



MENDOCINO  
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482  
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B  
(707) 463-1859  
Transportation Planning: Suite G  
(707) 234-3434

May 28, 2021

**To:** MCOG Board of Directors  
**From:** Janet Orth, Deputy Director / CFO  
**Subject:** Information Packet of June 7, 2021 Meeting - No Action Required

\*\*\*\*\*

The following items are attached.

1. Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) – Comments on the draft plan submitted by Executive Director Barrett, as directed by the Council on May 3.
2. California Road Charge Pilot – Press release dated March 17: “Caltrans Receives \$2.15 Million Federal Grant to Study Road User Charge in Rural Communities.” This will be the third phase of pilot studies and demonstrations since 2016, as the state addresses the complexities of moving from a transportation revenue system based on fuel consumption to a system based on miles driven.  
The California Transportation Commission’s Road Charge Technical Advisory Committee met on May 21 and discussed research by Mineta Transportation Institute and issues including pricing equity, privacy best practices, how to assess miles driven on public versus private roads, how to assess all drivers on California roads (visitors, deliveries, etc.), use of GIS and gaps in broadband services.
3. Transportation California’ Proposal for State Budget – The most recent version of this proposal to the Legislature for “Support for Additional Funding for Climate Friendly Transportation Infrastructure in the 2021-22 State Budget.”  
Executive Director Barrett had signed on to the coalition’s letter, as reported at the May 3 Council meeting; however, negotiations are ongoing and the proposal has since been modified and backed by several Senators. Based on the surplus in the Governor’s May Revise budget, this proposal requests over \$4 billion in one-time investments to infrastructure and related programs.
4. MCOG Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) – Meeting minutes of April 19, 2021.



MENDOCINO  
COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482  
www.mendocinocog.org

Information # 1

MCOG Meeting

6/07/2021

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B

(707) 463-1859

Transportation Planning: Suite G

(707) 234-3434

May 18, 2021

California State Transportation Agency  
Attn: Darwin Moosavi, Deputy Secretary  
915 Capitol Mall, Suite 350B  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Comments on the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure

Dear Mr. Moosavi:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the draft Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI). The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) has in general embraced efforts to reduce the effects of climate change and increase multimodal transportation options. Local efforts to reduce climate change and vehicle miles traveled include maximizing transit funding, including purchase of fully electric transit vehicles, and implementation of active transportation projects on local streets and roads as well as state highways. Additional efforts by MCOG include encouraging implementation of EV charging networks through adoption of the Mendocino County ZEV and Alternative Fuels Readiness Plan and funding installation of public charging infrastructure.

In Mendocino County we are keenly aware of climate-related impacts to transportation. Extreme weather conditions in recent years have led to road closures due to increased flooding and slides. More frequent and widespread wildfires have highlighted the need for improved and increased evacuation routes. Our aging, rural roadways have been heavily impacted by frequent trips of heavy vehicles and equipment during post-wildfire clean up and reconstruction.

While we support the overall goals of CAPTI, we want to make sure that progress toward those goals is made in a way that allows rural regions to be viable participants in the State's transportation funding programs, benefits disadvantage communities in rural areas, allows for critical safety improvements on rural roads and highways, and supports the completion of transportation projects that have undergone years of planning and funding during development. This letter includes both general concerns as well as specific comments and recommendations on implementation strategies and actions. Because we believe these concerns are shared by many regions, we encourage the creation of a stakeholder working group, including rural representation, to guide implementation of the strategies and actions in this plan.

In general, as a rural region with limited funding, we rely upon competitive grant programs to fund major transportation projects. We are concerned that even greater emphasis on reduction of vehicle miles traveled, infill projects, and mode shift across a wide range of programs will affect our ability to be successful in statewide competitive programs and make it difficult to complete projects,

including those that would support the goals of CAPTI, such as active transportation projects. Our lower populations and geographic distance between remote communities reduce our capacity for mode-shift and make it harder to compete in these categories.

Another general concern with the implementation strategies in CAPTI is the potential to significantly change the programs created by Senate Bill 1. Voters demonstrated their support of SB 1 and its programs through the defeat of Proposition 6 in 2018. Unfortunately, some of the strategies included in the draft CAPTI, particularly Strategies S1 and S2, propose to change those programs and undermine voter trust.

