



**SPECIAL SGVCOG Public Works TAC Meeting Minutes**

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

**PRELIMINARY BUSINESS**

1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:04 p.m.
2. Pledge of Allegiance. R. Guerrero led the TAC in the Pledge of Allegiance.
3. Roll Call

**Public Works TAC Members Present**

D. Bobadilla; Azusa  
 D. Liu; Diamond Bar  
 G. Stevens; El Monte  
 D. Co; Irwindale  
 A. Tachiki; Monrovia  
 B. Janka; Pasadena  
 R. Guerrero; Pomona  
 K. Patel; San Dimas  
 R. Salas; South El Monte  
 M. Forbes; Temple City  
 M. Heredia; West Covina  
 J. Yang P. Doudar, J. Lu, E. Kunitake; LACDPW

**Public Works TAC Members Absent**

Arcadia  
 Claremont

**Guests**

J. Nelson; CNC Engineering  
 F. Alamolhoda; LAE Associates  
 A. Chang, A. Ansani; Transtech  
 B. Jong; LA Metro  
 J. Martinez; NCE  
 Y. Igawa; Foothill Transit  
 D. Cadena; WKE, Inc.  
 D. Grilley, City of San Gabriel  
 S. Novotny; Caltrans

**SGVCOG Staff**

M. Creter  
 P. Duyshart

4. Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

5. Review Public Works TAC Meeting Minutes: 01/22/2018  
**There was a motion to approve the minutes (M/S: P. Doudar/K. Patel).**

**[Motion Passed]**

Ayes	Azusa, Diamond Bar, El Monte, Irwindale, Monrovia, Pasadena, Pomona, San Dimas, South El Monte, Temple City, West Covina, LACDPW
Noes	
Abstain	
Absent	Arcadia, Claremont

## PRESENTATIONS

### 6. Foothill Transit's Bus Stop Enhancement Program

Yoko Igawa, the Manager of Public Affairs for Foothill Transit, presented on this funding opportunity for cities. She first provided background information and facts about Foothill Transit and its role as a regional transit agency in the San Gabriel Valley. She also described how Foothill Transit consists of five clusters, which are organized geographically.

Ms. Igawa continued by pointing out to members of the TAC that while there are 3,631 Foothill Transit Bus Stops throughout the San Gabriel Valley, only three of the bus stops are owned by Foothill Transit; 99.9% of all Foothill Transit bus stops are owned by cities, LA County, or by the State of California. Additionally, many of these bus stops have poor or no amenities or infrastructure for transit riders while they wait for a bus, and while Foothill Transit wants to upgrade and improve some of these bus stops, the agency is not able to since it does not own these bus stops.

As a result, Foothill Transit has established the Bus Stop Enhancement Program. The purpose of this grant program is to fund needed bus stop improvements which make bus stops safer and better overall. There is a total of \$800,000 in available funding during this cycle, and cities and other localities are eligible to be reimbursed for up to \$40,000. Y. Igawa stated that all Foothill Transit member agencies are eligible to apply for funding under this program.

Ms. Igawa concluded her presentation by identifying sample bus stop amenities which cities could put their funding toward, including, but not limited to, improved shelters and benches, signage, solar panels, real-time bus arrival information, new LED lights, wider sidewalks at the stop site, and better recycling and waste bins. She also shared examples of City and County projects which have been completed as a result of the enhancement program since 2013, which was the first year of this cycle. Igawa also announced that program guidelines and a list of high-use transit and bus stops within each jurisdiction will be sent to all city managers.

### 7. SGVCOG & ACE Program Project Development, Evaluation, and Approval Process

Before the presentation began, R. Guerrero announced to TAC members that COG staff will be holding a workshop meeting on this item immediately following the TAC meeting. The purpose of this additional meeting is to give TAC members an opportunity to learn more about the specifics of the LOI and the LOI submission process, to ask COG staff in-depth and technical questions, and to be able to give feedback on any aspect of this process.

M. Creter presented on this item. She first mentioned how the goal is to bring a final draft review process to the Governing Board for official approval in May.

The reason why the SGVCOG needs to draft a new thorough project selection process is the Governing Board approved the new ACE Program to take on a wider array of capital construction projects besides just Alameda Corridor East projects. M. Creter went on to say that COG staff is looking for feedback, guidance, and direction on all aspects of the drafts of the project selection and approval processes.

M. Creter then went on to describe the proposed project selection process for Funded Projects. This overall process consists of five sub-processes: Threshold Criteria, Review, Negotiation, Programming, and Annual Updates. For the Threshold Criteria Process, project sponsors will submit Letters of Interest (LOI) to the SGVCOG/ACE. The LOI will be relatively simple to fill out, and should not be overly time-intensive, because the COG wants to devise an easy project

submission process for cities, to encourage more participation. This submission process will not be as intensive as a Metro call for projects scenario. The LOI will include sections regarding Project Description, Project Benefits, and a Statement of Need, among other sections. The Statement of Need will be weighted heavily, as the COG wants to assist cities which have resource limitations. Once the COG/ACE's call for projects is complete, the Governing Board will provide direction to staff regarding which projects are to proceed to the Review Phase, and this requires a majority vote of 19 agencies to proceed.

M. Creter proceeded to discuss the next step in the process, which is the Review Process. During this process, a Project Manager will provide a recommendation to the COG/ACE Chief Engineer regarding which projects are most viable and ready. These selected projects will then move on to the Negotiation Phase, which is Step 3 in the overarching process. As part of the Negotiation Phase, a Project Manager will prepare a draft master agreement for a selected project, the Chief Engineer and Project Manager will meet with the City Manager or other sponsoring agency contacts to review the proposed agreement, and the project sponsor provides a letter of commitment to the COG; this letter will indicate interest in having the COG manage the project. Moreover, the 4<sup>th</sup> step in the project selection and evaluation process is the Programming Stage, in which the Project Managers and Chief Engineer create a 5-year workplan of projects which make it past the Negotiation Phase, the COG Executive Director presents this workplan to the Governing Board for approval, and each individual agency-to-agency project agreement would also be submitted separately for approval by the Governing Board, too. Then, the final step in the process is the Annual Updates Process, which consists of the Governing Board reviewing the 5-year workplan every Spring.

