



# 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

## Special Meeting AGENDA

**Monday, August 20, 2018 at 1:30 p.m.**

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

### 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. Public Hearing: Adoption of Resolution #M2018-\_\_\_\* Adopting the 2018 Mendocino County Regional Housing Needs Plan
3. Convene as RTPA
4. Recess as RTPA – Reconvene as Policy Advisory Committee

### **PUBLIC EXPRESSION**

5. 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**

6. Presentation: North Coast and Upstate Fuel Cell Electric Vehicle (FCEV) Readiness Project
7. Amendment of 2018 Board Calendar – Schedule Fall Tour/Mobile Workshop

### **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.

8. Approval of June 4, 2018 Minutes
9. Approval of May 17, 2018 Transit Productivity Committee (TPC) Minutes
10. Approval of First Amendment to Fiscal Year 2018/19 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP)

## RATIFY ACTION

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

## REPORTS

12. Reports – Information
  - a. Mendocino Transit Authority
  - b. North Coast Railroad Authority
  - c. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
  - d. MCOG Administration Staff
    1. Senate Bill 1 Implementation - Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 – *verbal or handout at meeting*
    2. FY 2018/19 Local Agency Subrecipient Agreements Distributed August 6, 2018
    3. “Bringing Electric Vehicle Charging Stations to Mendocino County California State Parks” – Completion of 13 Installations through California Energy Commission Grant to Mendocino Land Trust with MCOG and Other Partners
    4. Miscellaneous
  - e. MCOG Planning Staff
    1. Mendocino County Pedestrian Needs Assessment and Engineered Feasibility Study – *verbal report*
    2. Miscellaneous
  - f. MCOG Directors
  - g. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates

## ADJOURNMENT

13. 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 agendaized, 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 8/14/2018

Next Resolution Number: M2018-10



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## STAFF REPORT

Agenda # 2  
MCOG Meeting  
8/20/2018

---

**TITLE:** Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan -  
Public Hearing and Adoption

**DATE PREPARED:** 08/13/18  
**MEETING DATE:** 08/20/18

---

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

---

**BACKGROUND:** The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) is a process to allocate a projection of additional housing units needed to accommodate anticipated household growth of all income levels over a specific time period, which in this case is 8.7 years. The RHNA process is the responsibility of MCOG as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA). Although MCOG does not typically deal with housing issues, the State has determined that the jurisdictional representation of the RTPA is appropriate for the purposes of the RHNA process.

MCOG staff has been meeting with staff from the County and cities over the last several months in order to establish the methodology and allocation of housing units assigned to the region by the State Department of Housing and Community Development across the 5 jurisdictions in Mendocino County. The committee developed a Methodology Statement which was adopted by the MCOG Board in June and can be found in the RHNA Plan.

The draft Regional Housing Need Determination was received from the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) in March 2018. HCD develops the regional determination using population projections from the Department of Finance. The projected population is analyzed in relation to a detailed demographic breakdown of the population to arrive at a “headship rate” for the region. The housing need is then adjusted by HCD to correct for high rates of overcrowding and low vacancy rates. The determination assigned by HCD is also broken down by income level. Unfortunately, the draft determination assigned a total need of 3,845 units to the Mendocino County region for this RHNA period. Although this RHNA period is longer than past cycles (8.7 years rather than 5.5), this was still very high. MCOG appealed this determination, citing concerns with the ability of the region to increase housing during times of fire recovery, the availability of services for a larger elderly population, and the extreme differential between the current and previous RHNA cycle, which identified a need of only 250 units. On July 9, 2018, MCOG received a response to the appeal with a revised Regional Housing Need Determination. The revised determination eliminated the adjustments for overcrowding and low vacancy rates and identified a total need of 1,845 units. The final determination is included in the appendices of the RHNA plan.

The Methodology Committee began the process of developing an allocation when the draft determination was received. Several trial allocations were considered by the committee, which can be found in the RHNA Plan. Ultimately, the committee recommended an allocation similar to the breakdown used at the time of the 2008 RHNA, but further adjusted to shift more of the low and very low income housing to the cities and more moderate and above moderate housing to the County. There was concern about the ability to provide for moderate and above moderate housing, which tends to be lower density, within the boundaries of the incorporated cities. Available land tends to be limited within cities. The incorporated areas tend to have the services and infrastructure that is better suited to higher density, lower income housing. Available land within the unincorporated county tends to be zoned and have infrastructure better suited for lower density development.

The draft allocation was developed by the committee using the draft determination from HCD. Notices of the proposed allocation were sent to each local agency, and an appeal period was established which ends on August 17. A notice of the proposed allocation and RHNA adoption was also published in the newspaper.

Following receipt of the revised Regional Housing Need Determination, MCOG released a revised Draft Allocation, which lowered each agency’s allocation, across all income levels, by approximately 52%. The proposed allocation is as follows:

**Table 7**  
Revised Draft Allocation  
Housing Unit Needs - December 2018 through August 2027

	<b>Very Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Above Moderate</b>	<b>Total</b>
Mendocino County	291	179	177	702	1349
City of Ukiah	86	72	49	32	239
City of Fort Bragg	60	31	23	23	137
City of Willits	34	25	17	35	111
City of Point Arena	3	1	3	2	9
	<b>474</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>794</b>	<b>1845</b>

The allocation has been incorporated into the Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan, which has been included in this packet. The plan includes a more detailed description of the allocation process, the methodology, a description of issues regarding housing and the constraints of each of the different agencies.

Following adoption by MCOG, staff will forward the plan to HCD for their review. The numbers will be utilized by the cities and County in preparation of updates to their housing elements. The local agencies will have approximately one year to complete the housing elements, per the requirements of SB 375. Adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which occurred February 5, 2018, triggered the due date for the next Housing Element. Housing Elements are due 18 months from the RTP adoption date, making them due in August of 2019. Subsequent RHNA Plans and Housing Elements will then be due every eight years.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:**

1. Make finding that proper notice of meeting has been provided. Notice was published in the Ukiah Daily Journal 6/17/18 and 6/19/18 (60 day notice).
2. Receive staff report.
3. Open public hearing.
4. Receive public comments.
5. Close public hearing.
6. Action by Resolution on the 2018 Mendocino County Regional Housing Needs Plan.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** Postpone adoption for a later meeting (this will reduce the time available for local agencies to prepare their Housing Elements).

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Adopt the attached resolution adopting the 2018 Mendocino County Regional Housing Needs Plan and direct staff to forward the plan to the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## BOARD of DIRECTORS

### RESOLUTION No. M2018-\_\_\_

#### ADOPTING THE 2018 MENDOCINO COUNTY REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS PLAN

WHEREAS,

- The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG), as the regional council of governments, is the appropriate agency to conduct the Regional Housing Needs Allocation Process, as determined by the State of California;
- The California Department of Housing and Community Development has provided a total Regional Housing Need for the region divided into four income levels;
- A methodology for allocating the housing need among the local jurisdictions was adopted by MCOG on June 4, 2018;
- MCOG staff has formed a Regional Housing Needs Allocation Methodology Committee made up of representatives from the County, cities, and MCOG staff;
- The Methodology Committee has agreed on an allocation to be used in the final Regional Housing Needs Plan;
- A review period and appeal was conducted for the proposed allocation;
- A revised Regional Housing Need Determination was received from the California Department of Housing and Community Development on July 9, 2018, resulting in a reduction of approximately 52%;
- All numbers in the allocation recommended by the Methodology Committee were reduced consistent with the revised Regional Housing Need Determination to arrive at a revised allocation;
- The following allocation has been used in development of the final Regional Housing Needs Plan:

Housing Unit Needs - December 2018 through August 2027

	<b>Very Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Above Moderate</b>	<b>Total</b>
Mendocino County	291	179	177	702	1,349
City of Ukiah	86	72	49	32	239
City of Fort Bragg	60	31	23	23	137
City of Willits	34	25	17	35	111
City of Point Arena	3	1	3	2	9
	<b>474</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>794</b>	<b>1,845</b>

- A review period and appeal was conducted for the proposed allocation during which no appeals were received; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, THAT:

The Mendocino Council of Governments hereby adopts the 2018 Mendocino County Regional Housing Needs Plan and directs staff to forward this resolution and the plan to the California Department of Housing and Community Development.

ADOPTION OF THIS RESOLUTION was moved by Director \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Director \_\_\_\_\_, and approved on this 20<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2018, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINING:

ABSENT:

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

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

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

FINAL

Mendocino County  
Regional Housing Needs Plan

Prepared by

Mendocino Council of Governments

Nephele Barrett  
Executive Director



For submittal to

**State of California**

Business, Housing & Transportation Agency

**Department of Housing & Community Development**

Division of Housing Policy Development

Proposed for

Adoption

August 20, 2018

## Introduction

This housing needs allocation plan has been prepared by the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) in response to statutory requirements, policy direction from the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and mandated deadlines for delivery of housing need allocation numbers to local jurisdictions within Mendocino County.

Although MCOG does not typically deal with housing issues, they have been designated by HCD as the appropriate regional agency to coordinate the housing need allocation process. The political jurisdictions that comprise the region consist of the Mendocino County unincorporated area and the Cities of Ukiah, Fort Bragg, Willits and Point Arena. Pertinent Government codes and legislation include Government Code Section 65584 and Chapter 85, Statutes of 2001.

Development of this plan began in early 2018. The process has included consultation with HCD, adoption of a methodology, forming a Methodology Committee, and consulting with other local governments, including tribal governments.

## HCD Regional Housing Need Determination

The RHNA process has been based on a total housing need assigned to the Mendocino County region by HCD. The anticipated housing need from HCD is derived using population projections from the Department of Finance. The projected population is analyzed in relation to a detailed demographic breakdown of the population to arrive at a “headship rate” for the region. The housing need is then adjusted by HCD to correct for high rates of overcrowding and low vacancy rates. MCOG received this draft Regional Housing Need Determination from HCD in March of 2018:

**Table 1**  
Draft Regional Housing Needs Determination  
December 31, 2018 through August 31, 2027

	<b>Very Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Above Moderate</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total Number	985	640	560	1660	<b>3,845</b>
Percentage	25.7%	16.7%	14.6%	43%	<b>100%</b>

The initial determination was concerning to local agencies as it was a dramatic increase from the determination for the 2013 RHNA of only 250. Although this cycle is longer than previous cycles (8.7 years compared to the previous 5.5 years), it is still an astronomical increase. Looking at the numbers on an average annual basis, the last RHNA called for approximately 45 units per year, while this draft determination calls for 442 units per year—a nearly 900% increase.

Even under typical conditions, this rate of growth would be unlikely for Mendocino County, but it is nearly impossible during the current period of fire recovery. During the tragic fires of

October 2017, about 349 homes were lost in Mendocino County. Unfortunately, the need to clean up and rebuild after the fire further limits the potential for creation of additional housing units in the region. In our rural area, there are few construction and development companies able to build homes. These resources will likely be fully utilized during rebuilding. Construction of the magnitude called for in the draft determination would require additional resources from outside areas. However, because Sonoma and Napa Counties to the south experienced a much greater loss in the fires (approximately 7000 structures lost), resources are likely to be focused in those areas which have better access to labor and materials. Given the great demand for contractors, labor and materials after the fires, Mendocino County will be challenged just to complete replacement of the destroyed homes during this RHNA cycle.

According to the DOF projections, the age groups that are expected to have the most significant growth are those 75 years and over. Unfortunately, Mendocino County does not have services that would support such a large population increase in those age categories. The region lacks the medical services that are needed by older populations, even in our more populated areas. According to the May 2016 Community Health Survey, which examined health factors across the entire county, lack of providers was the second most significant barrier to healthcare (cost being the first), with 36% of respondents citing this as a problem. As people age and become more dependent on easily accessible medical care, it is unlikely that they would choose to locate in Mendocino County. Older people also are more likely to have mobility limitations. The land that is available for development of new units tends to be outside of the few areas in which transit is available, making healthcare even less accessible. In fact, older people in our local communities often find that it is necessary to relocate outside of the county as they age in order to have better access to healthcare.

With these issues in mind, MCOG submitted an appeal of HCD’s draft Regional Housing Need Determination in May 2018. In response, HCD revised the regional determination, removing the adjustments for overcrowding and low vacancy rates which had significantly affected the draft determination. In particular, HCD recognized the large differential in the 5th and 6th cycle projections as well as the struggles the region will face during fire recovery. The revised and final determination, received on July 9, 2018, is shown below:

**Table 2**  
 Final Regional Housing Needs Determination  
 December 31, 2018 through August 31, 2027

	<b>Very Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Above Moderate</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total Number	474	308	269	794	<b>1,845</b>
Percentage	25.7%	16.7%	14.6%	43%	<b>100%</b>

## Methodology – Background

Before moving into the methodology and process for determining the housing needs by income category, it will be instructive to review the environment within which the allocation process has been implemented.

Regulations are contained in state law that specify the development of housing needs estimates by both HCD and the responsible regional agency. These laws are updated from time to time by the State Legislature, and the response of local agencies often depends on economic and demographic statewide conditions.

The Mendocino County Regional Housing Needs Plan has been developed in accordance with Section 66584 a. of the California Government Code which reads in part... “The distribution of regional housing needs shall, based upon available data, take into consideration market demand for housing, employment opportunities, the availability of suitable sites and public facilities, commuting patterns, type and tenure of housing need, the loss of units contained in assisted housing developments, change to non low-income use through mortgage pre-payment, subsidy contract expirations, or terminations of use restrictions, and the housing needs of farm workers.”

## Forces Impacting Housing Needs in Mendocino County

### Market Demand for Housing

The housing market in Mendocino County and areas to the south have largely recovered from the housing market crash. Although housing costs in Mendocino County are not low, they remain considerably lower than those in neighboring Sonoma County, making Mendocino County a more affordable option.

