being added to this RESERVE, freed up in Work Element 2, as noted above. This project's total will increase from \$50,000 to \$65,564. (*Note: The purpose of this RESERVE is to start accumulating funding in advance of a project expected to be programmed in the next OWP cycle.*)

This proposed amendment would increase the FY 2019/20 Overall Work Program total from \$989,346 to \$1,064,430, an increase of \$75,084. Details are shown in **bold** and ~~strike out~~ on the attached financial summary sheets. *Copies of the full amendment will be available upon request.*

***The TAC has not considered this proposed Amendment because their next meeting is on 8/21/19, after the MCOG meeting. However, staff considers the amendment routine and no new funding is involved.***

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Consider approval of First Amendment to FY 2019/20 Overall Work Program.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** (1) Approve Amendment (*Recommended*); (2) Do not approve Amendment; or (3) Refer Amendment to TAC for review and recommendation.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Accept staff's recommendation to approve the First Amendment to FY 2019/20 Overall Work Program (OWP), and authorize Executive Director to sign appropriate certifications and revised OWP Agreement (as needed), and forward to Caltrans as required.

*/le*

*Attachments: FY 2019/20 OWP - Summary of Funding Sources  
FY 2019/20 OWP – Funding Allocation & Expenditure Summary  
FY 2019/20 OWP - Summary of Carryover Funds*

**MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
FY 2019/2020 FINAL (AMENDED) OVERALL WORK PROGRAM  
SUMMARY OF FUNDING SOURCES**

NO.	WORK ELEMENT	LOCAL LTF	STATE PPM	STATE RPA	STATE SB 1 Sust. Comm. Grant	STATE SB 1 Adaptation Grant	TOTAL
1	MCOG - Regional Government & Intergovernmental Coordination	\$250		\$113,248			\$113,498
2	MCOG - Planning Management & General Coordination (Non-RPA)	\$82,276	\$12,723				\$94,999
3	MCOG - Community Transportation Planning	\$250	\$10,500				\$10,750
4	MCOG - Sustainable Transportation Planning			\$10,500			\$10,500
5	MCOG - SB 743 VMT Regional Baseline Study - <i>Grant Awarded</i>	\$15,485			\$119,516		\$135,001
6	Co. DOT - Combined Special Studies			\$60,000			\$60,000
7	MCOG - Planning, Programming & Monitoring		\$16,777 <b>\$77,297</b>	\$50,087			\$66,864 <b>\$127,384</b>
8	MCOG - Mendo. Co. Fire Vulnerability Assessment & Emergency Preparedness - <i>Grant Awarded (2-year project)</i>	<del>\$32,231</del> <b>\$32,116</b>				\$248,769 <b>\$247,884</b>	\$281,000 <b>\$280,000</b>
12	Ukiah - Comprehensive ADA Access Plan Update - <i>Carryover</i>		\$35,000				\$35,000
13	Co. DOT - Orchard Ave. Extension Feas. Study - <i>Grant Match - Carryover</i>	\$7,608					\$7,608
14	MCOG - Training	\$21,500					\$21,500
15	Fort Bragg - Transp. Planning for Mill Site Reuse & Rezoning - <i>Carryover</i>		\$41,361				\$41,361
16	MCOG - Multi-Modal Transportation Planning			\$31,500			\$31,500
18	MCOG - Geographic Information System (GIS) Activities	\$600		\$5,250			\$5,850
20	MCOG - Grant Development & Assistance	\$500		\$23,415			\$23,915
	<i>Pavement Management Program (PMP) Triennial Update - RESERVE</i>		<del>\$50,000</del> <b>\$65,564</b>				\$50,000 <b>\$65,564</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	\$160,700 <b>\$160,585</b>	\$166,361 <b>\$242,445</b>	\$294,000	\$119,516	\$248,769 <b>\$247,884</b>	\$989,346 <b>\$1,064,430</b>

**TOTAL WORK PROGRAM SUMMARY**

Local	\$160,700 <b>\$160,585</b>	Local LTF 2019/20 Alloc.	\$147,816 <b>\$147,701</b>
State	\$828,646 <b>\$903,845</b>	Local LTF <i>Carryover</i>	\$12,884
Federal	\$0	State PPM 2019/20 Alloc.	\$90,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	\$989,346 <b>\$1,064,430</b>	State PPM <i>Carryover</i>	\$76,361 <b>\$152,445</b>
		State RPA 2019/20 Alloc.	\$294,000
		State SB 1 Sust. Communities Grant	\$119,516
		State SB 1 Adaptation Grant	\$248,769 <b>\$247,884</b>

PROGRAM MATCH			
Local	\$160,700	46.2%	Federal
	<b>\$160,585</b>	<b>15.1%</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
State	\$828,646	83.8%	
	<b>\$903,845</b>	<b>84.9%</b>	
Federal	\$0	0.0%	
<b>TOTAL WORK PROGRAM SUMMARY</b>	\$989,346 <b>\$1,064,430</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	



**MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
FY 2019/2020 FINAL (AMENDED) OVERALL WORK PROGRAM  
FUNDING ALLOCATION & EXPENDITURE SUMMARY**