The following are comments on specific strategies proposed in the draft CAPTI:

#### Strategy S2:

- S2.2: While rail can certainly provide benefit for some parts of the state, there are many regions of California that have no meaningful rail system, and likely never will. Through Mendocino County, recent legislation has started a process to convert our inactive rail corridor to a trail. Prioritizing rail investment “across all funding opportunities” has the potential to reduce funding that is currently open to all regions, while benefiting just a few.
- S2.4: Increasing ATP funding should not come at the cost of other critical transportation infrastructure programs. Mendocino County agencies regularly apply for Active Transportation funding. We are supportive of additional funding for the program, however, many other important transportation activities are also underfunded. Taking funds from other transportation infrastructure programs that are themselves underfunded, such as the STBG program, can reduce funding that rural regions use to conduct some of the most essential activities, such as basic maintenance of existing infrastructure. We recommend Cap and Trade funding as an ongoing source of additional Active Transportation Program funding. In addition, we are supportive of the proposed one-time augmentation of the program in the FY 21-22 state budget as proposed by both the CTC and Transportation California.
- S2.5: We support the need for discussions on sustainable rural transportation solutions and look forward to participating in these efforts.

#### Strategy S3:

- S3.1: We support the establishment of transportation equity and environmental justice advisory committees. When discussing transportation equity, it is critical that the rural perspective be included, and therefore request that a rural representative be included in these committees. Rural regions are home to some of the state’s most disadvantage communities, and their remoteness and lack of access often make it even harder for those communities to overcome their disadvantaged conditions.
- S3.4: Although we understand the need for tools to assist in project evaluation, reliance upon indices in the past has led to an inability to participate in funding programs in rural Mendocino County. An example of this is CalEnviroScreen, which has been used in several grant programs to identify disadvantaged communities. Mendocino County is home to several severely disadvantage communities, such as the Hopland Rancheria with a median income that’s only 36% of the state average. However, because those communities are in air quality attainment, they are not considered disadvantaged per the CalEnviroScreen definition, and are therefore ineligible for certain grant programs. If an index is developed, we request that flexibility be allowed in methods to evaluate equity and not rely solely on an index tool.

#### Strategy S4:

- S4: Several actions in Strategy 4 could result in Caltrans project prioritization that would hurt safety in rural areas. Safety related improvements on State highways in rural areas often involve widening out of necessity. For instance, widening may be needed to provide separation between vehicles on a two-lane highway experiencing crossover collisions, or to accommodate turn lanes/pockets where rear-end collisions occur. This is of particular concern in Mendocino County where we have many two-lane, rural highways, which often serve as Main Street through communities. Although these projects do not have the potential to increase capacity like projects in urban areas, the prioritization proposed would still steer Caltrans away from these projects and critical safety improvements in rural areas won't happen.
- S4.4: While we support efforts to include multi-modal, sustainable transportation in highway corridor planning, we also recognize that a dramatic refocusing of corridor planning could result in regions' inability to move forward with projects that have been in development for years, or even decades. Based on past experience, we know that major projects in rural areas take longer to plan, implement, and fund than in urban areas. In addition, most rural areas are unable to fund major projects on State highways without a Caltrans funding partnership. This reprioritization should be done in a way that still allows projects that already have significant time and money invested in development to move forward.

In addition, S4.4 calls for innovative safety solutions that advance sustainable transportation modes, particularly in rural communities. While we welcome this, and hope that it would lead to improvements to bike and pedestrian safety where state highways are Main Street, it's also critical to acknowledge that sometimes safety concerns in rural areas call for traditional solutions. For instance, vehicle accidents on rural, two-lane highways may call for widening to allow for vehicle separation or recovery. It's critical that promoting innovative safety solutions does not lead to the elimination of still needed traditional solutions.