### Employment Opportunities

According to the California Employment Development Department, the labor force in Mendocino County as of June 2018 is estimated at 39,430. Of that number, approximately 37,850 individuals are employed, with an unemployment rate of 4%. This is an improvement since the last RHNA cycle, at which time the unemployment rate was 9%, although the labor force for the county has declined. Areas with the highest anticipated growth for the north coast region (Lake, Del Norte, Humboldt and Mendocino Counties) through 2024 are earth drillers, roofers, dry wall installers, heating/air/refrigeration workers, and construction trade helpers. The Service Industry currently provides the largest number of jobs.

### The Availability of Suitable Sites and Public Facilities

In order to develop housing, the availability of suitable sites and public facilities plays a key role. Given the rural nature of Mendocino County, there is a significant amount of vacant land. Much of this land is constrained by a number of factors, including public ownership, zoning, lack of access or public infrastructure, environmental factors such as steep slopes or flooding, isolation/proximity to urban centers, and other factors. In those areas of the County that are urbanized, suitable sites and public facilities are more available. However, within city limits, available land is very limited. In some cases, although services and infrastructure may be

present, systems have reached their capacity and are in need of expansion. The housing elements from each of the three jurisdictions contain information and detail concerning site suitability and public facilities.

### **Commuting Patterns**

Although they do not have an impact of the same magnitude as commute patterns in more urban areas, commute patterns still play a role in shaping growth in Mendocino County. The cities of Ukiah, Fort Bragg and Willits are the primary employment centers and produce commuting patterns to and from the surrounding residential communities. In addition to commute patterns within the county, commuters from within Mendocino County are also traveling to Sonoma County and areas further south for employment. These cross county commute patterns were more carefully examined in the Wine Country Interregional Partnership Phase II Origin and Destination Study final report. The most common trip purpose identified through this report for these cross county trips was work/commute. In addition to individuals commuting from Mendocino County to Lake, there are also a considerable number that commute into Mendocino County from Lake County due to relative housing affordability in Lake County, which highlights the need for more affordable housing options within Mendocino County. Commuting patterns are influenced by other factors such as the presence of service facilities, education, and commercial shopping opportunities, which will also lead to out of county travel.

### **Type and Tenure of Housing Need**

The distribution of housing within Mendocino County is to some degree influenced by the type and tenure of housing need and is defined regionally. More agricultural areas, such as Anderson Valley, have a higher incidence of farm worker housing need than do areas along the US 101 corridor.

According to the Department of Finance *Report E-5 City/County Population & Housing Estimates*, multi-family units make up approximately 13% of the county's housing units, with the largest concentration of those units in the Ukiah area.

Mendocino County has a large senior (65 and older) population (18.9% based on 2016 data from the American Community Survey Demographic and Housing Estimates) that also significantly impacts the need for housing, as older people form households with fewer people per home. Many seniors need affordable housing due to the high cost of housing and the impact on fixed incomes. Some also need special services that can be provided in affordable housing developments. People with disabilities or special needs require safe, decent, and affordable housing. Very low income individuals rely on government assistance in order to access affordable housing, and those with large families also have unique needs.

### **Potential Loss of Units in Assisted Housing Projects**

A significant statewide housing problem is the potential loss of affordability restrictions on a substantial portion of the government assisted rental housing stock. These privately owned, multi-family rental developments provide housing for low income individuals, elderly people, and families with children. The rent restrictions and use periods for these developments vary, but there are a number of these projects which are considered to be at risk for conversion from affordable, below market rents financed with tax exempt bonds to market rate rents. Such a

change would pose a hardship for lower income households in Mendocino County as well as statewide.

### Housing Needs of Farm Workers

According to Economic Development Department data, an annual average of 1,380 farm workers were employed in Mendocino County in 2017, with a high of 1,620 during peak season. In 2007, the County of Mendocino conducted a housing and transportation needs assessment for agricultural workers. In a survey conducted as part of the assessment, 90% of respondents cited Mendocino County as their permanent place of residence, while the other 10% traveled from into the County from other jurisdictions. Nearly 1 in 3 responding households (31%) reported the presence of children under the age of 18. Nearly half (46%) of households reported three or more children. There is a clear need for safe, decent, convenient farm worker housing, both for individuals and families, within Mendocino County.

### Population

Table 2 presents the population change for each of the five jurisdictions between 2000 and 2018.

**Table 3**  
Population Change 2000-2018

Jurisdiction	2000 Pop.	2010 Pop.	2018 Pop. Estimate
Ukiah	15,497	16,075	16,226
Fort Bragg	7,026	7,273	7,512
Willits	5,073	4,888	5,128
Point Arena	474	449	448
Unincorporated County	58,195	59,156	59,985
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>86,265</b>	<b>87,841</b>	<b>89,299</b>

*US Census Bureau and California Department of Finance Demographic Research Unit E-1 Report*

Previous growth rates are not precise indicators of growth over the next planning period, but they do show a trend. Growth over this period has slowed considerably from the historic growth rates. Over the last 8 year period (2010-2018), the region has experienced a total of only 1.7% growth. However, housing need is not related only to population growth, but also changes in the demographics of the population.

### Wildfire

Over the last few years, Mendocino County has been severely impacted by fires. Both lives and homes have been tragically lost. While the loss of lives in these fires far outweighs the loss of property, the impact to housing cannot be ignored. On October 9, 2017, at the same time that fires raged in the neighboring counties of Lake, Napa and Sonoma, Mendocino County was hit by the Redwood Complex fires, resulting in the loss of over 600 structures, including 349 residences. To date, about 50 permits have been issued to replace homes that were lost. Unfortunately, the need to clean up and rebuild after the fire further limits the potential for creation of additional housing units in the region. Due to the fire damage in neighboring counties, it is anticipated that resources available for cleanup and rebuilding will be limited.

At the time of this writing (August 2018), two fires—the River Fire and Ranch Fire, collectively the Mendocino Complex —are burning and have now become the largest fire in modern California history. The extent of the damage caused by these fires is not fully known at this time.

### **Regulatory, Internal & External Forces**

External forces also have an impact on the demand for housing. The type of external issues and the timing and nature of this impact is impossible to define precisely or to predict. The information and facts regarding economic growth, population growth, state in-migration patterns, market demand, housing prices, and California development patterns have been studied and trends identified. The California Department of Finance (DOF) provides annual population growth estimates. These projections show a very modest population growth for Mendocino County, reaching 93,452 by 2030. Other external forces include global economics, credit availability, fuel and raw material prices, decisions by corporate employers, and interregional shifts in housing supply from surrounding counties and the Bay Area. While these forces are of interest and need to be tracked, there is little that Mendocino County can do to alter their impact.

In summary, regulatory requirements that currently shape the housing need allocation process, and the subsequent preparation of Housing Elements of General Plans, are fairly clear in communicating the general approach and timetable as determined by HCD. The external forces cannot, for the most part, be changed or altered by any actions by the local jurisdictions. The decisions of private sector builders, investors, and property owners in response to these forces is outside of the control of local government.

Internal structure is the one factor by which local government can take some initiative in shaping future housing demand. The housing constraints found in Appendix B can be addressed by each local jurisdiction as a precursor to the preparation of their Housing Element updates in balancing housing need with ability to create housing supply. Each jurisdiction will look at zoning, building/subdivision requirements, possible annexations, water and sewer treatment capacities, and other creative ways to meet housing demand that are within local jurisdiction administrative responsibility. The challenge will be to meet the regional housing needs with a coordinated and cooperative effort.

## **Constraints**

There are a variety of issues that may potentially constrain growth and the ability of each local agency to provide for the development of housing. Potential constraints include water availability, infrastructure availability, and zoning/land use designations. Not only do these factors play a crucial role in the supply of housing, but they also influence the location of new employment centers.

Detailed descriptions of each agency's constraints to development can be found in Appendix B of this document.

## Methodology – Allocation Process

The previous regional housing allocation plan was prepared by MCOG in 2013. The total housing demand for Mendocino County has been calculated by HCD staff. Appendix A outlines the general methodology used by HCD in projecting regional housing needs for 2019 through 2027. The task remaining for MCOG and local agencies is to arrive at a methodology for allocating the total housing need among the five jurisdictions, across the identified income levels.

The local process began with formation of a Methodology Committee made up of planning representatives from each of the local agencies. This committee worked together to develop a methodology statement, which was adopted by the MCOG Board in June of 2018.

### ***RHNA Methodology Statement June 4, 2018***

*As part of the regional housing needs assessment, the Mendocino Council of Governments will allocate the housing need among its member agencies—the Cities of Ukiah, Fort Bragg, Willits and Point Arena and County of Mendocino—using the following methodology:*

*A Regional Housing Needs Allocation Methodology Committee will be formed and made up of representatives from each of the cities and the county. Tribal governments within the region will also be invited to participate in the process. MCOG will work cooperatively with this committee to determine an allocation based on the following factors:*

- *Current population distribution and trends*
- *Past development trends*
- *Availability of appropriately zoned land*
- *Annexation opportunities*
- *Zoning change and General Plan amendment impacts*
- *Availability of resources and infrastructure services*
- *2013 housing allocation*
- *Vacancy rates*
- *Tribal population and housing development*
- *Limitations and challenges to housing and land resulting from recent wildfires*
- *Potential impacts of recent housing related legislation, including SB 35*

Following development of the methodology, the same committee was convened to develop the allocation. These representatives are those responsible for planning and preparation of the Housing Element for each of the local jurisdictions. Each of the tribal governments within Mendocino County was also provided consultation and invited to participate in the process.

#### Committee Members:

Jesse Davis, County of Mendocino  
 Craig Schlatter, City of Ukiah  
 Marie Jones, City of Fort Bragg  
 Scott Perkins, City of Fort Bragg

Natalie Gregory, City of Fort Bragg  
 Dusty Duley, City of Willits  
 Richard Shoemaker, City of Point Arena  
 Paul Anderson, City of Point Arena  
 Nephele Barrett, MCOG

A series of meetings was held with the Committee. Although an appeal of the Regional Housing Need Determination had been submitted, the group moved forward with developing an allocation using the draft determination. Following initial discussions, two trial allocations were developed for consideration by the committee. The First Trial Allocation was proportionate to current population estimates. The Second Trial Allocation used the percentages in each income category that were used in the 2008 RHNA, which was similar to the draft regional determination of the current cycle in terms of total units. At the time of the 2008 RHNA, the allocation was developed using a number of different factors, including availability of land, infrastructure, availability of appropriate services, and equitability. Tables 4 and 5 show the First and Second Trial Allocations.

**Table 4**  
 First Trial Allocation  
 Proportionate to Population

		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
	<b>% Population</b>	<b>985.00</b>	<b>640.00</b>	<b>560.00</b>	<b>1660.00</b>	
County	67.00%	660	429	375	1112	2576
Ukiah	18.30%	180	117	102	304	703
Fort Bragg	8.72%	86	56	49	145	335
Willits	5.53%	54	35	31	92	212
Point Arena	0.50%	5	3	3	7	18
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>985</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>1660</b>	<b>3845</b>

**Table 5**  
 Second Trial Allocation  
 Proportionate to 2008 RHNA

	Very Low		Low		Moderate		Above Moderate		Total
County	64.3%	633	62.2%	398	69.5%	389	83.8%	1392	2812
Ukiah	16.8%	165	22.1%	141	18.1%	102	5.2%	86	494
Fort Bragg	11.5%	114	8.3%	53	6.0%	34	5.2%	86	287
Willits	6.8%	67	6.8%	44	5.7%	32	5.3%	88	231
Point Arena	0.6%	6	0.5%	3	0.6%	3	0.5%	8	21
<b>Total</b>		<b>985</b>		<b>640</b>		<b>560</b>		<b>1660</b>	<b>3845</b>

The committee met on May 23, 2018, and reviewed the two trial allocations. There was concern about the ability to provide for moderate and above moderate housing, which tends to be lower density, within the boundaries of the incorporated cities. Available land tends to be limited within cities. In addition, the incorporated areas tend to have the services and infrastructure that

is better suited to higher density, lower income housing. Available land within the county tends to be zoned and have infrastructure better suited for lower density development. Based on these concerns, a Third Trial Allocation was developed which shifted more of the low and very low income housing to the cities and more moderate and above moderate housing to the County. The committee reached consensus on the Third Trial Allocation, and on June 15, 2018, a notice was subsequently distributed advising of the draft allocation and establishing an appeal period.

**Table 6**  
Third Trial/Draft Allocation Approved by Committee  
May 29, 2018

	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total
Mendocino County	607	372	368	1465	2812
City of Ukiah	178	150	102	65	495
City of Fort Bragg	124	65	48	50	287
City of Willits	70	50	36	75	231
City of Point Arena	6	3	6	5	20
	<b>985</b>	<b>640</b>	<b>560</b>	<b>1660</b>	<b>3845</b>

Following the release of the Draft Allocation and the beginning of the appeal period, MCOG received a response of the appeal of the regional determination from HCD. The Regional Determination was reduced by approximately 52%, with no change in the distribution of housing need across income levels. A Revised Draft Allocation was developed using the same percentages from the previously approved Draft Allocation. This Revised Draft Allocation was distributed to agencies.

**Table 7**  
Revised Draft Allocation - July 16, 2018  
Housing Unit Needs - December 2018 through August 2027  
Based on Revised HCD Regional Housing Determination

	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Total %
Mendocino County	291	179	177	702	1349	73.1%
City of Ukiah	86	72	49	32	239	13.0%
City of Fort Bragg	60	31	23	23	137	7.4%
City of Willits	34	25	17	35	111	6.0%
City of Point Arena	3	1	3	2	9	0.5%
	<b>474</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>794</b>	<b>1845</b>	

It should be noted that this allocation does not establish a precedent for allocation of housing units during future RHNA cycles. This methodology and allocation were specific and appropriate to this particular cycle, and may not be appropriate for future cycles, particularly when and if the overall allocation is higher. If in the future Mendocino sees an increase in housing need, it will be important to carefully examine a variety of factors.