NO.	WORK ELEMENT TITLE	COUNTY DOT	COUNTY DPBS	MTA	CITIES	MCOG STAFF	CONSULT/ OTHERS/ DIRECT COSTS	TOTAL
1	MCOG - Regional Government & Intergovernmental Coordination					\$111,248	\$2,250	\$113,498
2	MCOG - Planning Management & General Coordination (Non-RPA)					\$94,999		\$94,999
3	MCOG - Community Transportation Planning					\$10,500	\$250	\$10,750
4	MCOG - Sustainable Transportation Planning					\$10,500		\$10,500
5	MCOG - SB 743 VMT Regional Baseline Study - Grant Award					\$15,000	\$120,001	\$135,001
6	Co. DOT - Combined Special Studies	\$60,000						\$60,000
7	<b>MCOG - Planning, Programming &amp; Monitoring</b>					<del>\$59,614</del> <b>\$120,134</b>	\$7,250	<del>\$66,864</del> <b>\$127,384</b>
8	<b>MCOG - Mendo. Co. Fire Vulnerability Assessment &amp; Emergency Preparedness - Grant Award (2-year project)</b>					<del>\$36,000</del> <b>\$35,000</b>	\$245,000	<del>\$281,000</del> <b>\$280,000</b>
12	Ukiah - Comprehensive ADA Access Plan Update - <i>Carryover</i>						\$35,000	\$35,000
13	Co. DOT - Orchard Ave. Extension Feas. Study - Grant Match - <i>Carryover</i>						\$7,608	\$7,608
14	MCOG - Training					\$10,500	\$11,000	\$21,500
15	Fort Bragg - Transp. Planning for Mill Site Reuse & Rezoning - <i>Carryover</i>				\$1,111		\$40,250	\$41,361
16	MCOG - Multi-Modal Transportation Planning					\$31,500		\$31,500
18	MCOG - Geographic Information System (GIS) Activities					\$5,250	\$600	\$5,850
20	MCOG - Grant Development & Assistance					\$23,415	\$500	\$23,915
	<i>Pavement Management Program Triennial Update - RESERVE</i>						<del>\$50,000</del> <b>\$65,564</b>	<del>\$50,000</del> <b>\$65,564</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$60,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,111</b>	<del>\$408,526</del> <b>\$468,046</b>	<del>\$519,709</del> <b>\$535,273</b>	<del>\$989,346</del> <b>\$1,064,430</b>

Note: Several work element numbers have been left blank for potential carryover projects

\*

*Reimbursement Rates Used For Calculating Days Programmed (estimate only)*

*County/Cities/Local Agencies (\$75/hr); Consultants (\$125/hr); MCOG Planning Staff (est. @ approx \$38-\$130/hr - various positions)*

*\* MCOG planning staff funding level is based on contracted obligation with DBC Consulting (\$390,542). DBC's contract extension (approved 5/6/19) goes through 9-30-20. In addition, ~~\$45,877.90~~ **\$111,977.54** in carryover funding (\$2,537.73 FY 2014/15; \$2,363.41 FY 2015/16; \$18,931.06 FY 2016/17; \$22,045.70 FY 2017/18; \$66,099.64 FY 2018/19) is available from under-expending prior years' funding, for a total available of ~~\$436,419.90~~ **\$502,519.54** ). ~~(FY 2018/19 unexpended funding, if any, will be identified after 6/30/19)~~*

**MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
 FY 2019/2020 FINAL (AMENDED) OVERALL WORK PROGRAM  
 SUMMARY OF CARRYOVER FUNDS**

<b>NO.</b>	<b>WORK ELEMENT</b>	<b>LOCAL LTF</b>	<b>STATE PPM</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>Notes</b>
2	MCOG - Planning Management & General Coord. (Non-RPA)	\$5,276	\$9,056	<del>\$5,276</del> \$14,332	17/18 LTF - no exp. 17/18 PPM exp. 6/30/20
7	<b>MCOG - Planning Management &amp; General Coord. (Non-RPA)</b>		\$60,520	\$60,520	17/18 PPM (\$37,154) - exp. 6/30/20 18/19 PPM (\$23,366) - exp 6/30/21
12	Ukiah - Comprehensive ADA Access Plan Update - <i>Carryover</i>		\$35,000	\$35,000	17/18 PPM - exp. 6/30/20
13	Co. DOT - Orchard Ave. Extension Feas. Study - Grant Match - <i>Carryover</i>	\$7,608		\$7,608	14/15 LTF - no exp.
15	Fort Bragg - Transp. Planning for Mill Site Reuse & Rezoning - <i>Carryover</i>		\$41,361	\$41,361	18/19 PPM - exp. 6/30/21
	<b>Pavement Management Program Triennial Update - Reserve</b>		\$6,508	\$6,508	18/19 PPM - exp 6/30/21
	<b>TOTAL</b>	\$12,884	<del>\$76,361</del> \$152,445	<del>\$89,245</del> \$165,329	



## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

### STAFF REPORT

**Agenda # 12**  
Consent Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/19/2019

---

**TITLE:** Funding Share by Formula for Statewide Local Streets & Roads Needs Assessment

**SUBMITTED BY:** Janet Orth, Deputy Director / CFO      **DATE PREPARED:** 8/9/2019

---

#### **BACKGROUND:**

Attached is a copy of a joint memorandum from CSAC and the League of California Cities, dated August 1, 2019, detailing a proposal to fund the next two (two-year) updates of the California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment

In 2011, MCOG joined other Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) in funding the 2012 and 2014 reports. In 2015, we again participated for the 2016 and 2018 reports. Our share was \$637 and \$648 of the \$550,000 cost respectively. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) unanimously recommended the original contribution.