M. Creter then went on to discuss the project review and approval process for Unfunded Projects. The five sub-processes for the Unfunded Projects Process are the same as they are for the Funded Project Process, but there are key structural differences. The steps during the Threshold Criteria and LOI sub-process are the same as for Funded Projects. For the Review Process, a Project Manager and the Director of Community and Government Relations reviews the LOI and schedules a meeting with the sponsoring agency, and then the former two individuals provide a recommendation to the Executive Director regarding whether or not the project should proceed to Negotiation. During the Negotiation Phase, a project manager will draft an MOU instead of a contract. Moreover, the COG will charge an annual flat fee to sponsoring agencies for the COG's services: the annual flat fee will be \$5,000 or \$10,000, depending on the project type. The Programming Stage for Unfunded Projects is the same as it is for Funded Projects. The Annual Updates Requirement is similar, too; however, if a project is successfully awarded funding, then the project sponsor may choose to submit the project for COG implementation.

M. Creter also added how if the COG and ACE get a lot of LOIs, then the COG would have to address issues with staff capacity. She reminded Committee members that one of the main purposes of the COG's role here is to play an advocacy role in securing funding and resources for cities' processes. She also wanted to make it clear that this Project Development Process will include all capital construction projects, such as water or storm water infrastructure projects, not just transportation projects.

COG staff is looking to have the Governing Board adopt the Program Manual for these two main processes in May of 2018. After that, COG staff would likely open and begin the LOI process for projects in Late Fall 2018 or Early Winter 2019. Creter also wanted to remind cities that projects which have a wholistic and regional impact will have a better chance at getting selected than a project which is narrow or small in scope.

Questions/Discussion: The following issues were discussed:

- There was a question about what resources are available to the SGVCOG and the ACE Program to be able to work on and execute these projects. M. Creter replied that ACE has five Senior Project Managers who would work on project approval assignments.
- A second TAC member asked how this Project Development and Selection Process relates to the Measure M subregional funds and call for projects. Creter said that she did not mention Measure M funds and projects during her presentation because she did not want TAC members to be confused between the two programs.
- Another TAC member asked if this capital projects selection process can include any type of project, and not just Measure M programmatic funds projects. Marisa confirmed that he was correct.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

## **UPDATE ITEMS**

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **8. MSRC Local Government Partnership Program**

P. Duyshart provided information about this item. He stated the primary goals of the Mobile Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC), and its role in helping improve the overall air quality in the South Coast AQMD region. To meet its goals, the MSRC has created the Clean Transportation Funding Initiative, which includes programs which are applicable to local agencies, such as the Local Government Partnership Program.

Duyshart then discussed the types of eligible projects under the Local Government Partnership Program. The program sets aside funding for cities to invest in clear-air project such as: light-duty zero emission vehicle purchases or leases, medium and heavy-duty zero emission vehicle purchases, near-zero emission heavy-duty alternative fuel vehicle purchases and repowers, electric vehicle charging infrastructure installation, and alternative fuel infrastructure construction or expansion.

P. Duyshart then briefly discussed the funding structure of this program. Funding is allocated to local agencies based on the size of the jurisdiction. Cities and Counties that receive an annual allocation of AB 2766 Subvention Funds less than \$50,000 are eligible to receive an MSRC Partnership match of \$50,000. Thus, the MSRC increases the amount of funding for small jurisdictions to ensure sufficient funds are available to implement a meaningful air pollution reduction project(s). Jurisdictions that receive a population-based AB 2766 Subvention Fund allocation greater than or equal to \$50,000 are eligible to receive a “dollar for dollar” MSRC funding allocation. Additionally, agencies should note that only small jurisdictions are eligible to apply for MSRC funds which would go towards signal coordination and active transportation projects.

MSRC applications were originally due on March 2, 2018, however, the deadline has now been extended to August 2, 2018.

### **9. Urban Greening Grant Program**

Mr. Duyshart also presented this item to the TAC. He stated that the Urban Greening Program is administered by the Natural Resources Agency of the State of California, and that the program is funded by California Climate Investments, which consists of cap-and-trade dollars. The Natural Resources Agency has released the final program guidelines for Round 2, and their office has been hosting application and program workshops throughout the state. Duyshart attended the workshop

which was held in Lynwood on February 15. He also announced that the two remaining Southern California workshops are on March 12<sup>th</sup> in Ontario and on March 8<sup>th</sup> in San Diego.

P. Duyshart then briefly went over the funding aspects of this grant program. There is \$24.7 million in local assistance available for Cycle 2, which is down sharply from the approximately \$75 million which was available for Cycle 1. Also, while no local or regional match is required, projects which do have a match component will be more competitive in the selection process. Moreover, a minimum of 75% of the awarded funds must go toward disadvantaged communities, though 95% of awarded funds went to DACs in Cycle 1.

Grant applications, which are long and intensive, are due to the State on April 11, 2018, and must be submitted to the System for Online Application Review (SOAR) by 5:00 P.M.

## **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

J. Martinez of NCE reminded TAC members to make sure that their respective agencies to complete the California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment 2018. The purpose of this assessment is to show how important SB 1 is for local agencies.

R. Guerrero announced that the next Public Works TAC Meeting will be on March 19, 2018.

## **ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 12:44 p.m.