## Determination of Final Housing Allocation

### Agency Notification

On June 15, 2018, MCOG provided notices to each of the local agencies notifying them of the proposed draft allocation that would be used in preparation of the RHNA Plan. An appeal period was established and set to end on August 17, 2018.

### Public Participation

In addition to interagency coordination with local agencies and tribal governments, an effort was also made to involve the public in the allocation process. Notices were published in the county wide newspapers alerting the public of both the intent to adopt the methodology statement as well as the final allocation and RHNA plan. Additional information, including the proposed methodology statement, draft allocation, and revised draft allocation, was available for the public on the MCOG website. Public comments will also be accepted at the public hearing at the time of adoption.

### Annexation Policy

This policy, adopted by MCOG November 4, 2002, establishes a process for the redistribution of the housing needs allocation set forth in the adopted Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP) in the event of annexation, detachment, incorporation or other change of organization between the county and any member city during the planning period.

1. Pre-Application Process

Prior to filing an application with the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) for a change of organization between the county and any member city, such as an annexation, detachment, incorporation or any combination thereof, the applicant is encouraged to file a pre-application with the county and subject city. The county and subject city are encouraged to engage in a pre-application process to review the RHNP allocations for potential redistribution. The proposed reallocation and any conditions thereof shall be submitted to the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG). A copy shall be submitted to LAFCo.

2. Filing of Application for Annexation, Detachment or Incorporation

If a pre-application has not been undertaken, upon receipt of the LAFCo notice of filing of a proposed change of organization, the county or subject city may submit to the other and MCOG a request for redistribution of the RHNP allocations. A copy shall be submitted to LAFCo.

3. County/City Negotiations

The county and subject city shall negotiate in good faith to redistribute the RHNP allocations. The redistribution shall not result in a net reduction in the regional housing and population totals set forth in the RHNP adopted by MCOG, nor in the allocation assigned to any other member city. The subject city and county may otherwise negotiate any redistribution and conditions thereof that are mutually agreeable.

4. MCOG Mediation

If the county and subject city cannot reach a mutually acceptable agreement for redistribution within 60 days from the date of LAFCo filing, one or both jurisdictions may request MCOG to mediate the redistribution of RHNP allocations. The mediation period should not exceed an additional 30 days unless a longer period is mutually agreed to. The purpose of mediation is to achieve a mutually acceptable redistribution.

**Final Proposed Allocation**

**Table 8**  
Proposed Final Allocation – County of Mendocino

<b>Income Level</b>	<b>Housing Units Needed</b>
Very Low	291
Low	179
Moderate	177
Above Moderate	702
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>1349</b>

**Table 9**  
Proposed Final Allocation – City of Ukiah

<b>Income Level</b>	<b>Housing Units Needed</b>
Very Low	86
Low	72
Moderate	49
Above Moderate	32
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>239</b>

**Table 10**  
Proposed Final Allocation – City of Fort Bragg

<b>Income Level</b>	<b>Housing Units Needed</b>
Very Low	60
Low	31
Moderate	23
Above Moderate	23
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>137</b>

**Table 11**  
Proposed Final Allocation – City of Willits

<b>Income Level</b>	<b>Housing Units Needed</b>
Very Low	34
Low	25
Moderate	17
Above Moderate	35
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>111</b>

**Table 12**  
Proposed Final Allocation – City of Point Arena

<b>Income Level</b>	<b>Housing Units Needed</b>
Very Low	3
Low	1
Moderate	3
Above Moderate	2
<b>Total Units</b>	<b>9</b>

Upon adoption of this plan by the Mendocino Council of Governments, the numbers will be utilized by the cities and County in preparation of updates to their housing elements, as required by law. The local agencies will have approximately one year to complete the housing elements, per the requirements of SB 375. Adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which occurred February 5, 2018, triggered the due date for the next Housing Element. Housing Elements are due 18 months from the RTP adoption date, making them due in August of 2019. Subsequent RHNA Plans and Housing Elements will then be due every eight years.

## **Appendices**

- A Housing & Community Development Regional Housing Need Assignment & Methodology
- B Member Jurisdictions' Statements of Constraints to Housing Development

# **APPENDIX A**

**DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DIVISION OF HOUSING POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500  
Sacramento, CA 95833  
(916) 263-2911 / FAX (916) 263-7453  
[www.hcd.ca.gov](http://www.hcd.ca.gov)



July 5, 2018

Phillip J. Dow  
Executive Director  
Mendocino Council of Governments  
367 North State Street  
Ukiah, CA 95482-4442

Dear Phillip J. Dow:

**RE: Final Regional Housing Need Determination**

Thank you for your letter regarding Mendocino Council of Government's (Mendocino COG) Regional Housing Needs Determination. Pursuant to state housing element law (Government Code (Gov. Code) section 65584, et seq.), the Department of Housing and Community Development (Department) is reporting the results of its review.

As a reminder, there are several reasons for the increase in Mendocino COG's 6<sup>th</sup> cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination as compared to the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle. First, as your letter noted, this cycle's projection period is 3.2 years longer than the previous cycle's projection period. Second, the California Department of Finance (DOF) Demographic Research Unit estimates substantial growth in the region in the upcoming years. Finally, the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) was much anomalously low at 250, compared to the 4<sup>th</sup> cycle's RHNA at 3,495.

However, based on many of the points raised in the letter – including the large differential in DOF's projections between the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> cycles, and the challenges the county will likely face in planning and permitting housing post-fire – the Department is providing Mendocino COG with a Regional Housing Needs Determination that includes no adjustment factors and solely includes the projected households that DOF estimates the county will have at the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> cycle minus the existing housing stock. While this Regional Housing Needs Determination is still significantly higher than the 5<sup>th</sup> cycle's determination, it is almost a 50% decrease from the 4<sup>th</sup> cycle's determination.

Attachment 1 displays the minimum regional housing need determination of **1,845** total units among four income categories for Mendocino COG to distribute among its local governments. Attachment 2 explains the methodology applied pursuant to Gov. Code section 65584.01. In determining Mendocino COG's housing need, the Department considered all the information specified in state housing law (Gov. Code section 65584.01(c)).

As you know, Mendocino COG is responsible for adopting a methodology and RHNA Plan for the *projection* period beginning December 31, 2018 and ending August 15, 2027. Within 30 days from the adoption date, Mendocino COG must submit the RHNA Plan to the Department for approval. Local governments are in turn responsible for updating their housing element for

the *planning* period beginning August 15, 2019 and ending August 15, 2027 to accommodate their share of new housing need for each income category.

Pursuant to Gov. Code section 65584(d), the methodology to prepare Mendocino COG's RHNA plan must be consistent with the following objectives:

- (1) Increasing the housing supply and mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability
- (2) Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, protecting environmental and agricultural resources, and encouraging efficient development patterns
- (3) Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing
- (4) Balancing disproportionate household income distributions

Pursuant to Gov. Code section 65584.04(d), to the extent data is available, Mendocino COG should include the factors listed in Gov. Code section 65584.04(d)(1-10) to develop its RHNA plan, and pursuant to Gov. Code section 65584.04(e), Mendocino COG must explain in writing how each of these factors was incorporated into the RHNA plan methodology.

The Department commends Mendocino COG for its leadership in fulfilling its important role in advancing the state's housing, transportation, and environmental goals. Mendocino COG is also recognized for its actions in proactively educating and engaging jurisdiction members on the RHNA process. The Department especially thanks Nephele Barrett for her significant efforts and assistance. The Department looks forward to its continued partnership with Mendocino COG and its member jurisdictions and assisting Mendocino COG in its planning efforts to accommodate the region's share of housing need.

If the Department can provide any additional assistance, or if you, or your staff, have any questions, please contact Megan Kirkeby, Assistant Deputy Director for Fair Housing, at (916) 263-7428 or [megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov](mailto:megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov).

Sincerely,



Zachary Olmstead  
Deputy Director

Enclosures

# ATTACHMENT 1

## HCD REGIONAL HOUSING NEED DETERMINATION

Mendocino County Governments: December 31, 2018 through August 31, 2027

<u>Income Category</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Housing Unit Need</u>
Very-Low*	25.7%	474
Low	16.7%	308
Moderate	14.6%	269
Above-Moderate	43.0%	794
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,845</b>

Notes:

Income Distribution:

Income categories are prescribed by California Health and Safety Code (Section 50093, et. seq.). Percents are derived based on Census/ACS reported household income brackets and County median income.

## ATTACHMENT 2

### HCD REGIONAL HOUSING NEED DETERMINATION: Mendocino County December 31, 2018 – August 31, 2027

#### Methodology

1.	<b>Mendocino County: December 31, 2018 – August 31, 2027 (8.8 years) HCD Determined Population, Households, &amp; Housing Unit Need</b>			
2.	<b>Population: August 31, 2027 (DOF June 30, 2028 projection adjusted minus 10 months back to August 31, 2027)</b>			<b>92,815</b>
3.	<i>- Group Quarters Population (DOF June 30, 2028 projection adjusted minus 10 months back to August 31, 2027)</i>			-2,145
4.	<b>Household (HH) Population</b>			<b>90,670</b>
	<b>Household Formation Groups</b>	<b>HCD Adjusted DOF Projected HH Population</b>	<b>DOF HH Formation Rates</b>	<b>HCD Adjusted DOF Projected Households</b>
		<b>90,670</b>		<b>36,715</b>
	under 15 years	15,150	n/a	n/a
	15 – 24 years	10,730	9.46%	1,015
	25 – 34 years	10,850	37.46%	4,065
	35 – 44 years	10,505	45.60%	4,790
	45 – 54 years	10,160	54.15%	5,500
	55 – 64 years	9,745	58.61%	5,710
	65 – 74 years	11,420	62.61%	7,150
	75 – 84 years	9,350	69.80%	6,525
	85+	2,760	71.01%	1,960
5.	<b>Projected Households (Occupied Unit Stock)</b>			<b>36,715</b>
6.	<i>- Occupied Units (HHs) estimated January 1, 2019 (from DOF data)</i>			-34,870
<b>6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Regional Housing Need Assessment (RHNA)</b>				<b>1,845</b>

#### Explanation and Data Sources

1. Projection period: Gov. Code 65588(f) specifies RHNA projection period start is December 31 or June 30, whichever date most closely precedes end of previous RHNA projection period end date. RHNA projection period end date is set to align with planning period end date. The planning period end date is eight years following the Housing Element due date, which is 18 months following the Regional Transportation Plan adoption rounded to the 15<sup>th</sup> or end of the month.
- 2-5. Population, Group Quarters, Household Population, & Projected Households: Pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.01, projections were extrapolated from Department of Finance (DOF) projections. Population reflects total persons. Group Quarter Population reflects persons in a dormitory, group home, institute, military, etc. that do not require residential housing. Household Population reflects persons requiring residential housing. Projected Households reflect the propensity of persons, by age groups, to form households at different rates based on Census trends.
6. Occupied Units: This figure reflects DOF's estimate of occupied units at the start of the January closest to the projection period start date, per DOF E-5 report.

# **APPENDIX B**



---

---

## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Nephele Barrett, Senior Planner, MCOG  
**FROM:** Ignacio Gonzalez, Interim Director, Planning and Building Services  
**SUBJECT:** Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Allocation: Statement of Constraints for Mendocino County  
**DATE:** August 10, 2018

---

The Mendocino Council of Governments' (MCOG) process for distributing its Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) has resulted in an allocation of 1,349 housing units to the unincorporated areas of Mendocino County. After collaborative and cooperative discussion with MCOG partners, this figure is reflects the County's "fair share" proportion for the upcoming 2018 Regional Housing Needs Determination as conveyed by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

This determination, however, is incompatible with regional planning doctrine and impractical given the land-constraints that challenge residential development in unincorporated Mendocino County. Housing an increasingly diverse population requires strategies more innovative than simply assigning units based upon a formulaic assessment. From a regional planning perspective, housing strategies must do more than guarantee people a place to live; they must also ensure that where people live reflects sound principles of growth and social equity. The impractical nature of this assigned determination preempts the County's ability to plan a practical solution with our regional partners. The Department of Planning and Building Services can provide the necessary analysis, the requisite communitywide reflection and education, as well as the momentum required to respond to these housing challenges, but not when forced to adhere to such a rigid time-line.

While it is recognized that this allocation is significantly lower than the originally assigned distribution, we implore MCOG, as well as HCD, to recognize the limitations that continue to impede the County's efforts in complying with its apportionment. Anticipated constraints are discussed in greater detail below:

**Water Infrastructure:** Compared to other parts of California, major development of water resources has not occurred in Mendocino County. Normally, the County receives substantial wintertime precipitation, but relies on groundwater during the hot summer months. A number of unincorporated communities are built over "fractured hard rock," which stores groundwater in limited amounts, making residents especially susceptible to water shortages in dry years.

There are many water service providers in Mendocino County, including the cities, special districts, and private water purveyors. Many, however, have limited additional capacity, and some have maintained moratoriums in the past to restrict access. The Redwood Valley County Water District exemplifies many of these infrastructure limitations. Presently, when developing accessory residential structures, Redwood Valley applicants cannot obtain a domestic water connection for an accessory dwelling unit, due to a moratorium on second-residential connections.<sup>1</sup>

In 2018, it is expected that the Brooktrails Township Communities Services District, one of the County's larger unincorporated communities, will offer only two dozen new connections. Additionally, Brooktrails is further challenged by the lack of adequate transportation access in the event of an evacuation or disaster. Therefore, while opportunities for limited in-fill development exist, large-scale residential construction as

---

<sup>1</sup> Redwood Valley County Water District. (Water Rates) Domestic Water Rates. 06.10.18: <http://www.rvcwd.org/html/rates.html>

required by HCD would necessitate substantial improvements to numerous water supply and distribution systems.

**Sewer Infrastructure:** Public sewer systems in Mendocino County are provided by cities, special districts, and some private water purveyors. There are 13 major wastewater systems in the county, four of which primarily serve the incorporated cities, but also serve some unincorporated areas. Sewage disposal in the remainder of the county is generally handled by private onsite facilities, primarily septic tank and leach field systems, although alternative engineered wastewater systems may be used. In past planning documents, the County Division of Environmental Health cites the lack of sites for disposal of wastewater pumped from onsite systems as a countywide issue that constrains residential development.