The amount now requested is slightly less, as the cost will be divided three ways rather than two. The estimated cost has risen to \$680,000. Whereas previously, half the cost was born by regional entities and the other half by counties and cities, the current proposal has regions, cities and counties each contributing one-third of the cost.

MCOG's requested contribution to the \$226,667 regional share totals \$527. The regional agencies would contribute their shares "off the top" of the statewide formula distribution of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds. Alternatively, agencies may choose to contribute to this effort with other funds.

MCOG's FY 2019/20 RSTP funds are estimated at \$780,992. MCOG's policies for allocation of these regional funds already includes an annual "off the top" allocation for our local Partnership Funding Program and funding for MCOG's Regional Project Coordinator staff position. MCOG allocates the remainder to the five member governments by formula.

Staff considers this minor investment a bargain for a valuable product by a coalition of interests that supports local streets and roads needs.

---

#### **ACTION REQUIRED:**

Approve the "off the top" contribution of \$527 in RSTP funds to the Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment, consistent with previous MCOG Board action.

---

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

- Consider contributing other MCOG planning funds, such as *PPM*, *RPA*, or *LTF*, to support this effort, subject to eligibility requirements. - *not recommended*
  - Decline to participate in this statewide effort. - *not recommended*
- 

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve the "off the top" contribution of \$527 in RSTP funds to the 2020 and 2022 Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment updates, and authorize staff to send a notification letter to Caltrans.



California State Association of  
Counties 1100 K Street, Suite 101  
Sacramento, CA 95814



1400 K Street, Suite 400 • Sacramento, California 95814  
Phone: 916.658.8200 Fax: 916.658.8240  
www.cacities.org

August 1, 2019

To: Executive Directors, Regional Transportation Planning Agencies

From: David Leamon, Stanislaus County Public Works Director and Local Streets and  
Roads Needs Assessment Oversight Committee Chair  
Chris Lee, Legislative Representative, California State Association of Counties  
Rony Berdugo, Legislative Representative, League of California Cities

**Re: Funding for California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment 2020 and 2022 Reports**

---

**Background.** The California State Association of Counties (CSAC), League of California Cities (League), County Engineers Association of California (CEAC), and the state's regional transportation planning agencies completed another successful assessment of the statewide local streets and roads network last fall. The *2018 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment Report* (Report) is the sixth report of its kind since the start of this important effort in 2007.

The Report is a comprehensive and systematic statewide assessment of the state's local street and road network. It includes an analysis of current funding available to cities and counties to maintain the local network and identifies a funding shortfall to preserve the public's \$220 billion investment. It is updated biennially to ensure that information is up to date. The goal of the Report is to educate the public, and policy- and decision-makers at all levels of government about the infrastructure investments needed to provide California with a seamless, safe, and efficient multi-modal transportation system.

The Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment Oversight Committee (Oversight Committee), consisting of the project manager and representatives from counties, cities, and regional transportation planning agencies, have already begun work on the 2020 Report.

The cost of developing the 2016 and 2018 reports was approximately \$600,000. The Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) contributed \$300,000; cities and counties contributed \$300,000.

**Value of the Report.** The Report continues to be extremely valuable. It was vital to our success telling the story for local streets and roads funding needs while advocating for the first state gas tax increase since 1993: SB 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017. The Report also was a critical tool for informing the public about the impact of Proposition 6, which would have repealed SB 1's new transportation revenues. SB 1 is an extremely important funding source, but does not get us all the way to a Statewide PCI of 80, which is a need of approximately double of what we receive (\$3.083B vs need of \$6.824B).

**Funding Proposal.** In 2011 and again in 2015, the RTPA's agreed to financially partner with CSAC and the League for the development of the reports. The reports continue to improve in terms of the quality of data, its use as a tool for educating policy- and decision-makers, and the scope of the assessment. For instance the 2018 report incorporated data collection on the National Highway System (NHS). Over the years the report has also been enhanced to include essential roadway components, complete streets and sustainable pavement practices that are cost-effective and environmentally friendly.

The budget for the 2020 and 2022 reports is anticipated to be \$680,000, an increase of \$80,000 over the last two reports. The cost for this cycle is larger than the last cycle due to the general increase in costs of projects, including consultant costs. The committee will make every effort to ensure that we do not surpass this amount for this cycle. This increase would be shared equally by the regions and cities and counties, each contributing one-third toward the cost, or \$226,667.

With your continued support and approval of the budget augmentation, we propose using the same formula that was used to determine Surface Transportation Block Grants (STBG) contributions to the Caltrans' Cooperative Training Assistance Program (CTAP). **Specifically, we request that each region send a letter to Caltrans by September 1, 2019 authorizing Caltrans to reduce its share of Surface Transportation Block Grants (STBG) funding by the specific formula amounts shown in the attached chart as each region's contribution to the effort.**

After September 1, 2019, Caltrans will reduce the STBG balance for each Region in accordance with the letter to Caltrans. The amounts contributed by regions would then be provided to the County Engineer's Association of California (CEAC) who is responsible for payments on the Report contract.

Attached is a template letter to Ray Zhang at Caltrans Local Assistance that you could use for your request to Caltrans. Please copy Marina Espinoza with CSAC on your letter by email ([mespinoza@counties.org](mailto:mespinoza@counties.org)) or hard copy (CSAC, 1100 K Street, Suite 101, Sacramento, CA 95814).