#### Strategy S5:

- S5.1: We support development of climate risk assessment planning and implementation guidance. However, we request that the reliance on Caltrans' District Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Priorities Reports, which were developed as part of a statewide contract, be minimized. Our District assessment and priorities focused on only a few climate related risks in our county, and the prioritization did not address some of our most critical climate related needs, including areas of frequent flooding, slides, and fire evacuation. We encourage that further state efforts utilize local information on vulnerability and prioritization in addition to these District assessments.
- S5.2: Implementation of climate adaptation is critical. In Mendocino County we have identified many needed climate adaptation transportation infrastructure projects, but are unable to secure funding for all but the smallest projects. However, existing SB 1 competitive programs are both inappropriate and inadequate funding sources for these projects. Projects that implement adaptation strategies are likely to be large and costly. Trying to fund these projects with existing SB 1 programs that are intended for other purposes would either greatly impact those programs or result in a continued lack of funding for adaptation projects. New sources are needed to fund infrastructure projects that implement adaptation strategies.

Strategy S7:

- S7.1 – When considering ways to strengthen the connections between transportation and land use, jobs and water availability should be considered in addition to infill housing. While several of our local jurisdictions have made efforts to encourage infill housing development, the reality in rural regions is that the residents of the housing, infill or otherwise, frequently must travel long distances for employment, in part because rural communities have small water services districts that lack sufficient number of customer accounts to be able to afford to expand service, unless State water grants are made available. Job creation should be considered as part of this equation, along with infill housing. It should also be noted that while the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities program is called out in this Action as a success, many parts of the state have never found success through this program.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide comment on the draft CAPTI. We appreciate the efforts of both CalSTA and CTC staff to provide multiple workshops and opportunities for engagement. We look forward to working with state agencies to help meet the State's climate goals in a way that works for all Californians.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Nephele Barrett". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Nephele Barrett  
Executive Director

Cc: Brad Mettam, Caltrans District 1  
Matthew Yosgott, CTC

[Travel](#)[Work with Caltrans](#)[Programs](#)[Caltrans Near Me](#)[Search](#)[Home](#) | [News Releases](#) | [\\$2.15M Fed Grant Rural Road User Charge](#)

# Caltrans Receives \$2.15 Million Federal Grant to Study Road User Charge in Rural Communities

Published: Mar 17, 2021

**District:** Headquarters

**Contact:** Tamie McGowen

**Phone:** (916) 416-8615

**SACRAMENTO** — Caltrans received a \$2.15 million grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) today to study impacts of a potential road user charge program in rural communities. The grant builds upon Caltrans' ongoing research on possible alternatives to the state gas tax to fund road and highway maintenance. In a road charge system, drivers could be charged for the miles they travel rather than the gasoline they use.

“As the state looks toward a zero-emission future, California needs to study alternatives to the gas tax to fund our transportation infrastructure. It is critical that we fully understand how a road charge program may uniquely impact rural communities and work together to find solutions.”

— Toks Omishakin, Caltrans Director

With the grant, Caltrans will study the viability of GPS technology in differentiating between public and private roads — a key area of research. The project will also identify priorities and analyze potential benefits of a statewide road charge program in rural and tribal communities. Caltrans will use volunteers for the study, which it expects to complete in mid-2023.

Caltrans received the grant as part of the USDOT Surface Transportation System Funding Alternatives Program, which supports projects that test alternative tools — such as road charge — to fund transportation maintenance. This program was established in conjunction with the federal Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act of 2015, aimed at providing long-term funding certainty for surface transportation nationwide.

This project will be Caltrans' third road charge study. The initial [California Road Charge Pilot](#) launched in 2016 and ran for nine months. During that time, more than 5,000 vehicles from all over the state reported over 37 million miles driven, through six different reporting and recording methods ranging from manual methods to highly technical methods with optional location-based services.

Caltrans launched its second project in January to study how best to facilitate an easy user experience. Based on recommendations from the original pilot report, this project simulates a road charge with four technologies: pay at the pump/charge point, usage-based insurance, ridesharing and autonomous vehicles.

California is also partnering with Oregon, which has a voluntary road charge program, on a pilot project to explore issues around interoperability between states and help develop a potential regional system.

To learn more about the California Road Charge program, and the efforts to design a more fair and sustainable way to fund road maintenance, preservation and improvements for all Californians, visit [CARoadCharge.com](#).