Wastewater infrastructure, or lack thereof, has also imposed potential limits on development in some areas. Septic system constraints are an issue in the Anderson Valley, as well as the community of Laytonville. The community of Laytonville is currently served by individual septic systems, but a high water table and high annual rainfall are contributing to septic system problems, which has led to the community studying the feasibility of a waste water treatment plant. Similar to water constraints, opportunities for limited in-fill development do exist, but large-scale residential construction as required by HCD will necessitate substantial improvements to wastewater systems and sewer infrastructure.

**MCOG Allocation Methodology:** The overall breakdown for the County based on unit affordability and household income was “very low” (607), “low” (372), “moderate” (368) and “above moderate” (1465). While there was collaborative and cooperative discussion between MCOG partners, the methodology statement and assigned breakdown still creates an unrealizable burden for the County.

We believe that conventional planning principles require a reconsideration of the methodology used to allocate these numbers in the future, and that a much higher percentage of “very low” (607), and “low” (372) be assigned to our incorporated partners, who are better able to facilitate this form of residential development.

Funding constraints typically dictate that new stock of “low” and “very low” income housing units be produced at higher residential densities and where public services and infrastructure exist. By contrast, limited services and infrastructure in unincorporated areas substantially prohibit higher density residential development. Commonly, grants needed to construct these housing opportunities require proximity to a myriad of services, including public transportation.

Additionally, a portion of this RHNA determination is based on the expected increase of elderly-households in Mendocino County. It is agreed that elderly households may have special housing needs due to fixed or limited incomes, increased health care costs, or physical limitations. Many elderly persons have limited funds for housing, housing repairs or modifications, or assistance for everyday living. As some elderly may require proximity to health care or supportive services, Mendocino County prioritizes housing opportunities in more urbanized areas, where those services and transportation opportunities are more readily available. As of 2015, no assisted senior complexes are located in the unincorporated area, though several, such as Duncan Place and Lenore Senior Housing, are located in Fort Bragg, Willits, and Ukiah.

From a sound planning perspective, it would thus seem appropriate to have a greater proportion of “low” or “very low” income units allocated to the incorporated, or urbanized, areas of the County. While it is understood that the County and regional partners have a shared obligation to provide housing commiserate with anticipated countywide population growth, the MCOG allocation should take these development constraints with regard to services and infrastructure into account.

**Coastal Zone Constraints:** Residential communities which lie within the Coastal Zone are subject to an additional layer of constraints due to development restrictions found within the County’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) and maintaining overall compliance with the California Coastal Act. On top of the noted water and sewer constraints, a restriction on “second units” within the Coastal Zone adds to the difficulties of “low” and “very low” income households in finding affordable housing opportunities in these areas.

Another of the factors listed within the adopted RHNA Methodology was “availability of appropriately zoned land,” which is also an issue along the coastal regions of the County. Extensive areas along the County’s coast consist of Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHA) which dramatically impact the County’s ability to rezone additional land for increased density. For appropriately zoned land, the highly discretionary nature of coastal development, in general, and permitting requirements that would likely accompany multi-family type development, in particular, only adds to the challenge of increasing housing stocks within these areas.

**Flood & Other Hazards:** Unfortunately, substantial proportions of vacant or underutilized lands surrounding Willits and Ukiah, perhaps the most conducive areas for higher density residential development, are located either in a flood zone or situated near a fault zone. The combining zones created by these environmental settings require special conditions or building requirements, which must be satisfied before a structure can be built or substantially remodeled.

In general, major floods within Mendocino County have resulted from extended periods of winter rainfall produced by winter storms from the Pacific Ocean. Generally, these storms affect the region from early November until the end of March. From a sound planning perspective, it would seem appropriate to recognize the constraints created by flood plains as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Several areas within the County are particularly prone to flooding. These include:

- State Route 128 at State Route 1, Navarro River
- State Route 175 at the Russian River Bridge
- State Route 1 at the Garcia River
- Talmage Court - east side of the Ukiah Valley
- City of Ukiah - eastern side along/near the Russian River
- Little Lake Valley near the City of Willits sewage treatment plant

The County has established a "Flood Plain Combining District" (FP) in its Inland and Coastal Zoning Ordinances. The FP zone applies to floodplain areas as delineated on Flood Insurance Rate Maps prepared by Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Certain development within the combining district is prohibited, while other development is subject to standards designed to reduce flood hazards. While the cost of housing in these areas may be increased and subsequently limited, these measures are necessary to protect life and property.

The County’s Zoning Ordinances also includes special districts for seismically active areas. Mendocino County is also subject to seismic safety standards for the design and construction of buildings within *Seismic Zone 4* as identified in the Uniform Building Code (UBC). The County’s Building Division ensures that structures in the County comply with the UBC and the zoning ordinances. The San Andreas Fault traverses the southwest corner of the County and continues offshore north of Manchester. The Maacama fault extends from northern Sonoma County to north of Laytonville in Mendocino County. Both of these faults have established Earthquake Fault Zones. In total, five active or potentially active faults traverse Mendocino County.

**Fire Hazards and Recovery:** Forests and grasslands are located throughout the County, along with residences and unincorporated small communities. Widespread areas of the County have high fire risk, and many areas can be classified as wildland/urban interfaces (WUI). Wildland fires are a major risk to housing development and pose a substantial constraint with regard to new housing development. The State Board of Forestry has adopted "fire safe" regulations that apply to State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) as a means of reducing pre-fire fuel loads. Within SRAs, the State has the primary financial responsibility for preventing and suppressing fires. Much of the unincorporated County is within SRAs.

The statewide fire safe regulations include:

- Road standards for emergency access and evacuation, including width, surface, and grade
- Standards for signs identifying streets, roads, and buildings
- Minimum water supply reserves for emergency fire use

- Fuel breaks (i.e., "defensible space") around structures and greenbelts around new subdivisions

All new construction and subdivisions within SRA's must meet State Board of Forestry standards as set out in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. Only within the County's limited valley areas which are also served by local districts are the State fire regulations not applicable.

During the tragic fires of October 2017, approximately 349 homes were lost within Mendocino County. To date, only 80 building permits have been issued to replace destroyed homes. Unfortunately, the need to clean-up and rebuild, further limits potential housing development within the region, and creates a challenge meeting our assigned determination. In our rural area, there are few construction and development entities able to accommodate complex residential construction activities. Construction of the magnitude required by the Department of Housing and Community Development would require support from regional neighbors.

Given the damage sustained in Sonoma, Napa and Lake Counties, however, resources are likely to be limited for the foreseeable future. Given that the County's stated priority is to expeditiously focus on the reconstruction of houses lost by fire, the demand for contracts, labor and materials, will be challenged just to complete replacement of the destroyed homes during this RHNA cycle. The high risk of fires in rural Mendocino County, create the probability that additional structures will be lost in the years to come.

Moving forward, an expected constraint includes the difficulty of obtaining home-owner insurance for fire damage and destruction. Most major insurance companies require a home to be located within five miles or less of a fire station in order to qualify for homeowner's insurance. For homes located outside this range or with a high Insurance Services Office (ISO) rating (8 or 9), homeowner insurance may not be available or may be prohibitively expensive. In order to address this concern, the County, should encourage residential uses in areas with adequate water infrastructure and fire service, and unburdened by seismic or flood constraints, which as described by this memorandum are limited.

**Conclusion:** As it moves forward, we strongly recommend that MCOG reexamine its methodology and allocation with particular regard to "low" and "very low" income housing units for unincorporated Mendocino County. Additionally, we hope that the constraints presented in this memorandum, alongside those prepared by our regional partners, are considered by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), resulting in another reduction of required units.

*Cc: Carmel Angelo, County Executive Officer (CEO)  
Steve Dunncliff, Deputy CEO*



**CITY OF FORT BRAGG**

416 N. FRANKLIN, FORT BRAGG, CA 95437  
PHONE 707/961-2823 FAX 707/961-2802

---

---

**MEMO**

**MEETING DATE:** August 13, 2018  
**TO:** Nephele Barrett, Senior Planner, MCOG  
**FROM:** Marie Jones, Community Development Director  
**AGENDA ITEM TITLE:** Regional Housing Needs Allocation – Housing Production Limitation Factors

---

The development of new units is constrained in the Fort Bragg by four significant issues: 1) Coastal Zone regulatory requirements; 2) single-family development on parcels with higher density zoning designations, which are unlikely to be demolished to maximize development density of parcels; 3) lack of developers and contractors with multi-family development experience; and 4) location and economic factors.

1. **Coastal Zone Regulatory Constraints.** Approximately 1/3 of the city is in the Coastal Zone and is subject to the protection of Coastal Act resource which include environmentally sensitive habitat areas, cultural resources, coastal access and visual resources. Projects within the Coastal Zone are subject to the requirements of the coastal act and require the issuance of a Coastal Development permit in order to proceed. Many of the remaining vacant parcels in the Coastal Zone include some coastal resources and protection of these coastal resources means that full development potential of these parcels is rarely realized.
2. **Lack of Vacant Residentially Zoned Land and Underutilized of Residential Land.** The majority of Fort Bragg's Very High Density and other high density zoned parcels contain single- family dwellings. Given Fort Bragg's market and the small size of the parcels involved, these single family homes are unlikely to be demolished to achieve the maximum density allowed under the zoning code. Therefore, the City is unlikely to achieve maximum build-out as defined in the General Plan. The City has a limited number of residentially zoned vacant parcels. Most of the remaining vacant parcels with residential zoning are located in the Coastal Zone, and many include significant development constraints such as being located on a bluff top or having wetland and riparian corridors through the parcel.
3. **Lack of Multifamily Developers & Contractors.** Fort Bragg is home to many single family residential contractors, but there no contractors with experience building multi-family projects. Additionally, the City does not as yet have any multifamily developers. Many of the larger remaining vacant parcels in Fort Bragg or zoned for multifamily development. The City is working with out of area developers to build multi-family projects.
4. **Location and Economics.** The City of Fort Bragg is located in a remote coastal area, accessible by twisty two-lane roads. Its relative inaccessibility continues to result in a slow growth rate (below 1% annually) for housing, residential and job growth. Typically the City adds from ten to 15 new units of housing per year. The real estate market has recently heated up in Fort Bragg, particularly as people retire from the Bay Area to the Mendocino Coast. This has resulted in higher home prices, but not significantly more development of new residential projects.



111 E. COMMERCIAL STREET  
WILLITS, CALIFORNIA 95490  
(707) 459-4601 TEL  
(707) 459-1562 FAX

## MEMORANDUM

To: Nephele Barrett, Executive Director MCOG  
Subject: RHNA; Constraints Statement  
Date: 8/9/2018

Anticipated constraints associated with the development of new housing within the City limits are described below.

Seismic Hazards: The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone extends the full length of the City of Willits. The zone is located in the center of Willits and impacts two significant areas with development potential for new residences. Formal geotechnical studies have concluded that approximately 50 acres of R-1 zoned vacant or underutilized land in the northwest segment of the City are impacted by issues of seismicity and slope stability. Also, approximately 23 acres of land zoned R-2 in the area east of Baechtal Road in the southeast quadrant of the City are subject to the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act which requires costly geotechnical studies prior to construction in

Flood Hazards: Approximately 26 acres of vacant or underutilized residential lands in Willits are located in the 100-year flood plain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The City's zoning code has established combining districts identifying these areas as being located in the Floodway Combining (-FW) Zone or the Floodplain Combining (-FP) Zone. Both of these combining zones require special conditions or building requirements which must be satisfied before a structure can be built or substantially remodeled.

Economic Development: Subsequent to the decline of the timber industry which was the backbone of the local economy, Willits has experienced minimal economic and population growth. This trend appears to be continuing into the foreseeable future, which is reflected in the development of limited new residential units.

Summary: The state of the local economy, as well as environmental limitations of flood and seismic hazards, continue to limit the development of new residential units within the City of Willits.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please call me at (707) 459-7124 or email at [dduley@cityofwillits.org](mailto:dduley@cityofwillits.org).

Sincerely,

Dusty Duley  
City Planner



## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

### STAFF REPORT

**Agenda # 6**  
Regular Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/20/2018

---

**TITLE:** Presentation: North Coast and Upstate Fuel Cell Vehicle (FCEV) Readiness Project

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

**DATE:** 8/13/2018

---

#### **BACKGROUND:**

In 2014 MCOG began participating with the Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA), a regional joint powers authority in Humboldt County, on the Northwest California Alternative Transportation Fuels Readiness Project, funded by a grant from the California Energy Commission (CEC). The resulting plan was completed in August 2016.

Partners included RCEA, the Schatz Energy Research Center at Humboldt State University (SERC), the North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District, and the Siskiyou County Economic Development Council. The project was consistent with MCOG's inter-regional coordination policies, our Regional Transportation Plan, and the regions' efforts to prepare Zero Emission Vehicle Regional Readiness Plans.

In 2015, RCEA began work on another CEC grant, for the North Coast and Upstate Fuel Cell Vehicle (FCEV) Readiness Project. Through various agencies, nine (9) counties are represented: Humboldt, Del Norte, Glenn, Lake, Mendocino, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity.

In February 2017, MCOG signed an agreement as a subcontractor to Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA) for participation in the FCEV project, to represent the Mendocino County region and to perform a minor scope of work as approved in the grant award, for \$2,000. The agreement terminates November 7, 2018.

One of the final tasks remaining due is to give a presentation that increases awareness of fuel cell electric vehicle technology, associated infrastructure, planning activity, and related information. I will present a collection of slides from RCEA's material.

---

#### **ACTION REQUIRED:**

Receive a presentation about the FCEV planning project and general education on the subject.

---

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

MCOG could present to another audience; however the Council represents a countywide constituency, serves as a multiplier in terms of outreach, and meets criteria for this grant task.