If you would prefer to contribute to this effort with other funds (i.e. Non-STBG funds), please send a check payable to "CEAC" directly to Mike Crump, CEAC Treasurer, or contact Chris Lee to discuss alternative options.

Mike Crump  
Retired Director of Public Works – Butte County  
PO Box 478  
Durham CA 95938

Finally, while Executive Directors in many regions have authority to contribute funds to this effort without board approval, for those that would like to take this action to their boards, a sample resolution that could be used is attached.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of our request.

**Contact.** If you have any questions regarding this request, or want more information on the history of or specific findings from the reports, please contact Rony Berdugo, League Legislative Representative, at (916) 658-8249 or [rberdugo@cacities.org](mailto:rberdugo@cacities.org), or Chris Lee, CSAC Legislative Representative at (916) 650-8180 or [clee@counties.org](mailto:clee@counties.org).

#### **Attachments**

Proposed RTPA Needs Assessment Funding Contributions  
Sample Needs Assessment Funding Letter to Caltrans  
Sample Resolution

cc: Regional Transportation Planning Agency Group  
Rural Counties Task Force

**Formula Distribution of RTPA contributions  
to the Statewide Local Streets and Roads (LSR) Needs Assessment  
Formulas based on Actual Final Distribution, 2017-2018 of RSTP/contributions to CTAP**

MPO/RTPA/County	STP Large Urbanized Apportionment Area	STP Small Area Apportionment	CTAP Adjustment	Percent Share to CTAP	Proposed LSR Assessment Contribution for 2020 and 2022 Reports
Alpine	\$ -	\$ 15,026	\$ 16	0.00%	\$ 7
Amador	\$ -	\$ 487,103	\$ 504	0.10%	\$ 228
Butte	\$ -	\$ 2,813,330	\$ 2,911	0.58%	\$ 1,320
Calaveras	\$ -	\$ 582,845	\$ 603	0.12%	\$ 273
Colusa	\$ -	\$ 273,903	\$ 283	0.06%	\$ 128
Del Norte	\$ -	\$ 365,861	\$ 379	0.08%	\$ 172
El Dorado	\$ 796,800	\$ 1,136,943	\$ 2,001	0.40%	\$ 907
Fresno	\$ 8,492,197	\$ 3,527,174	\$ 12,435	2.49%	\$ 5,637
Glenn	\$ -	\$ 359,620	\$ 372	0.07%	\$ 169
Humboldt	\$ -	\$ 1,721,541	\$ 1,781	0.36%	\$ 807
Imperial	\$ -	\$ 2,231,840	\$ 2,309	0.46%	\$ 1,047
Inyo	\$ -	\$ 237,164	\$ 245	0.05%	\$ 111
Kern	\$ 6,797,541	\$ 4,036,323	\$ 11,209	2.24%	\$ 5,081
Kings	\$ -	\$ 1,956,313	\$ 2,024	0.40%	\$ 918
Lake	\$ -	\$ 826,927	\$ 856	0.17%	\$ 388
Lassen	\$ -	\$ 446,233	\$ 462	0.09%	\$ 209
Los Angeles	\$ 126,400,031	\$ 958,514	\$ 131,765	26.35%	\$ 59,734
MTC	\$ 79,749,311	\$ 12,828,759	\$ 95,781	19.16%	\$ 43,421
Madera	\$ -	\$ 1,929,241	\$ 1,996	0.40%	\$ 905
Mariposa	\$ -	\$ 233,391	\$ 241	0.05%	\$ 109
Mendocino	\$ -	\$ 1,123,299	\$ 1,162	0.23%	\$ 527
Merced	\$ -	\$ 3,271,046	\$ 3,384	0.68%	\$ 1,534
Modoc	\$ -	\$ 123,863	\$ 128	0.03%	\$ 58
Mono	\$ -	\$ 181,613	\$ 188	0.04%	\$ 85
Monterey	\$ -	\$ 5,307,692	\$ 5,491	1.10%	\$ 2,489
Nevada	\$ -	\$ 1,262,981	\$ 1,307	0.26%	\$ 593
Orange Co.	\$ 38,990,517	\$ 59,029	\$ 40,401	8.08%	\$ 18,315
Placer	\$ 3,304,162	\$ 1,064,973	\$ 4,520	0.90%	\$ 2,049
Plumas	\$ -	\$ 255,847	\$ 265	0.05%	\$ 120
Riverside	\$ 21,373,801	\$ 6,931,329	\$ 29,284	5.86%	\$ 13,275
SACOG	\$ 18,258,974	\$ 4,846,868	\$ 23,906	4.78%	\$ 10,837
San Benito	\$ -	\$ 706,772	\$ 731	0.15%	\$ 331
San Bernardino	\$ 25,995,819	\$ 400,273	\$ 27,309	5.46%	\$ 12,380
San Diego	\$ 38,465,531	\$ 1,664,545	\$ 41,519	8.30%	\$ 18,822
San Joaquin	\$ 4,807,408	\$ 4,024,635	\$ 9,138	1.83%	\$ 4,143
San Luis Obispo	\$ -	\$ 3,448,081	\$ 3,567	0.71%	\$ 1,617
Santa Barbara	\$ -	\$ 5,420,712	\$ 5,608	1.12%	\$ 2,542
Santa Cruz	\$ -	\$ 3,355,305	\$ 3,471	0.69%	\$ 1,574
Shasta	\$ -	\$ 2,266,304	\$ 2,345	0.47%	\$ 1,063
Sierra	\$ -	\$ 41,433	\$ 43	0.01%	\$ 19
Siskiyou	\$ -	\$ 574,175	\$ 594	0.12%	\$ 269
Stanislaus-Modesto	\$ 4,646,406	\$ 1,998,500	\$ 6,875	1.38%	\$ 3,117
TRPA	\$ 1,881,020	\$ -	\$ 1,946	0.39%	\$ 882
Tehama	\$ -	\$ 811,556	\$ 840	0.17%	\$ 381
Trinity	\$ -	\$ 176,293	\$ 182	0.04%	\$ 83
Tulare	\$ 2,846,879	\$ 2,848,177	\$ 5,892	1.18%	\$ 2,671
Tuolumne	\$ -	\$ 708,000	\$ 732	0.15%	\$ 332
Ventura	\$ 7,208,498	\$ 3,422,608	\$ 10,999	2.20%	\$ 4,986
<b>Statewide Totals</b>	<b>\$ 390,014,895</b>	<b>\$ 93,263,960</b>	<b>\$ 500,000</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$ 226,667</b>



MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
STAFF REPORT

Agenda #14c  
Reports  
MCOG Meeting  
8/19/2019

TITLE: Summary of Meetings

DATE PREPARED: 8/6/2019

SUBMITTED BY: Monica Galliani, Administrative Assistant

BACKGROUND:

Since our last regular MCOG meeting packet, MCOG Administration and Planning staff has attended (or will have attended) \_\_ meetings the following statewide and local meetings on behalf of MCOG:

Date	Meeting/Event	Location	Staff
6/11/2019	Project Development Team Meeting	Covelo	Barrett & Sookne
6/11/2019	W-Trans ZEV Draft Plan Review	Teleconference	Ellard & Orth
6/13/2019	California Air Resources Board Workshop	Teleconference	Ellard
6/17/2019	Rep. Huffman Transportation Roundtable	Ukiah	Barrett
6/19/2019	Ukiah General Plan Stakeholder Meeting	Ukiah	Barrett
6/20/2019	Rural Multi-Modal Planning	Webinar	Ellard, Speka
6/20/2019	Round Valley Tribal Council Meeting	Covelo	Barrett, Sookne
6/26/2019 - 6/27/2019	California Transportation Commission	Teleconference	Davey-Bates, Dow, & Barrett
6/26/2019	Mendocino Transit Authority Board	Ukiah	Ellard
7/8/2019	SB 743/VMT Grant Kickoff Meeting	Teleconference	Ellard, Barrett, & Pedrotti
7/8/2019	Ukiah School Area Traffic Study Meeting	Teleconference	Barrett
7/9/2019	Covelo Project Development Team Meeting	Teleconference	Barrett & Sookne
7/10/2019	Gualala Project Development Team Meeting	Teleconference	Barrett
7/11/2019	Dow & DBC Coordination Meeting	Ukiah	All Staff
7/11/2019	Mendocino Transit Authority and MCOG Staffs	Ukiah	Orth & Barrett
7/16/2019	Caltrans District 1 and Regional Transportation Planning Agency	Ukiah	Barrett
7/17/2019	Orchard Avenue Project Development	Ukiah	Sookne & Barrett
7/19/2019	Rural Counties Task Force Meeting	Sacramento	Barrett
7/20/2019	Rural Multi-Modal Planning	Webinar	Speka & Ellard
7/22/2019	STIP Guidelines Workshop	Sacramento	Sookne & Pedrotti
7/24/2019	Covelo Project Mitigation Meeting	Teleconference	Barrett & Sookne
7/25/2019	Climate Adaptation Grant Kickoff	Ukiah	Ellard, Barrett, Sookne & Pedrotti
7/25/2019	SB 743/VMT Consultant Selection Committee	Ukiah	Ellard & Barrett
7/25/2019	Gualala Streetscape Public Meeting	Gualala	Barrett
7/30/2019	COG Directors Association of California	Sacramento	Barrett
7/31/2019	Mendocino Transit Authority Board	Willits	Ellard
7/31/2019	Project Development Team Meeting	Gualala	Barrett
8/5/2019	Proposition 68 Grant Meeting	Point Arena	Ellard
8/7/2019	Willits Housing Element Meeting	Willits	Barrett & Sookne
8/13/2019	Housing Planning Grant Meeting	Ukiah	Barrett & Ellard



8/14/2019	North Coast Railroad Authority	Novato	Ellard
8/14/2019- 8/15/2019	California Transportation Commission	Bay Area	Barrett & Davey- Bates
8/15/2019	Ukiah Senior Center Meeting	Ukiah	Barrett & Orth

I will provide information to Board members regarding the outcome of any of these meetings as requested.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** None.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** None identified.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** None. This is for information only.



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## STAFF REPORT

Agenda # 14d1  
Reports  
MCOG Meeting  
8/19/2019

---

**TITLE:** Local Government Planning Support Grants Program

**DATE PREPARED:** 8/9/19

**MEETING DATE:** 8/19/19

---

**SUBMITTED BY:** Nephele Barrett, Executive Director

---

**BACKGROUND:**

Recent passage of the Budget Trailer Bill, AB 101, established the Local Government Planning Support Grants Program, which includes two new one-time pots of funding for planning related to housing production and implementation of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). One pot of funding will go directly to cities and counties, and the second pot will go to multi-county agencies or COGs responsible for RHNA. MCOG will receive a total of \$410,000 to be used for activities that “increase housing planning and accelerate housing production.” Eligible activities include providing technical assistance, performing infrastructure planning, and conducting feasibility studies. Funds may also be suballocated for these activities, as well as the establishment of housing trust funds. The relevant section of AB 101 is attached for reference.