May 28, 2021

The Honorable Nany Skinner  
Chair, Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee  
State Capitol, Room 5094  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Phil Ting  
Chair, Assembly Budget Committee  
State Capitol, Room 6026  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: Support for Additional Funding for Climate Friendly Transportation Infrastructure in the 2021-22 State Budget**

Dear Senator Skinner, Assembly Member Ting,

The undersigned organizations write in strong support of additional funding for strategic, multimodal transportation infrastructure investments in the 2021-22 State Budget to supplement the healthy investments Governor Newsom proposed in his May Revision and that your relevant subcommittees have already approved. The state has a unique opportunity to use its windfall of one-time revenues to repair our aging infrastructure while also accelerating progress in meeting the state's safety, mobility, climate, housing, health, and equity goals. Moreover, investing in infrastructure is the ideal use for one-time money, will support the state's economic recovery, and creates and sustains living-wage jobs.



Consistent with the attached requests from several of your colleagues, we respectfully call on you incorporate one-time appropriations for the following programs:

- \$300 million for the Trade Corridor Enhancement Program
- \$300 million for the Solutions for Congested Corridor Program
- \$500 million for the Highway Bridge Program
- \$250 million for the Highway Safety Improvement Program
- \$500 million for a new State and Local Climate Adaptation Program
- \$10 million for Climate Change/Transportation/Housing/High-Roads Jobs Related Research

We also support increased funding for the Active Transportation Program for a total of \$1 billion in 2021-22 (the Governor proposed \$500 million); providing \$250 million for non-brownfield remediation activities in the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program (the May Revise includes \$250 million for brownfield activities exclusively), and support a \$1 billion appropriation to invest more heavily in the charging and refueling infrastructure necessary to support the state's transition to zero-emission vehicles, trucks, and equipment.

Collectively, these investments will aid the state in meeting its safety, mobility, housing, and climate related challenges within the transportation sector. These outlined programs have a proven track record of funding projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce vehicle miles traveled, decrease the time spent in congestion, and provide more healthy transportation alternatives. Moreover, the proposed augmentations to existing programs would help fund a backlog of already vetted, high-scoring, and ready to deliver projects across the state.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of these meritorious investments. Should you have any questions, please contact Kiana Valentine, Executive Director for Transportation California ([kiana@politicogroup.com](mailto:kiana@politicogroup.com) or (916) 266-3892.

Sincerely,



*Approved 5/19/21*

## MINUTES

### MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Meeting Held Remotely via Zoom Meeting/Teleconference*

**April 21, 2021**

#### **Members Present**

Chantell O’Neal, City of Fort Bragg  
Tasha Ahlstrand, Caltrans  
Dusty Duley, City of Willits  
Alicia Meier, County DOT  
Paul Andersen, City of Point Arena  
Tim Eriksen, City of Ukiah  
Mark Cliser, Co. DPBS (*arrived approx. 10:18 a.m.*)\*

#### **Staff & Others Present**

Nephele Barrett, MCOG Administration  
Loretta Ellard, MCOG Planning  
James Sookne, MCOG Planning  
Charlene Parker, MCOG Planning  
Jessica Stull-Otto

#### **Members Absent**

Mitch Stogner, NCRA (*Non-Voting*)  
Barbara Moed, AQMD  
Jacob King, MTA

- Call to Order/Introductions** – Nephele called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Individuals present on the Zoom meeting/teleconference were identified. *\*Staff was unaware that Mark Cliser joined the meeting late, until the meeting ended. Therefore, his name was not called during roll call votes.*
- Public Expression** – None.
- Input from Native American Tribal Governments’ Representatives** – No tribal representatives were present.
- Approval of 3/17/21 Minutes** - Dusty requested a correction on page 2, item #6, as follows: “...but the meeting was unproductive so they set up a site meeting virtual meeting setting didn’t allow for full evaluation so they set up a site meeting...” **Motion by Alicia Meier, seconded by Tim Eriksen, and carried on roll call vote (5 ayes – Duley, Meier, Eriksen, Andersen, Ahlstrand; 1 abstention – O’Neal) to approve the minutes of 3/17/21 as corrected.**
- Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Funding** – Nephele noted the first two rounds of HIP funding were awarded to Ukiah’s Downtown Streetscape project, and the third and fourth rounds include much smaller amounts. A total of \$169,176 is available (\$93,208 for FY 19/20, and \$75,968 for FY 20/21). She summarized that three projects have been discussed by the TAC for this funding: City of Willits’ Highway 20/Walnut Street crossing project; City of Ukiah’s Downtown Streetscape, Ph. 2 project; and the County’s Ackerman Creek bridge project.