---

#### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Allow staff to present a general overview of the North Coast and Upstate Fuel Cell Vehicle Readiness planning effort and concepts of fuel cell renewable energy technology and its uses for transportation.



## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

### STAFF REPORT

---

**Agenda # 7**  
Regular Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/20/2018

**TITLE:** Board Calendar - Schedule Fall Transportation Tour/Mobile Workshop

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

**DATE:** 8.13.2018

---

**BACKGROUND:**

MCOG has been conducting transportation project tours in various parts of Mendocino County (and even a couple of out-of-county tours) since 2006. It provides an opportunity for Council members from outside the tour area to familiarize themselves with transportation projects in that area, for which they may be asked to commit funding, and to review completed projects which MCOG has funded. There is also an opportunity for local agencies to review projects under their jurisdictions. Staffers, elected officials, and interested community members are welcome.

The adopted 2018 calendar (attached for reference) includes a placeholder for a tour in September or October, location to be determined. Staff has suggested a trip to Laytonville, where the Council last toured projects in 2007. We anticipate completion of the Branscomb Road Pedestrian/Multi-Use Bridge Over Ten Mile Creek construction project by that time. This is a costly project in which MCOG has contributed at least \$853,000, since it links together numerous previous planned transportation projects and investments, such as Safe Routes to Schools and Active Transportation Program (ATP) projects.

We propose that the Council select a date so that staff may proceed with organizing a tour. Available dates suggested are September 5, 10, 17, 18, and October 1 (regular meeting date). We would spend most of the day including transportation, the tour, lunch, and community meeting. Please bring your calendars.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:**

Select a date for a transportation tour/mobile workshop of Laytonville in September or October, as is customary for the Council in spring and/or fall.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:**

Postpone the tour, propose alternate dates, or choose not to pursue this opportunity.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Select a date for a transportation tour/mobile workshop of Laytonville in September or October.

# 2018 MCOG BOARD MEETING CALENDAR

1st Monday at 1:30 pm, 9-10 months per year, at County Administration Center,  
Board of Supervisors Chambers, Room 1070, 501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah  
*Subject to Venue Availability and Unless Otherwise Noticed*

*Adopted 2/5/2018 - subject to change*

Date	Planned Highlights and Recurring Actions	Notes
January	No meeting this month	
February 5	Election of Officers and Committee Appointments	
March 5	<u>Executive Committee Recommendations:</u> Draft 2018/19 Budget – No Action	
April 2	Regular Business	
May 7	Budget Workshop Including: <u>Executive Committee Recommendations:</u> Draft 2018/19 Budget <u>Transit Productivity Committee (TPC) and SSTAC Recommendations:</u> 2018/19 Unmet Transit Needs Reasonable-to-Meet Finding Funding of MTA's Annual Transit Claim	
June 4	<u>Combined Recommendations of Staff &amp; Committees:</u> Adoption of 2018/19 Regional Transportation Planning Agency Budget <u>TAC Recommendations:</u> Adoption of 2018/19 Planning Overall Work Program	
July	No meeting this month	
August 20 Special Meeting	Regular Business	Change to third Monday
September TBD Special Meeting	<u>On Location Tour/Mobile Workshop (Optional):</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transportation Tour of Plans &amp; Projects – To Be Determined</li> <li>▪ Informal Lunch and Presentations/Discussion</li> </ul>	All-day field trip and community meeting
October 1	Regular Business	
November 5	Regular Business	
December 3	<u>Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC) Recommendations:</u> 2019/20 Unmet Transit Needs - Public Hearing	

## Related Meetings of Interest / Educational Options

February 21	19th Annual CTF Transportation Forum, Sacramento <a href="http://www.transportationfoundation.org/">http://www.transportationfoundation.org/</a>	CA's leading charitable transportation organization
March 14-16	CALCOG Delegates: 2018 Annual Regional Leadership Forum, Monterey <a href="http://www.calcog.org/">http://www.calcog.org/</a>	Assn. of regional agencies; networking & current issues
April 11-12	CA Transportation Commission Town Hall – Mendocino/Lake/Sonoma RTPAs	Regionally hosted CTC visit
Oct. 28-30	29th Annual Focus on the Future Conference – Self Help Counties Coalition, Indian Wells, CA <a href="http://www.selfhelpcounties.org/focus/">http://www.selfhelpcounties.org/focus/</a>	20 local agencies with transportation sales taxes

August 13, 2018

**To:** MCOG Board of Directors  
**From:** Janet Orth, Deputy Director / CFO  
**Subject:** Consent Calendar of August 20, 2018

The following agenda items are recommended for approval/action.

8. Approval of June 4, 2018 Minutes – *attached*
9. Approval of May 17, 2018 Transit Productivity Committee (TPC) Minutes  
– *attached*
10. Approval of First Amendment to Fiscal Year 2018/19 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) - This routine amendment would carry over to FY 2018/19 Work Element 5, City of Ukiah's "Update Speed Zone Reports" project. Total OWP funding would increase from \$1,221,126 to \$1,227,959 (increase of \$6,833 of Local Transportation Funds).  
*- Staff report and amendment are attached.*

# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Agenda # 8**  
Consent Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/20/2018

## MINUTES

**Monday, June 4, 2018**

County Administration Center, Board of Supervisors Chambers

### 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 1:35 p.m. with Directors Larry Stranske, Richey Wasserman, Michael Cimolino, Michael Carter (Alternate), Georgeanne Croskey, and Rex Jackman (Caltrans/PAC); Chair Dan Gjerde presiding. Director Steve Scalmanini was absent.

Staff present: Phil Dow, Executive Director; Nephele Barrett, Program Manager (executive director successor); Janet Orth, Deputy Director/CFO; Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner; and Marta Ford, Administrative Assistant. Additional staffs present for Agenda #2; Lisa Davey-Bates, Transportation Planner, and James Sookne, Regional Project Manager.

**2. Report of Executive Director Succession.** Executive Director Dow announced his retirement as Executive Director and introduced Nephele Barrett as his successor under the current contract. Mr. Dow has worked as MCOG staff in various positions leading up to Executive Director since 1981. He gave a brief description of his history with MCOG, description of tasks that have been completed, and explained his decision for retirement at this time. He gave a brief background of Ms. Barrett's history with Dow & Associates and as an MCOG staff member. He reminded the group MCOG has two staffing contracts, one for administrative services with Dow & Associates, and one for planning services with Davey-Bates Consulting (DBC), together they have worked as MCOG staff for many decades. He conveyed his assurance in staff's abilities to continue working at the same level to provide high quality service; he plans to maintain a presence to provide support and mentor opportunities until the end of the contract, September 2019. Ms. Barrett indicated that a more formal retirement celebration will be planned in his honor.

Chair Gjerde invited the staff and audience members to respond; participants expressing appreciation for Mr. Dow's service and offering anecdotes included:

- Nephele Barrett, Executive Director - successor
- Rex Jackman, Branch Chief, Transportation Planning, Caltrans District 1
- John McCowen, Mendocino County District 2 Supervisor, former MCOG Board member
- Dan Gjerde, MCOG Chair
- Matt Brady, District Director, Caltrans District – presenting a custom highway sign
- Janet Orth, Deputy Director / CFO, Dow & Associates
- Lisa Davey-Bates, Principal for Davey-Bates Consulting (DBC)
- Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner, DBC

**3. Public Hearing: Adoption of Resolution #M2018-07 Adopting Methodology for the 2018 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA).** Ms. Barrett explained the RHNA process, why it is necessary, what the determination numbers are used for, and the requirement to adopt a methodology. A public hearing on the RHNA requires a 60-day notice. Executive Director Barrett

presented proof of publication from the Ukiah Daily Journal dated April 4, 2018 as evidence of compliance.

**Upon motion** by Carter, second by Stranske and carried unanimously (*7 Ayes – Stranske, Wasserman, Cimolino, Carter/Alt., Croskey, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent*): IT IS ORDERED that this public hearing on adopting the Methodology for the 2018 Regional Housing Needs Assessment was properly noticed.

Ms. Barrett referred to her written staff report that included the RHNA Draft Methodology Statement. The recommendation for MCOG was to adopt the Methodology by resolution and continue to advance the process.

Chair Gjerde opened and closed the public hearing at 2:06 p.m., with no testimony offered. **Upon motion** by Cimolino, second by Carter and carried unanimously on roll call vote (*7 Ayes – Stranske, Wasserman, Cimolino, Carter/Alt., Croskey, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent*): IT IS ORDERED that the following resolution is adopted.

**Resolution No. M2018-07**

Adopting the Methodology for the 2018 Mendocino County  
Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)  
(Reso. #M2018-07 is incorporated herein by reference)

**4. Convene as RTPA**

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

**6. Public Expression.** None.

**7 - 9. Regular Calendar.**

**7. Fiscal Year 2018/19 RTPA Budget.** Ms. Orth reported on the final budget proposal, the result of all recommendations by the Executive Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, Transit Productivity Committee, 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 \$7.6 million, and total allocations are recommended at \$7.3 million. Her summary included:

- The proposed resolutions;
- Release of further phases of Active Transportation Program (ATP) grant funding anticipated from California Transportation Commission (CTC) for the Covelo trail project;
- Increase in Transportation Planning Program funding from prior-year carryover;
- Seven Unmet Transit Needs identified as “reasonable to meet”;
- Eligibility findings for Mendocino Transit Authority’s annual claim for funds;
- New apportionment funds that are to come in from the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), fund balances available and current allocations for Partnership Funding, Local Assistance, and Formula Distribution to member agencies.

The Chair invited public comment; no one volunteered. **Upon motion** by Croskey, second by Carter, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (*7 Ayes – Stranske, Wasserman, Cimolino, Carter (Alternate), Croskey, 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 M2018-03 Allocating Fiscal Year 2018/19 Funds and 2017/18 Carryover Funds for Administration, Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities, Planning and Reserves.

**Resolution No. M2018-03**

Allocating Fiscal Year 2018/19 Funds and 2017/18 Carryover Funds for Administration, Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities, Planning and Reserves  
(Reso. #M2018-03 is incorporated herein by reference)

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)		
Reserved LTF prior-year unallocated revenue	29,135	
MCOG Administration	442,444	
2% Bicycle & Pedestrian	66,181	
Planning Program – new funds	147,816	
LTF carryover – Planning program	36,008	
Total LTF		721,584
Regional Surface Trans. Program – Admin.		90,000
ATP Infrastructure Grants – Admin.		673,173
ATP Non-Infrastructure Grants - Planning		400,151
Sustainable Communities Grant		138,992
PPM Funds - Planning		176,659
RPA Funds - Planning		321,500
<b>Total Allocations</b>		<b>2,522,059</b>

- b. Adoption of Resolution #M2018-04 Finding That There Are Unmet Transit Needs That Are Reasonable To Meet for Fiscal Year 2018/19.

**Resolution No. M2018-04**

Finding That There Are Unmet Transit Needs  
That Are Reasonable To Meet for Fiscal Year 2018/19  
(Reso. #M2018-04 is incorporated herein by reference)

- c. Adoption of Resolution #M2018-05 Allocating Fiscal Year 2018/19 Local Transportation Funds, State Transit Assistance, and Capital Reserve Funds and FY 2017/18 Carryover Funds to Mendocino Transit Authority.

**Resolution No. M2018-05**

Allocating Fiscal Year 2018/19 LTF, STA, and Capital Reserve Funds and  
2017/18 Carryover Funds to Mendocino Transit Authority  
(Reso. #M2018-05 is incorporated herein by reference)

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)		
MTA Operations	2,661,288	
Unmet Transit Needs	0	
Senior Center Operations	493,777	
Capital Reserve Fund	0	
Total LTF		3,155,065
State Transit Assistance (STA)		
MTA Operations	300,000	
MTA & Senior Center Capital	49,000	
Capital Reserve Fund	331,645	
Total STA		680,645
Capital Reserve Program		
Current Year - MTA	0	
Current Year – Senior Centers	0	
Long Term – MTA and Seniors	632,138	
Adjustment for STA Contribution (duplication)	-331,645	
Total Capital Reserve		300,493
<b>Total Transit Allocations</b>		<b>4,136,203</b>

- d. Adoption of Resolution #M2018-06 Allocating Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds for Fiscal Year 2018/19 MCOG Partnership Funding Program, Local Assistance, and Distribution By Formula To Member Agencies.

**Resolution No. M2018-06**

Allocating RSTP Funds for Fiscal Year 2018/19 MCOG Partnership Funding Program, Local Assistance, and Distribution by Formula To Member Agencies  
(Reso. #M2018-06 is incorporated herein by reference)

MCOG Partnership Funding Program		100,000
Local Assistance – Project Delivery		90,000
Formula Distribution to Members		
Mendocino County DOT	117,729	
City of Ukiah	159,438	
City of Fort Bragg	105,786	
City of Willits	99,289	
City of Point Arena	65,624	
Total Formula Distributions		546,865
<b>Total RSTP Allocations</b>		<b>736,865</b>

**8. Technical Advisory Committee Recommendations of May 21, 2018: Adoption of Final Fiscal Year 2018/19 Planning Overall Work Program (OWP).** Ms. Ellard referred to her written staff report. Ms. Ellard explained the final program that includes 19 work elements and totals \$1,221,126. Ms. Ellard invited public comment.

**Upon motion** by Director Croskey, second by Director Stranske, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (7 Ayes – Stranske, Wasserman, Cimolino, Carter/Alt., Croskey, Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent): IT IS ORDERED that the FY 2018/19 Final Overall Work Program is adopted as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee, and the Executive Director or designee is authorized to sign certifications and the OWP Agreement and to forward to Caltrans, as required.