The Department of Housing and Community Development will be developing guidelines for these programs in the next few months. MCOG will have until January 31, 2021, to request allocation of funds, however, the local agency funding pot must be allocated sooner. We will be having a preliminary meeting with local agency Planning and Community Development staff the week of August 12 to discuss the upcoming programs.

MCOG’s role in land use and housing related planning has previously been limited to development of the RHNA and Blueprint Planning efforts of several years ago. With the increasing focus on housing planning and production at the State level, we anticipate that we may see the addition of more housing related responsibilities for COGs in the future. More information will be provided to the MCOG Board in the coming months as details on these programs emerge.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** This item is for information only. No action is required.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** None identified – information only.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** This item is for information only. No action is required.

---

**SEC. 11.**

Chapter 3.1 (commencing with Section 50515) is added to Part 2 of Division 31 of the Health and Safety Code, to read:

**CHAPTER 3.1. Local Government Planning Support Grants Program**

**50515.**

For purposes of this chapter:

- (a) "Annual progress report" means the annual report required to be submitted to the department pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 65400 of the Government Code.
- (b) "Completed entitlement" means a housing development project that has received all the required land use approvals or entitlements necessary for the issuance of a building permit and for which no additional action, including environmental review or appeals, is required to be eligible to apply for and obtain a building permit.
- (c) "Council of governments" means a single or multicounty council created by a joint powers agreement pursuant to Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 6500) of Division 7 of Title 1 of the Government Code that is responsible for allocating regional housing need pursuant to Sections 65584, 65584.04, and 65584.05 of the Government Code.
- (d) "Housing element" or "element" means the housing element of a community's general plan, as required pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 65302 of the Government Code and prepared in accordance with Article 10.6 (commencing with Section 65580) of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code.
- (e) "Jurisdiction" means a city, county, or city and county.
- (f) "Program" means the Local Government Planning Support Grants Program established pursuant to this chapter.
- (g) "Regional housing need assessment" means the existing and projected need for housing for each region, as determined by the department pursuant to Section 65584.01 of the Government Code.

**50515.01.**

- (a) (1) The Local Government Planning Support Grants Program is hereby established for the purpose of providing regions and jurisdictions with one-time funding, including grants for planning activities to enable jurisdictions to meet the sixth cycle of the regional housing need assessment.
- (2) Upon appropriation by the Legislature, two hundred fifty million dollars (\$250,000,000) shall be distributed under the program in accordance with this chapter, as provided in Sections 50515.02 and 50515.03.
- (b) The department shall administer the program and, consistent with the requirements of this chapter, provide grants to regions and jurisdictions for technical assistance, preparation and adoption of planning documents, and process improvements to accelerate housing production and facilitate compliance to implement the sixth cycle of the regional housing need assessment.
- (c) Of the total amount of any moneys appropriated for purposes of this chapter, the department shall set aside up to 5 percent for program administration, including state operations expenditures and technical assistance, as well as expenditures by recipients of funding pursuant to Sections 50515.02 and 50515.03.

**50515.02.**

Of the amount described in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 50515.01, one hundred twenty-five million dollars (\$125,000,000) shall be available to councils of governments and other regional entities, as follows:

(a) The moneys allocated pursuant to this subdivision shall be available to the following entities:

(1) The Association of Bay Area Governments, representing the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma, and the City and County of San Francisco.

(2) The Sacramento Area Council of Governments, representing the Counties of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba.

(3) The San Diego Association of Governments, representing the County of San Diego.

(4) The Southern California Association of Governments, representing the Counties of Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura.

(5) A central coast multiagency working group, formed in accordance with subdivision (c), consisting of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, and the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments, representing the Counties of Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz.

(6) A San Joaquin Valley multiagency working group, formed in accordance with subdivision (c), consisting of the Fresno Council of Governments, the Kern Council of Governments, the Kings County Association of Governments, the Madera County Transportation Commission, the Merced County Association of Governments, the San Joaquin Council of Governments, the Stanislaus Council of Governments, and the Tulare County Association of Governments, representing the Counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Tulare.

(7) Councils of governments from the Counties of Butte, Humboldt, Lake, and Mendocino. Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the councils of governments described in this paragraph may apply directly to the department for funds pursuant to the program.

(8) The Counties of Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Inyo, Lassen, Mariposa, Modoc, Mono, Nevada, Plumas, Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Tuolumne, and Trinity. Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the counties described in this paragraph may apply directly to the department for funds pursuant to the program. The department may approve a fiscal agent to receive funds from the amount identified in this section on behalf of a county or consortium of counties listed in this paragraph.

(b) (1) Except as otherwise provided in paragraphs (7) and (8) of subdivision (a), the department shall make the allocations required by this subdivision to each regional entity on behalf all of the jurisdictions represented by that entity. The department shall calculate the amount of each allocation in accordance with the population estimates consistent with the methodology described in subdivision (a) of Section 50515.03.