Nephele advised she recently learned that Willits' project is not ready to move forward. Dusty and Tasha addressed this item, with Tasha explaining that Caltrans traffic safety staff conducted a field review on April 8, and it was determined that more time is needed for evaluation.

Of the two remaining projects, Nephele suggested the Ackerman Creek project makes the most sense, as the County hopes to go to construction this season, and if not, next year. While acknowledging the value of the second phase of the Downtown Streetscape project, she had concerns about timing, and since it received the first two rounds of funding, thought this would be an opportunity to share funding with other projects.

Tim expressed appreciation for Ukiah's project receiving the prior funding, and said he will be happy to be in a back-up position to the County's project. He added that timing could be quicker than expected, with the project possibly going to construction next season. Alicia commented on the importance of the Ackerman Creek bridge project, and said the County is just waiting for the bridge program funding to be allocated. Although the college has contributed some funds toward the local match, approx. \$1 million is still needed, and the bridge (*approx. \$11m construction cost*) does not qualify for toll credits, so any help with the local share will be very beneficial.

**Motion by Tim Eriksen, seconded by Dusty Duley, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (6 ayes – Duley, Meier, Eriksen, O'Neal, Andersen, Ahlstrand) to recommend to MCOG that the \$169,176 of HIP funds for years 3 and 4 be awarded to the County's Ackerman Creek bridge project.**

It was briefly discussed whether Tim wanted to add to the motion that Ukiah's project would be in a back-up position, but he declined. Nephele noted staff can advise the MCOG Board of that discussion without making it a condition of approval.

**6. Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriation Act of 2021 (CRRSAA) (HR 133) Funding** – James reviewed his staff report and explained the CTC approved a distribution formula for the CRRSAA funds based 50% on STBG formula and 50% on STIP formula, which resulted in a total of \$1,622,007 for the Mendocino County region. Of this amount, \$423,875 will flow through the STBG program, and \$1,198,132 through the STIP (including PPM of \$59,907).

He reviewed that at the last TAC meeting the TAC supported a formula funding distribution instead of a competitive application cycle. At the April MCOG Board meeting, the TAC's preference was presented, and the Board directed staff to develop formula distribution scenarios. He drafted several scenarios including base amounts plus 50/50 split of population and center-lane miles. Base amount options were: Scenario 1 (\$50,000); Scenario 2 (\$100,000); or Scenario 3 (\$150,000). Nephele suggested Scenario 2 was a good compromise, and several members expressed support for Scenario 2. No one expressed support for a different base amount.

Discussion continued with James explaining the various scenarios, and with James and Nephele responding to questions. Nephele addressed differences between funds administered through the STIP vs funds flowing through the STBG program, and referenced the draft CRRSAA program guidelines

included with the staff report. Some answers are not yet known (*i.e. can funds be added to projects already allocated, or to projects already under contract?*) and staff has asked (or can ask) CTC/Caltrans staff. Accelerated STIP timelines were noted for agencies wanting to program funds in the mid-cycle STIP.

The challenge of having to work with two different programs was noted, and it was agreed it would be easier for some agencies to not have to work with both STIP and STBG programs. During discussion, a new option emerged (*which James shared on Zoom, subsequently named “Scenario 2G”*) which would allocate only STIP funds to Ukiah, Willits, and Fort Bragg, and only STBG funds to Point Arena; with a mix of STIP/STBG to the County. This scenario was supported by all, as the County (which receives the most money) would be the only agency receiving funds from both programs.

**Motion by Dusty Duley, seconded by Chantell O’Neal, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (6 ayes – Duley, Meier, Eriksen, O’Neal, Andersen, Ahlstrand), to recommend that MCOG adopt Scenario #2G for distribution of the CRRSAA funds:**

	Scenario #2G		
	\$100,000 Base		
	STIP	STBG	Total
County	\$ 599,619.45	\$ 318,509.72	\$ 918,129.17
Ukiah	\$ 232,694.96	\$ -	\$ 232,694.96
Willits	\$ 144,050.60	\$ -	\$ 144,050.60
Fort Bragg	\$ 161,859.99	\$ -	\$ 161,859.99
Point Arena	\$ -	\$ 105,365.28	\$ 105,365.28
Total:	\$ 1,138,225.00	\$ 423,875.00	\$ 1,562,100.00

Nephele summarized that James will follow up with local agencies to get clarification on what agencies would like to do with their funds, and this item (*and any project lists, if ready*) will be presented for approval at the next MCOG meeting.