**9. Consideration of Endorsement of Senate Bill 1029 – North Coast Railroad Authority Right-of-Way, Great Redwood Trail Agency / Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit District.** This item was brought forward prior to Agenda #8 out of respect for a participant’s schedule. Ms. Ellard summarized the events that brought this agenda item back to the MCOG Board and clarified the location of the mile marker location in question at the May 8, 2018 MCOG Board meeting. Jason Liles, Senior Policy Advisor for Senator Mike McGuire, gave an update on Senate Bill 1029 and answered questions from the Board. North Coast Railroad Authority (NCRA) acquired about \$9.8 million in debt. He explained that in 1989, the governor signed a bill to assemble the NCRA but the mechanism to fund the bill was vetoed; therefore no public funding was approved to support the organization’s efforts. Caltrans has a discrepancy with California Transportation Commission (CTC) regarding the amount of the debt. He summarized the tasks and timelines to get the bill to the Assembly. The goal is to create a trail from San Francisco Bay to Humboldt Bay by connecting the new trails with existing trails along the way, to reduce cost and delays. There is a \$92 billion outdoor recreation industry than can contribute to the region’s economy. Questions and comments from the Council included:

- *Does the Senator’s office have any feedback on MCOG’s request for changes to the composition of the two boards?* (Gjerde) Mr. Liles explained his experience with larger boards. He cautioned against a large number of representatives on a board. He justified the decision for the appointees and explained the preference to limit the representation, yet create fair representation for all.

- *Could the proposed joint member be a person selected by the Board of Supervisors of Humboldt and Mendocino? (Carter)* Mr. Liles said it could but suggested that the terms may rotate every couple of years with representatives from the areas within the League of Cities that have a right-of-way contained within their city.
- *Suggestion to maintain the request for more local representation on both boards; it may be a disservice if representation is overloaded with people not affiliated with this area. (Cimolino)* Mr. Liles explained that the Governor appoints representatives, one that is anticipated to be from Caltrans. Of the proposed seven seats on the new trail agency, there will be three local people appointed, one board member from Humboldt, one board member from Mendocino, and one likely municipal member. He took note of the request for two additional local representatives on the SMART board to be included for approval in the amendment.
- *Asked for more clarification on changes that were made and that were struck from the draft. (Croskey)* Mr. Liles said these were amendments that the Appropriations Committee put in that involved funding, which is still under negotiations. Until funding is determined, those changes may or may not be included. It remains as temporary language.
- *Why was Caltrans removed from its role to temporarily serve as the new trail agency? (Staff)* Mr. Liles explained that Caltrans declined to undertake this role. They were involved in keeping updated on the process but, with their other duties, did not find it necessary to serve in this manner.
- *An additional comment on the number of representatives on the SMART Board that involves more people from the Bay Area than from local communities.(Stranske)* Mr. Liles explained that Marin and Sonoma counties had already invested in the infrastructure. Chair Gjerde explained further that the voters from Marin and Sonoma counties approved an eighth-cent sales tax for the SMART passenger train by a two-thirds vote. Due to those counties funding this project, they have earned the privilege for more representation on the SMART Board.
- *What is the anticipated cost of the entire project?(Cimolino)* Mr. Liles says it can vary widely depending on the areas and the type of materials used; there is no estimate.
- *How much will it cost to maintain the trail? (Cimolino)* It depends on the type of materials used for the trails; parts of the trail will be paved, part dirt. There are national specifications available based on thousands of miles of trail; urban areas cost more.
- *Will this be funded through General Fund revenue from the State?(Cimolino)* Mr. Liles said there are bond funds available for the construction; for maintenance would be a different type of funding. General funds could be used to retire debt; SB 5 California Drought, Water, Parks, Climate, Coastal Protection, and Outdoor Access for All Act of 2018 and Parks Bonds may be used for to maintain the trail.
- *How will the operations of the agency that will maintain it be paid?* The bill includes \$1 million for startup of the Great Redwood Trail Agency in FY 2018/19.

Director Stranske asked for more clarification of various milemarkers and the intended location of where the train would let people off in Willits. Mr. Liles said that at this time it is too early to tell with certainty; the plans for that location will take years to formulate.

**Upon motion** by Wasserman, second by Cimolino, and carried unanimously(7 Ayes; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent):: IT IS ORDERED that MCOG will send a letter of support for SB 1029 and to reiterate the previous request of additional local representation. Chair Gjerde directed MCOG staff to write the letter.

**10 - 12. Consent Calendar.** Ms. Orth provided updated information for Agenda #12, explaining that, at the time the staff report was written, MTA had not provided a specific requested amount. The draft resolution provided in the agenda packet states “up to the amount of available funds for

Mendocino County.” Ms. Orth would like to amend the resolution to specify MTA’s request of “up to \$350,000 of available funds for Mendocino County.”

**Upon motion** by Carter, second by Stranske, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (7 Ayes –, Stranske, Croskey, Carter (Alt.), Cimolino, Wasserman, Jackman/PAC, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent): IT IS ORDERED that consent items are approved as amended:

**10. Approval of May 7, 2018 Minutes – as written**

**11. Adoption of Resolution #M2018-08 Approving Mendocino Transit Authority’s Grant Application for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Program – Annual Regional Apportionment for Transit Operating Assistance**

**12. Adoption of Resolution #M2018-09 Approving the Programming of FTA Section 5311(f) Intercity Bus Program Funds for Mendocino Transit Authority’s Project Proposal. – as amended to specify request of up to \$350,000**

**13. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee - Reconvene as RTPA - Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee.** Upon motion by Wasserman, second by Carter, 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. None.
- b. North Coast Railroad Authority. As discussed earlier in Agenda Item #9. No further information to report.
- c. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings. Mr. Dow’s staff report was distributed as a handout; no more information was highlighted.
- d. MCOG Administration Staff. Ms. Orth reminded MCOG Board that the next MCOG meeting is scheduled for August 20, 2018. The Council typically does not meet in July due to the July 4 holiday or in September due to Labor Day. Scheduling a meeting for late August bridges the four-month gap in a manageable way.
- e. MCOG Planning Staff. Mrs. Ellard announced the first community workshop for the Mendocino County Pedestrian Needs Assessment and Engineered Feasibility Study scheduled for June 19, 2018 in Point Arena.
- f. MCOG Directors. None.
- g. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates. Director Croskey was unable to attend the last meeting on May 30, 2018.

**15. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Submitted: PHILLIP J. DOW, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

By Marta Ford, Administrative Assistant

# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Agenda # 9**  
Consent Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/20/2018

## MINUTES

Transit Productivity Committee - TPC  
May 17, 2018

Dow & Associates Conference Room, Ukiah

### PRESENT:

MCOG Board Members: Susan Ranochak and Steve Scalmanini  
MTA Board Members: Jim Mastin  
Senior Centers Rep.: Charles Bush, Redwood Coast Seniors  
Staff: Janet Orth, Nephele Barrett and Marta Ford, MCOG  
Carla Meyer and Jacob King, MTA

ABSENT: Jim Tarbell, MTA

- 1. Call to Order.** MCOG Director Ranochak called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m. Jim Tarbell was excused by prior arrangement.
- 2. Public Expression.** None.
- 3. Annual Review of MTA Performance Reports Against MCOG Standards.** Janet gave an overview of her written staff report and her initial review of performance using the adopted “CPI Adjusted Rolling Average” with both one-year and three-year results. She noted the data was still a year behind schedule for review.

Service Type	2016/17	2017/18	3-Year Average
Dial-A-Ride (DAR) met Cost/Hour, improved Passengers/Hour	2 of 4	Pending data from MTA	1 of 4
Short Distance Bus Routes met just Cost/Hour	1 of 4		1 of 4
Long Distance Routes declined in Farebox, Cost/Hour rose	2 of 4		4 of 4
Senior Centers declined in Farebox, Cost/Hour rose	3 of 4		4 of 4

### Discussion included:

- Description and consideration of the four service types.
- There is potential to improve DAR, especially in a rural area. (Carla)
- Costs are up for all types because the labor union negotiated higher pay for the previously underpaid drivers. Also ridership is down 16% over the past year due to loss of choice riders, attributed to homeless people using bus shelters. Ridership is down as a nationwide trend, but is worse here. MTA’s shelter cleaner was assaulted and robbed at the Pear Tree Center in Ukiah. MTA is in process of changing out benches with designs that discourage loitering. (Carla)
- This issue came up recently at the County Continuum of Care governing board and will be addressed as a high priority. It will not change quickly, but have confidence that it will change. (Charles)
- Senior centers have a different scenario. Riders are dispatched. Another advantage is dealing with transportation clientele linked to a range of other services. (Charles)
- Review of the five recommendations from most recent independent Triennial Performance Audit of MTA, for the period ended June 30, 2015; the next audit is due to start this year. (Janet)
  - 1) “Develop internal goals for collection and measurement of on-time performance.” – N/A, in progress.
  - 2) “Develop a charter policy that meets federal and state requirements.” – N/A, MTA is eliminating charter services.
  - 3) “Consider an alternate funding formula for Senior Center TDA funds.” – It may be time to address.
  - 4) “Update the Short Range Transit Development Plan (SRTDP).” – MTA will apply again for a Caltrans planning grant in the upcoming cycle this fall.

- 5) “Review opportunities for increasing local revenue to boost farebox recovery.” – Discussion of new advertising revenues (\$100,000), agriculture vanpool (\$30,000), opportunities for fare revenue agreements with Redwood Coast Regional Center (RCRC), and other ideas. (All)
- Any recommendations for Short and Long-Distance fixed bus routes? (Janet)
  - Bus shelter issue is the main problem right now. Mendocino College is not a problem due to state funding of MTA’s free student fares through Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP), so college ridership is up. There is better security at the Ukiah main campus; County Sheriff monitors regularly. After the recent incident, MTA has sought more support from law enforcement, so far unsuccessfully. Ukiah City Council appointed a new ad hoc committee to address this issue. About two-thirds of homeless are rooted in community, staying put where services are. The other third is transient, route is north-south, and should be moved back to where they came from to get services. Actions should be around getting local homeless into housing. A recent report identifies a need to find ways to stop nuisance behavior in public places. Another major target is policing of transients, coupled with taking care of the local home-grown group. Charles will report and work on this with the Continuum of Care governing board. (Carla, Janet, Jacob, Steve, Charles)
  - Reference to report: Homelessness Needs Assessment and Action Steps for Mendocino County, by Marbut Consulting, March 19, 2018.
  - MTA has adopted a state-compliant rider exclusion policy, such that it can exclude nuisance riders for up to one year. (Carla)
  - Does summer school/student traffic go up much? No. MTA offers a summer youth pass all summer for \$40 and sells about 50 passes, down from 100. Is that because they are not going out as much and are more connected with social media? Likely it is a combination of homelessness and social media. (Charles, Carla, Jacob, Jim, Nephele)
  - Short-range routes: Ukiah, Fort Bragg, and Willits have had regular fixed routes for the past three years. Willits is dragging down average performance. Black Bart Casino did not renew batch tickets agreement with MTA. (Jacob)
  - Long-range routes: Willits locals ride #20 to/from Ukiah. Why is performance down for long-range? Three-year review meets all standards; most recent year reviewed met just 2 of 4. Was that a bad year or a trend? Ridership is down in general. Gas is still cheap, but would take \$5 price to affect it. (All)
  - MTA’s route committee is reconvening to analyze each route. Drivers meet Saturdays once a month. Ideas include express routes, so people don’t need to wait as long and get to destinations on time, as well as unmet needs solutions. MTA is active internally to address productivity. (Carla)

Janet called for the question of recommendations to the Council. Carla suggested 1) review routes that have not been reviewed in years; 2) work with community partners on addressing the homeless issue; and 3) compare MTA’s fare structure to like agencies in rural areas. Charles added “make safe, friendly places.”

Discussion followed on fare revenues. Carla wanted MCOG to reduce its farebox standard from 15% to 10%, consistent with new state law (SB 508 in 2015). Jim and Charles agreed that raising fare prices is a disincentive to increasing ridership; it is more important to get more riders. Jim clarified that when MTA increases its fare prices, it is mainly to meet compliance standards.

- What is the timeline for considering this change? Route committee results should be considered first. It was agreed to revisit in six months. (Steve, Carla, Jacob, All)
- Other transit agencies want to get out from under even the 10% new state standard. Further discussion of the need for riders over fares. Public transit should be made cheap and easy. Transit is the only government service requiring an additional funding share. (Jim, Charles, Carla)

**Recommendation:**

Upon motion by Bush, seconded by Scalmanini, and carried unanimously (*4 Ayes; 0 Noes; 1 Absent*), the TPC recommended that 1) 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; 2) MTA work with community partner agencies to address the homelessness problem that is impacting ridership; and 3) MCOG encourage MTA to conduct a review of all routes on the system for productivity.

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

#### **4. Review and Recommendation on MTA's Analysis and Prioritization of 2018/19 Unmet Transit Needs.**

Janet briefly reviewed the annual process and adopted definitions. Carla handed out her 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. Carla's report was ranked by five categories: *Already Exists* (2), *High Priority–Consider for FY 2018/19* (5), *Medium Priority* (2), *Low Priority* (5), and *Not an Unmet Need* (5), for a total of 19 needs. (One of the 18 needs on MCOG's list, SSTAC's #2, was split into two parts.) Carla's review and group discussion included the following.