(2) Each council of governments or other regional entity may, in consultation with the department and consistent with the requirements of this chapter, determine the appropriate use of funds or suballocations within its boundaries to appropriately address its unique housing and planning priorities.

(c) The following shall apply with respect to any allocation made pursuant to this subdivision to a multiagency working group, as described in paragraphs (5) and (6) of subdivision (a):

(1) Before November 30, 2019, the multiagency working groups described in paragraphs (5) and (6) of subdivision (a) shall be formed as follows:

(A) Each working group shall consist of the following members:

(i) One representative from each county described in paragraph (5) or (6), as applicable, of subdivision (a).

(ii) Two city representatives from each county described in paragraph (5) or (6), as applicable, of subdivision (a) appointed by the city selection committee for that county. In appointing city representatives, the city selection committee shall appoint one representative of a larger city within the county and one representative of a smaller city within the county.

(iii) Of the three representatives from each county serving on the multiagency working group pursuant to clauses (i) and (ii), at least one of the representatives shall also be a member of the governing body of the applicable council of governments representing the county.

(B) The multiagency working group shall select a council of governments to serve as the fiscal agent of the multiagency working group and identify staff to assist the work of the group. If the multiagency working group fails to agree to the selection of a council of governments to serve as fiscal agent pursuant to this clause within a reasonable time period, the department shall select a fiscal agent based on factors such as capacity and experience in administering grant programs.

(C) Upon its formation, the multiagency working group shall notify each city and county that is a member of a council of governments described in paragraph (5) or (6), as applicable, of subdivision (a) of its purpose pursuant to this section.

(2) In recognition of the unique challenges in developing a process through a multiagency working group, the department shall allocate eight million dollars (\$8,000,000) of the amount available pursuant to this subdivision to the multiagency working groups described in paragraphs (5) and (6) of subdivision (a), as follows:

(A) Twenty-five percent of the amount subject to this subparagraph shall be allocated to the central coast multiagency working group described in paragraph (5) of subdivision (a).

(B) Seventy-five percent of the amount subject to this subparagraph shall be allocated to the San Joaquin Valley multiagency working group described in paragraph (6) of subdivision (a).

(d) (1) **Until January 31, 2021, a council of governments or other regional entity described in subdivision (a), or a county described in paragraph (8) of subdivision (a), may request an allocation of funds** pursuant to this section by submitting an application, in the form and manner prescribed by the department, that includes the following information:

(A) An allocation budget for the funds provided pursuant to this section.

(B) The amounts retained by the council of governments, regional entity, or county, and any suballocations to jurisdictions.

(C) An explanation of how proposed uses will increase housing planning and facilitate local housing production.

(D) Identification of current best practices at the regional and statewide level that promote sufficient supply of housing affordable to all income levels, and a strategy for increasing adoption of these practices at the regional level, where viable.

(E) An education and outreach strategy to inform local agencies of the need and benefits of taking early action related to the sixth cycle regional needs allocation.

(2) The department shall review an application submitted pursuant to this subdivision within 30 days. Upon approval of an application for funds pursuant to this subdivision, the department shall award the moneys for which the council of governments, other regional entity, or county, as applicable, qualifies.

(e) A council of governments, other regional entity, or county that receives an allocation of funds pursuant to this section shall establish priorities and use those moneys to increase housing planning and accelerate housing production, as follows:

(1) Developing an improved methodology for the distribution of the sixth cycle regional housing need assessment to further the objectives described in subdivision (d) of Section 65584 of the Government Code.

(2) Suballocating moneys directly and equitably to jurisdictions or other subregional entities in the form of grants, to be used in accordance with subdivision (f), for planning that will accommodate the development of housing and infrastructure that will accelerate housing production in a way that aligns with state planning priorities, housing, transportation, equity, and climate goals.

(3) Providing jurisdictions and other local agencies with technical assistance, planning, temporary staffing or consultant needs associated with updating local planning and zoning documents, expediting application processing, and other actions to accelerate additional housing production.

(4) Covering the costs of administering any programs described in this subdivision.

(f) An entity that receives a suballocation of funds pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (e) shall only use that suballocation for housing-related planning activities, including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) Technical assistance in improving housing permitting processes, tracking systems, and planning tools.

(2) Establishing regional or countywide housing trust funds for affordable housing.

(3) Performing infrastructure planning, including for sewers, water systems, transit, roads, or other public facilities necessary to support new housing and new residents.

(4) Performing feasibility studies to determine the most efficient locations to site housing consistent with Sections 65041.1 and 65080 of the Government Code.

(5) Covering the costs of temporary staffing or consultant needs associated with the activities described in paragraphs (1) to (4), inclusive.

### **50515.03.**

Of the amount described in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 50515.01, one hundred twenty-five million dollars (\$125,000,000) shall be available to jurisdictions to assist in planning for other activities related to meeting the sixth cycle regional housing need assessment, as follows:

(a) (1) The maximum amount that a jurisdiction may receive pursuant to this subdivision shall be as follows:

(A) If the jurisdiction has a population of 750,000 or greater, one million five hundred thousand dollars (\$1,500,000).

(B) If the jurisdiction has a population of 300,000 or greater, but equal to or less than 749,999, seven hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$750,000).

(C) If the jurisdiction has a population of 100,000 or greater, but equal to or less than 299,999, five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000).

(D) If the jurisdiction has a population of 60,000 or greater, but equal to or less than 99,999, three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000).

(E) If the jurisdiction has a population of 20,000 or greater, but equal to or less than 59,999, one hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000).