**7. Staff Reports**

7a. 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan Update – Loretta reported she is continuing to work with local agencies to gather information, and virtual public outreach is continuing through the public outreach platform “Social Pinpoint” on MCOG’s website. She reviewed online interaction numbers (*surveys completed, map comments, etc.*) and said staff plans to send out another round of advertisements soon to encourage more input. Jessica Stull-Otto, Round Valley MAC member, offered to share the outreach flyer with the RVMAC, and welcomed a presentation at an

upcoming meeting. She said several MACs are meeting tomorrow, and she offered to share the information. Nephele advised that she will also be attending the “big MAC” meeting tomorrow. Jessica suggested that staff also reach out to the Board of Supervisors, and other groups such as the Climate Advisory Committee, and said she would follow-up with an email including contact information.

Loretta and Nephele asked members to continue sharing the flyer and encouraged all to take the transportation survey. Nephele added the link to the project website to the chat:

<https://www.mendocinocog.org/regional-transportation-plan-rtp-active-transportation-plan-2022-update>

7b. Coordinated Public Transit – Human Services Transportation Plan Update – Loretta explained that each region is required to adopt a Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan in order to qualify for certain federal funding sources. The purpose of these plans is to address transportation needs of elderly, disabled, and low-income individuals, and projects must be included in a Coordinated Plan to be eligible for funding. She said past projects have mainly included vehicles for senior centers, and Nephele added that senior center operations have also been eligible for the past few years under the expanded Sec. 5310 program (*which recently received federal stimulus funding*).

Loretta advised the state hired a consultant to help rural agencies develop their plans. The consultant has now submitted the proposed final plan, which has been posted on MCOG’s website, and is scheduled for MCOG adoption on May 3. This 2021 Coordinated Plan is an update to the 2015 plan.

7c. Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) – Update – Loretta said the consultant (TJKM) has requested that local agencies post a link on their agency website to the LRSP project page, and it looks like all have now done so. The next monthly meeting with consultant (*not a TAG meeting*) is April 26.

Nephele said she put a link to the LRSP website in the chat, and asked Jessica Stull-Otto to also advise the Round Valley MAC of this opportunity to provide input on safety concerns, which are not always reflected in accident reports. She said LRSPs are a requirement of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) program, which funds safety projects, and it is important to capture unreported safety concerns since the program is largely based on data. She asked Loretta to send the project website link (<https://www.mendocinocog.org/seeking-input-for-local-road-safety-plans>) to Jessica.

7d. MCOG May 3, 2021 Meeting – Virtual Tour of Ukiah Area Projects – Nephele announced this upcoming virtual tour of Ukiah area transportation projects. She explained that in-person tours of transportation projects in various areas of the County were held in the past to provide an opportunity for board members to visit areas of the County they may not often see, and this will be the first virtual tour. She noted she has reviewed the video, and complimented the quality presentation, including the use of drones to capture video.

7e. Notice of Funding Opportunity for the Department of Transportation’s National Infrastructure Investments – Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) – Nephele noted this federal grant program, advising that it replaced the former BUILD program. She explained that it’s for large infrastructure projects, with an emphasis on economic development and

sustainability. She suggested the Orchard Avenue extension might be a good example of an eligible project, and noted the July 12 due date.

**8. Miscellaneous**

Active Transportation Program (ATP) Augmentation – Lisa mentioned that agencies are being asked to support CTC Commissioner Alvarado’s request for a one-time infusion of \$2 billion augmentation to the ATP program, in the state budget. Nephele said she hopes to take this to the MCOG Board if there is time, and noted the state budget surplus is due to revenues exceeding estimates, coupled with cuts to the last budget. Loretta offered to distribute the email/request so local agencies can take to their boards/councils, if interested.

Summer Intern – Lisa said she knows a college student (studying environmental engineering) who is looking for summer work, and invited members to contact her if they need a summer intern.

8a. Next Meeting – 5/19/21.

**11. Adjournment** – at approx. 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Loretta Ellard  
Deputy Planner

*/le*