- "Already Exist" – Weekend and after hours rides for seniors and adults is partially provided, in Ukiah area on evenings and Saturdays. However, MTA provides door-to-door service, not door-through-door. Refer to Low Priority for other destinations and times.
- "High Priority–Consider for FY 2018/19" – Design of downtown Ukiah shuttle routes is in MTA's existing budget. This and earlier morning service for UVAH clients are under review by a Route Committee. It is a misconception that people are willing to ride smaller busses but not larger ones. Smaller vehicles can be used in the evenings but would be over capacity by day. An additional Ukiah-Point Arena round trip might encourage family trips. Service to Willits pool and High School would target youth and can be evaluated for a low-cost route adjustment.
- "High Priority–Consider for FY 2018/19" – The only high priority of five SSTAC identified needs was a long-standing one for "Wheelchair accessible door-through-door assisted services for seniors and disabled adults on Wednesday in the Ukiah area." MTA proposes that funding come from revising the formula for distribution of TDA transportation funds to the senior center contracts, a task that has been recommended in the past two triennial performance audits of both MCOG and MTA. There is currently no mechanism to evaluate the funding formula, but perhaps the time has come to tackle this issue.
- "Medium Priority" – Two needs from MTA's list were identified. Brooktrails service has been tried many years ago, but demographics have changed. The Route Committee will consider it and Potter Valley service for MCAVHN (Mendocino County AIDS/Viral Hepatitis Network) clients.
- "Low Priority" – A South Coast shuttle from Sea Ranch to Gualala/Manchester and the other four SSTAC identified needs were in this category. "Transportation from remote rural areas to existing transit stops" was considered by MTA staff to be a logistical challenge.
- "Non-Qualifying Unmet Needs" – These were considered infeasible, not transit, or not a public service.

Discussion followed on reasonable-to-meet needs and how they could be funded or otherwise provided. Staff recommended appropriate language for a motion to reflect the above discussion.

#### **Recommendation:**

Upon motion by Mastin, seconded by Bush, 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 2018/19, contingent on review of existing routes, update of the funding formula for senior centers' transportation contracts, and potential new revenues through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Program, as identified on the FY 2018/19 list:

- #6-M Design of more shuttle routes that remove parking downtown and well as increase housing, with smaller buses that people would ride
- #7-M Addition of one-day round-trip from Ukiah to Point Arena
- #12-M Service to Willits pool and High School
- #1-PH Ukiah fixed route and DAR service starting a half hour earlier in the mornings for transportation to jobs (UVAH clients)
- #4-S Wheelchair accessible door-through-door assisted services for seniors and disabled adults on Wednesdays in the Ukiah area.

[M=MTA; PH=Public Hearing; S=SSTAC]

**5. Review and Recommendation on Fiscal Year 2018/19 Transit Claim.** Janet reviewed her written analysis and staff recommendation very briefly, since the meeting had gone into overtime. She noted that Local Transportation Funds available for public transit are up 4.4% (\$132,444) over the previous year.

Carla confirmed that State Transit Assistance (STA) funds are claimed by MTA for deposit to the Capital Reserve Fund (CRF). This would be the first contribution by MTA to the reserve in many years. No CRF funds are claimed for expenditure in FY 2018/19. Janet clarified that MTA’s Five-Year Capital Plan submitted with the claim only covers Vehicle Replacement and no CRF needs are identified. By law, MCOG cannot hold a reserve without identifying capital projects for it. Carla stated that MTA’s budget was not yet finalized, but that the CRF could be used to fund their transit center project. She will provide the complete Five-Year Capital Plan after adopted by MTA, and also a revised claim to reflect this discussion.

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

**Recommendation:**

Upon motion by Bush, seconded by Mastin, and carried unanimously (*4 Ayes; 0 Noes; 1 Absent*), the TPC recommended that MCOG:

- 1) Allocate full funding of MTA’s claim for FY 2018/19 Local Transportation Funds, and
- 2) Make allocations for State Transit Assistance and Capital Reserve funds when adjusted to reflect Long Term Capital and MTA’s adopted Five-Year Capital Plan is provided to MCOG.

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)		
MTA Operations	2,661,288	
Unmet Transit Needs	0	
Senior Center Operations	493,777	
Transit Capital Reserve	0	
Total LTF		3,155,065
State Transit Assistance Fund (STA)		
MTA Operations	300,000	
MTA & Seniors Capital	49,000	
Transit Capital Reserve	331,645	
Total STA		680,645
Capital Reserve Fund (CRF)		
MTA Capital, Current Year	0	
Senior Capital, Current Year	0	
Long-Term Capital Reserve	632,138	
Total CRF		632,138
Adjustment for STA Contribution to CRF		(331,645)
<b>Total Recommended FY 2018/19 Transit Allocation</b>		<b>4,136,203</b>

**6. Miscellaneous / Members’ Concerns.** None.

**7. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 3:28 p.m.

Submitted by Janet Orth, Deputy Director / CFO

# Mendocino Council of Governments

## Annual Transit Performance Review

March 1, 2016 - February 28, 2017

MCOG Standards	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Ratio	Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour	Cost per Passenger
<i>When comparing to performance:</i>				
	Higher # is better	Higher # is better	Lower # is better	Lower # is better
<b>Dial-A-Ride</b>				
Spring 2016	4.1	14.7%	\$87.25	\$21.28
Summer 2016	5.0	14.7%	\$87.25	\$17.45
Fall 2016	4.1	14.7%	\$87.25	\$21.28
Winter 2016/17	4.2	14.7%	\$87.25	\$20.77
Annual Average	4.4	14.7%	\$87.25	\$20.20
Standard	<b>4.5</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	NA	NA
CPI Adjusted Rolling Average	NA	NA	<b>\$95.15</b>	<b>\$21.14</b>
Result	not met	not met	✓	✓
<b>Short Distance Bus Routes</b>				
Spring 2016	7.8	12.4%	\$85.22	\$10.93
Summer 2016	10.0	12.4%	\$85.22	\$8.52
Fall 2016	9.0	12.4%	\$85.22	\$9.47
Winter 2016/17	7.6	12.4%	\$85.22	\$11.21
Annual Average	8.6	12.4%	\$85.22	\$10.03
Standard	<b>14.0</b>	<b>15%</b>	NA	NA
CPI Adjusted Rolling Average	NA	NA	<b>\$86.42</b>	<b>\$6.17</b>
Result	not met	not met	✓	not met
<b>Long Distance Routes</b>				
Spring 2016	3.3	13.3%	\$97.03	\$29.76
Summer 2016	4.4	13.3%	\$97.03	\$22.05
Fall 2016	3.8	14.5%	\$97.03	\$25.53
Winter 2016/17	2.9	13.3%	\$97.03	\$33.46
Annual Average	3.6	13.6%	\$97.03	\$27.70
Standard	<b>3.2</b>	<b>15%</b>	NA	NA
CPI Adjusted Rolling Average	NA	NA	<b>\$93.80</b>	<b>\$29.31</b>
Result	✓	not met	not met	✓
<b>Senior Centers</b>				
Spring 2016	3.3	9.5%	\$47.55	\$14.41
Summer 2016	3.9	14.3%	\$54.08	\$13.87
Fall 2016	2.8	9.8%	\$48.23	\$17.23
Winter 2016/17	3.1	10.8%	\$51.49	\$16.61
Annual Average	3.3	11.1%	\$50.34	\$15.53
Standard	<b>3.0</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	NA	NA
CPI Adjusted Rolling Average	NA	NA	<b>\$50.03</b>	<b>\$16.68</b>
Result	✓	not met	w/i margin of error	✓

**NOTES:**

"CPI Adjusted Rolling Average" uses the Consumer Price Index (CPI) Annual Average, All Urban Consumers, California, percent change from calendar year 2016 to 2017, added to the past three-year average and rounded. See Standards chart.

Check-mark symbol indicates the standard was met.

Cost per Passenger is the result of Cost per Hour divided by Passengers per Hour (may differ slightly from MTA report).

Round-off errors may occur between MTA's report and this summary, or differences based on number of decimal places entered.

Inland and Coast routes were changed by TPC recommendation to "Short Distance" and "Long Distance" respectively.

Flex Routes were deleted from this table.

# Mendocino Council of Governments Annual Transit Performance Review

3 Years: March 1, 2014 - February 28, 2017

MCOG Standards	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Ratio	Operating Cost per Vehicle Service Hour	Cost per Passenger	Cost/Hr Annual CPI adj.	
<i>When comparing to performance:</i>						
	Higher # is better	Higher # is better	Lower # is better	Lower # is better		
<b>Dial-A-Ride</b>						
Mar. 1, 2014 - Feb. 28, 2015	4.0	12.3%	\$95.58	\$24.07	\$97.33	1.83%
Mar. 1, 2015 - Feb. 29, 2016	3.9	13.9%	\$97.46	\$24.99	\$98.89	1.47%
Mar. 1, 2016 - Feb. 28, 2017	4.4	14.7%	\$87.25	\$20.20	\$89.22	2.26%
3-Year Average	4.1	13.6%	\$93.43	\$23.09	\$95.15	1.85%
Standard	<b>4.5</b>	<b>15.0%</b>	NA	NA		
CPI Adjusted Rolling Average	NA	NA	<b>\$95.15</b>	<b>\$21.14</b>	Cost/Hr divided by Pass/Hr	
Result	not met	not met	✓	not met		
<b>Short Distance Bus Routes</b>						
Mar. 1, 2014 - Feb. 28, 2015	13.1	13.7%	\$89.18	\$6.81	\$90.81	
Mar. 1, 2015 - Feb. 29, 2016	12.9	16.4%	\$80.15	\$6.22	\$81.32	
Mar. 1, 2016 - Feb. 28, 2017	8.6	12.4%	\$85.22	\$10.03	\$87.14	
3-Year Average	11.5	14.2%	\$84.85	\$7.69	\$86.42	
Standard	<b>14.0</b>	<b>15%</b>	NA	NA		
CPI Adjusted Rolling Average	NA	NA	<b>\$86.42</b>	<b>\$6.17</b>		
Result	not met	not met	✓	not met		
<b>Long Distance Routes</b>						
Mar. 1, 2014 - Feb. 28, 2015	4.2	17.9%	\$93.23	\$22.48	\$94.94	
Mar. 1, 2015 - Feb. 29, 2016	3.6	19.2%	\$85.99	\$23.92	\$87.25	
Mar. 1, 2016 - Feb. 28, 2017	3.6	13.6%	\$97.03	\$27.70	\$99.22	
3-Year Average	3.8	16.9%	\$92.08	\$24.70	\$93.80	
Standard	<b>3.2</b>	<b>15%</b>	NA	NA		
CPI Adjusted Rolling Average	NA	NA	<b>\$93.80</b>	<b>\$29.31</b>		
Result	✓	✓	✓	✓		
<b>Senior Centers</b>						
Mar. 1, 2014 - Feb. 28, 2015	3.4	12.8%	\$47.76	\$14.17	\$48.63	
Mar. 1, 2015 - Feb. 29, 2016	3.0	12.6%	\$49.25	\$16.71	\$49.97	
Mar. 1, 2016 - Feb. 28, 2017	3.3	11.1%	\$50.34	\$15.53	\$51.47	
3-Year Average	3.2	12.2%	\$49.12	\$15.47	\$50.03	
Standard	<b>3.0</b>	<b>12.0%</b>	NA	NA		
CPI Adjusted Rolling Average	NA	NA	<b>\$50.03</b>	<b>\$16.68</b>		
Result	✓	✓	✓	✓		

**NOTES:**

"CPI Adjusted Rolling Average" uses the Consumer Price Index (CPI) Annual Average, All Urban Consumers, California, percent change from corresponding calendar year to year, added to each of the past three years and averaged.

Check-mark symbol indicates the standard was met.

Cost per Passenger is the result of Cost per Hour divided by Passengers per Hour (may differ slightly from MTA report).

Round-off errors may occur between MTA's report and this summary, or differences based on number of decimal places entered.

Inland and Coast routes were changed by TPC recommendation to "Short Distance" and "Long Distance" respectively.

Flex Routes were deleted from this table.



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## STAFF REPORT

**Agenda # 10**  
Consent Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/20/2018

---

**TITLE:** First Amendment to FY 2018/19 Overall Work Program

**DATE PREPARED:** 8/7/18

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

**MEETING DATE:** 8/20/18

---

### **BACKGROUND:**

The Final FY 2018/19 Overall Work Program (*totaling \$1,221,126*) was adopted by MCOG on June 4, 2018. After that date, the City of Ukiah requested carryover of a project that was unable to be completed before June 30, 2018 as planned, so that project now needs to be amended into the Work Program in this First Amendment.

We would also typically adjust carryover amounts at this time, however, the FY 2017/18 books have not yet closed and some invoices are still outstanding. In addition, RPA (Rural Planning Assistance) carryover fund balances require Caltrans' certification, which has not yet been done. These routine adjustments will be made in a Second OWP Amendment, likely in September or October.

The sole purpose of this proposed First Amendment is to add the following carryover project:

W.E. 5 (Ukiah) Update Speed Zone Reports – Carryover – A total of \$6,833 in Local Transportation Funds (LTF) is being carried over and programmed for this project. This will be the third and final year of programming for this study which was funded in FY 2016/17 at a total of \$40,000.