(F) If the jurisdiction has a population equal to or less than 19,999, sixty-five thousand dollars (\$65,000).

(2) For purposes of this subdivision, the population of a jurisdiction shall be based on the population estimates posted on the Department of Finance's internet website as of January 1, 2019.

(b) (1) Until July 1, 2020, a jurisdiction may request an allocation of funds pursuant to this section by submitting an application to the department, in the form and manner prescribed by the department, that contains the following information:

(A) An allocation budget for the funds provided pursuant to this section.

(B) An explanation of how proposed uses will increase housing planning and facilitate local housing production.

(2) The department shall review an application submitted pursuant to this subdivision within 30 days. Upon approval of an application for funds pursuant to this subdivision, the department shall award the moneys for which the jurisdiction qualifies.

(c) A jurisdiction that receives an allocation pursuant to this section shall only use that allocation for housing-related planning activities, including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) Rezoning and encouraging development by updating planning documents and zoning ordinances, such as general plans, community plans, specific plans, sustainable communities' strategies, and local coastal programs.

(2) Completing environmental clearance to eliminate the need for project-specific review.

(3) Establishing a workforce housing opportunity zone pursuant to Article 10.10 (commencing with Section 65620) of Chapter 3 of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code or a housing sustainability district pursuant to Chapter 11 (commencing with Section 66200) of Division 1 of Title 7 of the Government Code.

(4) Performing infrastructure planning, including for sewers, water systems, transit, roads, or other public facilities necessary to support new housing and new residents.

(5) Partnering with other local entities to identify and prepare excess property for residential development.

(6) Revamping local planning processes to speed up housing production.

(7) Developing or improving an accessory dwelling unit ordinance in compliance with Section 65852.2 of the Government Code.

(8) Covering the costs of temporary staffing or consultant needs associated with the activities described in paragraphs (1) to (7), inclusive.

#### **50515.04.**

(a) (1) Subject to paragraph (2), a council of governments, other regional entity, or jurisdiction, as applicable, that receives an allocation of program funds pursuant to Section 50515.02 or 50515.03 shall submit a report, in the form and manner prescribed by the department, to be made publicly available on its internet website, by

April 1 of the year following the receipt of those funds, and annually thereafter until those funds are expended, that contains the following information:

(A) The status of the proposed uses listed in the entity's application for funding and the corresponding impact on housing within the region or jurisdiction, as applicable, categorized based on the eligible uses specified in Section 50515.02 or 50515.03, as applicable.

(B) A summary of building permits, certificates of occupancy, or other completed entitlements issued by entities within the region or by the jurisdiction, as applicable.

(2) A city or county that receives program funds shall, in lieu of providing a separate annual report pursuant to this subdivision, provide the information required by paragraph (1) as part of its annual progress report.

(b) (1) The department shall maintain records of the following and provide that information publicly on its internet website:

(A) The name of each applicant for program funds and the status of that entity's application.

(B) The number of applications for program funding received by the department.

(C) The information described in subdivision (a) for each recipient of program funds.

(2) The department may request additional information, as needed, to meet other applicable reporting or audit requirements.

(c) (1) Each recipient of funds under the program shall expend those funds no later than December 31, 2023.

(2) No later than December 31, 2024, each council of governments, other regional entity, or county that receives an allocation of funds pursuant to Section 50515.02 shall submit a final report on the use of those funds to the department. The report required by this paragraph shall include an evaluation of jurisdiction actions taken in support of the entity's proposed uses of those funds, as specified in the entity's application, including which actions had greatest impact on housing production.

(d) The department may monitor expenditures and activities of an applicant, as the department deems necessary, to ensure compliance with program requirements.

(e) The department may, as it deems appropriate or necessary, request the repayment of funds from an applicant, or pursue any other remedies available to it by law for failure to comply with program requirements.

(f) The department may implement the program through the issuance of forms, guidelines, and one or more notices of funding availability, as the department deems necessary, to exercise the powers and perform the duties conferred on it by this chapter. Any forms, guidelines, and notices of funding availability adopted pursuant to this section are hereby exempted from the rulemaking provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act (Chapter 3.5 (commencing with Section 11340) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code).

(g) The department's decision to approve or deny an application or request for funding pursuant to the program, and its determination of the amount of funding to be provided, shall be final.

#### **50515.05.**

(a) It is the intent of the Legislature to revamp the existing regional housing need allocation process described in Sections 65584 to 65584.2, inclusive, of the Government Code in order to accomplish the following objectives:

(1) Create a fair, transparent, and objective process for identifying housing needs across the state.



(2) Strategically plan for housing growth according to statewide priorities, consistent with Section 65041.1 of the Government Code, and expected future need for housing at all income levels.

(3) Encourage increased development to address the state's housing affordability issues.

(4) Improve compliance and outcomes through incentives and enforcement.

(b) (1) By December 31, 2022, the department, in collaboration with the Office of Planning and Research and after engaging in stakeholder participation, shall develop a recommended improved regional housing need allocation process and methodology that promotes and streamlines housing development and substantially addresses California's housing shortage.

(2) In developing the recommendations required by this subdivision, the department may appoint a third-party consultant to facilitate a comprehensive review of the current regional housing need allocation process and methodology.

(c) Upon completion of the process described in subdivision (b), the department shall submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the Legislature. The report required to be submitted pursuant to this subdivision shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.