The proposed amendment would increase the Overall Work Program total from \$1,221,126 to \$1,227,959, an increase of \$6,833 (from LTF carryover funds). 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 8/22/18, after the MCOG meeting. However, this is a routine carryover procedure, and no new funding is involved.***

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Consider approval of First Amendment to FY 2018/19 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 2018/19 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 2018/19 OWP - Summary of Funding Sources  
FY 2018/19 OWP – Funding Allocation & Expenditure Summary  
W.E. 5 City of Ukiah – Update Speed Zone Reports

**MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
FY 2018/2019 FINAL (AMENDED) OVERALL WORK PROGRAM  
SUMMARY OF FUNDING SOURCES**

NO.	WORK ELEMENT	LOCAL LTF	STATE PPM	STATE RPA	STATE Sust. Comm.	STATE ATP Grant	TOTAL
1	MCOG - Regional Government & Intergovernmental Coordination	\$250		\$107,950			\$108,200
2	MCOG - Planning Management & General Coordination (Non-RPA)	\$90,475					\$90,475
3	MCOG - Community Transportation Planning	\$10,250					\$10,250
4	MCOG - Sustainable Transportation Planning			\$10,000			\$10,000
<b>5</b>	<b>City of Ukiah - Update Speed Zone Reports - Carryover</b>	<b>\$6,833</b>					<b>\$6,833</b>
6	Co. DOT - Combined Special Studies			\$60,000			\$60,000
7	MCOG - Planning, Programming & Monitoring		\$35,275	\$28,750			\$64,025
9	Fort Bragg - Street Safety Plan - Carryover		\$48,000				\$48,000
10	MTA - Transit Designs Guidelines Manual	\$30,341	\$4,659				\$35,000
12	Ukiah - Comprehensive ADA Access Plan Update - Carryover		\$35,000				\$35,000
13	Co. DOT - Orchard Ave. Extension Feas. Study Grant Match - Carryover	\$13,000					\$13,000
14	MCOG - Training	\$21,000					\$21,000
15	Fort Bragg - Transportation Planning for Mill Site Reuse & Rezoning		\$48,125				\$48,125
16	MCOG - Multi-Modal Transportation Planning			\$30,000			\$30,000
17	MCOG - Zero Emissions Vehicle & Alternative Fuels Readiness Plan Update			\$35,000			\$35,000
18	MCOG - Geographic Information System (GIS) Activities		\$5,600				\$5,600
19	MCOG - Ped. Facility Needs Inventory/EFS (S. Coast) - Carryover			\$27,500			\$27,500
20	MCOG - Grant Development & Assistance	\$500		\$22,300			\$22,800
21	MCOG - Ped. Facility Needs Inventory/EFS (Inland/N. Coast) - Carryover	\$18,008			\$138,992		\$157,000
22	MCOG - Safe Routes To School ATP Non-Infrastructure Grant - Carryover					\$400,151	\$400,151
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$183,824</b>	<b>\$176,659</b>	<b>\$321,500</b>	<b>\$138,992</b>	<b>\$400,151</b>	<b>\$1,221,126</b>
		<b>\$190,657</b>					<b>\$1,227,959</b>

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

**TOTAL WORK PROGRAM SUMMARY**

Local	\$183,824	Local LTF 2018/19 Alloc.	\$147,816
	<b>\$190,657</b>	Local LTF c/o	\$36,008
State	\$1,037,302		<b>\$42,841</b>
Federal	\$0	State PPM 2018/19 Alloc.	\$89,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,221,126</b>	State PPM c/o	\$87,659
	<b>\$1,227,959</b>	State RPA 2018/19 Alloc.	\$294,000
		State RPA 2017/18 c/o	\$27,500 * see note below
		State Sust. Comm. Grant c/o	\$138,992
		State ATP Grant c/o	\$400,151
		Federal	\$0
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,221,126</b>
			<b>\$1,227,959</b>

PROGRAM MATCH		
Local	\$183,824	15.05%
	<b>\$190,657</b>	<b>15.53%</b>
State	\$1,037,302	84.95%
		<b>84.47%</b>
Federal	\$0	0.00%
<b>TOTAL WORK PROGRAM SUMMARY</b>	<b>\$1,221,126</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
	<b>\$1,227,959</b>	

\* Note: RPA Carryover Funds are pending Caltrans' certification

**MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
FY 2018/2019 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					\$105,950	\$2,250	\$108,200
2	MCOG - Planning Management & General Coordination (Non-RPA)					\$90,475		\$90,475
3	MCOG - Community Transportation Planning					\$10,000	\$250	\$10,250
4	MCOG - Sustainable Transportation Planning					\$10,000		\$10,000
<b>5</b>	<b><u>City of Ukiah - Update Speed Zone Reports - Carryover</u></b>						<b>\$6,833</b>	<b>\$6,833</b>
6	Co. DOT - Combined Special Studies	\$60,000						\$60,000
7	MCOG - Planning, Programming & Monitoring					\$56,775	\$7,250	\$64,025
9	<i>Fort Bragg - Street Safety Plan - Carryover</i>				\$3,000		\$45,000	\$48,000
10	MTA - Transit Designs Guidelines Manual						\$35,000	\$35,000
12	<i>Ukiah - Comprehensive ADA Access Plan Update - Carryover</i>						\$35,000	\$35,000
13	<i>Co. DOT - Orchard Ave. Extension Feas. Study Grant Match - Carryover</i>						\$13,000	\$13,000
14	MCOG - Training					\$10,000	\$11,000	\$21,000
15	Fort Bragg - Transportation Planning for Mill Site Reuse & Rezoning						\$48,125	\$48,125
16	MCOG - Multi-Modal Transportation Planning					\$30,000		\$30,000
17	MCOG - Zero Emissions Vehicle & Alternative Fuels Readiness Plan Update					\$8,500	\$26,500	\$35,000
18	MCOG - Geographic Information System (GIS) Activities					\$5,000	\$600	\$5,600
19	<i>MCOG - Ped. Facility Needs Inventory/EFS (S. Coast) - Carryover</i>						\$27,500	\$27,500
20	MCOG - Grant Development & Assistance					\$22,300	\$500	\$22,800
21	<i>MCOG - Ped. Facility Needs Inventory/EFS (Inland/N. Coast) - Carryover</i>					\$7,000	\$150,000	\$157,000
22	<i>MCOG - Safe Routes to School ATP Non-Infrastructure Grant - Carryover</i>					\$50,000	\$350,151	\$400,151
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$60,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$3,000</b>	<b>\$406,000</b>	<b>\$752,126</b>	<b>\$1,221,126</b>
							<b>\$758,959</b>	<b>\$1,227,959</b>

Note: Some 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 (approx \$36-\$122/hr - various positions, per contract)

\* MCOG planning staff funding level based on contracted obligation with DBC Consulting (\$373,641), and includes a 2.94% CPI increase.

In addition, \$23,832.20 in carryover funding (\$2,537.73 FY 2014/15 + \$2,363.41 FY 2015/16 + \$18,931.06 FY 2016/17) is available from under-expending prior years' contracted funding, for a total available of \$397,473.20. FY 2017/18 unexpended funding (if any) will be identified after 6/30/18.

\*\* Consultant mark-up of subconsultant & direct costs is not allowed. Travel costs are limited to Caltrans' approved rates.

**WORK ELEMENT (5) CITY OF UKIAH – UPDATE SPEED ZONE REPORTS (CARRYOVER)**

**PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this project is to provide the five year update of engineering and traffic surveys for speed studies for the City of Ukiah. The adopted speed zone ordinance will provide for legally enforceable speed zones for all persons driving within the City of Ukiah.

This work element supports the Local Streets and Roads goal in the Regional Transportation Plan to “provide a safe and efficient transportation network...” and the Non-Motorized Goal to “provide a safe and useable network for bicycle and pedestrian facilities...” as speed limit enforcement is expected to help improve safety for both motorized and non-motorized users.

**PREVIOUS WORK:**

The City of Ukiah completed and adopted (by ordinance) speed zone studies on July 18, 2012, funded through MCOG’s FY 2011/12 Overall Work Program.

**TASKS:**

*Tasks 1-2 have been completed.*

1. *Prepare and distribute Request for Proposals, select consultant, award consultant contract. (City)*
2. *Conduct speed zone surveys, perform traffic counts, and complete traffic surveys and analysis. (Consultant)*
3. Present speed zone survey report with ordinance to Ukiah City Council for approval. (City)

**PRODUCTS:** (1) Request for Proposals; (2) Citywide speed zone survey report; (3) Ordinance adopting speed zone survey report.

**FUNDING AND AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES**

Responsible Agency	Estimated Person Days	Budget	Funding Source	Fiscal Year
Consultant	7	\$6,833	Local LTF	2016/2017 C/O
Total	7	\$6,833		

**ESTIMATED SCHEDULE**

Tasks	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun
3	x	x	x									



## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

### STAFF REPORT

---

**Agenda # 12d2**

Reports

MCOG Meeting

8/20/2018

**TITLE:** Local Agency Sub-Recipient Funding Agreements

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

**DATE PREPARED:** 8/13/2018

---

**BACKGROUND:**

One year ago, I reported on our administrative effort to draft and execute contracts with our five member agencies that receive funds from MCOG. We are now in the second year of these agreements.

As the recipient of state and federal funds, MCOG is required to enter into various funding agreements. These agreements include numerous standard terms with the recipient agency (MCOG) as well as subrecipients (County, Cities)—in other words, flow-down provisions. Staff has received training on subrecipient administration from the CTC's Rural Counties Task Force. The new agreements are comprehensive, covering all funding sources and obligations with our local partners.

In June 2017, the Council authorized staff to enter into cooperative Subrecipient Agreements, using the draft template we developed with various examples and outside legal counsel, for execution by local agencies receiving funds from MCOG, effective July 1, 2017. We designed a master agreement good for five years, through June 30, 2022. Each fiscal year we are generating exhibits detailing Scope of Work and Budget for each agency partner. All five local governments have signed the master agreement and first year of exhibits.

Last week I distributed exhibits for FY 2018/19. We anticipate a smooth process now that each entity has become familiar with these documents. We appreciate the cooperation of all of our local agency partners.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:**

None.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:**

Not applicable.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

None, this is for information only.



## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

### STAFF REPORT

**Agenda # 12d3**

Reports

MCOG Meeting

8/13/2018

---

**TITLE:** CEC Grant Award for “Bringing Electric Vehicle Charging Stations to Mendocino County California State Parks”

**SUBMITTED BY:** Janet Orth, Deputy Director for Administration      **DATE:** 8/9/2014

---

**BACKGROUND:**

Four years ago, in August 2014, I reported joining forces on MCOG’s behalf with Mendocino Land Trust, State Parks, and other local partners to secure a nearly \$500,000 grant from the California Energy Commission to build public electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure in our state parks as well as towns along the transportation corridors. The grant award was made soon thereafter. This project is consistent with MCOG’s Mendocino County Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Regional Readiness Plan.

I am pleased to report the completion of this project under the able management of the Land Trust staff, particularly the indefatigable Doug Kern. Details are provided in the attached press release announcing our ribbon-cutting event on August 17 in Willits.

Numerous change orders were needed to accomplish this ground-breaking project, to fulfill regulatory requirements and find willing site hosts that met necessary criteria. A time extension was granted by the CEC. Supplemental funds were allocated by MCOG. Budgets were stretched. Lessons were learned. This was truly an immense effort to bring all of the variables to completion.

“Bringing Electric Vehicle Charging Stations to Mendocino County California State Parks” installed public charging stations in seven “destination” park sites. In addition, “corridor” stations were installed in Caspar, Point Arena, Fort Bragg and Willits, for a total of 13 sites.

I will be glad to answer any questions at our meeting on August 20. My thanks to the Council for your support throughout.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:**

None.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:**

Not applicable.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

None, this is for information only.

---

Enclosure: Press Release



**For Immediate Release on July 31, 2018**

**Contact Name: Megan Smithyman, Communications Manager**  
707-962-0470, [mesmithy@mendocinolandtrust.org](mailto:mesmithy@mendocinolandtrust.org)

## **Mendocino Land Trust Celebrates Completion of 13 Electric Vehicle Charging Stations in Mendocino County**

### **Ribbon Cutting in Willits on August 17**

Mendocino County is on the road to a cleaner and more sustainable future with the installation of thirteen new electric vehicle charging stations along the coast and in Willits. Thanks to a \$498,040 grant from the California Energy Commission awarded to Mendocino Land Trust in 2014, a string of new electric vehicle charging stations in Mendocino County are up and running, with the final station completed in Willits in mid-July.

A ribbon cutting celebration will be held in Willits, 5:00 pm on Friday, August 17 at the City parking lot at West Mendocino Avenue and School Street, hosted by the Willits Chamber of Commerce, Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) and Mendocino Land Trust.

To bring these charging stations to the public, Mendocino Land Trust worked under the grant from the California Energy Commission in partnership with California State Parks and MCOG. MCOG contributed \$34,500 in supplemental funds and ongoing staff support from the grant proposal through project completion. In kind matching assistance was provided by Visit Mendocino County, and matching funds were also provided by the City of Fort Bragg, the Tarbell Family Foundation, Clipper Creek, Group II Commercial Real Estate and Harvest Market. The project culminated in an electric byway that provides incentive for visitors and locals alike to use plug-in hybrid-electric and all-electric vehicles.

Every year, thousands of tourists hit the road in search of adventure in the sweeping landscapes of Mendocino County. Many drive for hundreds of miles in hope of reconnecting with the wild places of Northern California, which is why Mendocino Land Trust and its partners decided to spearhead this effort to build this series of new electric vehicle charging stations in Mendocino County, ten of which are placed within or very close to State Parks.

Until the end of December you may charge your car for free while you are outside exploring one of the beautiful trails at these parks:

- Westport Union Landing State Beach
- MacKerricher State Park
- Point Cabrillo Light Station State Historic Park
- Russian Gulch State Park
- Van Damme State Park
- Greenwood State Beach
- Hendy Woods State Park

If you are closer to town activities, or for a stop on the way, you will find new chargers conveniently located at:

- City of Fort Bragg’s City Hall parking lot
- City of Fort Bragg’s Laurel Street parking lot
- Fort Bragg’s Boatyard Shopping Center
- Caspar Community Center
- City of Point Arena’s downtown public parking lot
- City of Willits’ downtown parking at School Street and W. Mendocino Ave.

“We are proud to be providing a part of the solution to climate change in Mendocino County,” says Doug Kern, Director of Conservation at Mendocino Land Trust. “Building the infrastructure to reduce fossil fuels usage is an important step in keeping our water and air free of pollutants.”

“It’s been a pleasure working with the Land Trust’s dedicated staff on this vital project,” added Janet Orth, MCOG Deputy Director. “These installations are fulfilling several recommended public charging sites in our Mendocino County Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Regional Readiness Plan along with the park locations.”

California State Parks is responding to the increasing challenges of climate change with the installation of EV charging stations as part of their “Cool Parks” initiative. Facilitating the expansion and use of plug-in cars not only encourages their use by environmentally conscious visitors, but also allows the general public to see this futuristic technology in action.

“This is a fantastic program for visitors to our coast to charge their electric vehicles while they adventure in our beautiful parks,” says Loren Rex, Mendocino Sector Superintendent. “We’re thrilled the charging stations are all in and excited to see them being used regularly. Thanks to Doug Kern at Mendocino Land Trust and all the partners, for completing this cutting edge project.”

#####