AGENDA

Public comment on any agenda item may be made during the consideration of that item. All comments on items not listed on the agenda may be made during the time allotted on the agenda to the public. Members of the public may comment by raising a hand and being recognized by the Chair. Speakers shall confine their comments to three minutes per speaker. Unless otherwise noted in the Agenda, the public may only comment on matters that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Westside Cities Council of Governments or items listed on the agenda.

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF VOTING MEMBERS (2 min)

3. ACTION ITEMS (1 min)
   A. Approval of August 8, 2019 Draft Meeting Notes
      Action: Approve the August 8, 2019 draft meeting notes

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT (2 min)
   A.WSCCOG Mobility Study/Multi-Year Subregional Program Request for Proposal Update
   B. California Air Resources Board Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT) Regulation

5. HOUSING/HOMELESSNESS STRATEGIC INITIATIVE (10 min)
   A. SCAG Regional Housing Need Determination
   B. Housing and Homelessness-Related Funding Opportunities

6. REPORT FROM WSCCOG REGIONAL HOMELESSNESS STRATEGIC PLAN AD HOC COMMITTEE (10 min)

7. LEGISLATION (45 min)
   A. State Legislation Update
   B. Discussion with State Legislators

8. RECEIVE AND FILE
   A. Transportation Working Group Meeting Notes
9. ANNOUNCEMENTS (2 min)

10. FUTURE MEETING LOCATIONS AND AGENDA ITEMS
   A. Future Meeting Location
      i. Hosted by City of Culver City at the Mike Balkman Council Chambers
         (Thursday, December 12)
   B. Future Agenda Items
      i. Connect SoCal Presentation by SCAG
      ii. WSCCOG Boardmember Requests for Future Agenda Items

11. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (3 min)
   Members of the public may address the Westside Cities Council of Governments
   (WSCCOG) on any subject on or off the agenda by raising a hand and being recognized
   by the WSCCOG Chair. Speakers shall confine their comments to two minutes per
   speaker.

12. ADJOURN

Written materials distributed to the Board within 72 hours of the Board meeting are available for public
inspection immediately upon distribution at the WSCCOG office 448 S. Hill, Suite 1105, Los Angeles, CA
90013, during normal business hours. Such documents will also be posted on the WSCCOG website at
www.westsidecities.org and will be made available at the meeting.

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you require a disability related modification or
accommodation to attend or participate in this meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please contact
WSCCOG Project Director Winnie Fong at 323-306-9856 or winnie@estolanolesar.com at least three
days prior to the meeting.
THURSDAY, AUGUST 8, 2019
12:00 NOON

County of Los Angeles
Felicia Mahood Senior Center
11338 Santa Monica Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90025

IN ATTENDENCE:

**Beverly Hills:** Councilmember Robert Wunderlich. Staff: Cindy Owens, Jim Latta, Timmi Tway

**Culver City:** Staff: Shelly Wolfberg, Diana Chang, Heba El-Guindy

**Santa Monica:** Councilmember Kevin McKeown, Mayor Gleam Davis. Staff: Stephanie Venegas, Francie Stefan, Alisa Orduna.

**West Hollywood:** Councilmember John Heilman. Councilmember Lauren Meister. Staff: Hernan Molina, Peter Noonan, Rachel Dimond

**City of LA:** District 5 Staff: Debbie Dyner Harris. District 11 Staff: Eric Bruins. Legislative Analyst Office: Steve Luu

**County of LA:** Supervisory District 3 Staff: Stephanie Cohen.

**WSCCOG:** Executive Director: Cecilia V. Estolano. Staff: Winnie Fong. Legal Counsel: Lauren Langer.

**Other:** Peter Carter, Cory Zelmer, Patrick Chandler (Metro); Ma‘Ayn Johnson; Sarah Patterson (SCAG); Mary Strenn (ICMA/League of CA Cities); Jeff Kiernan (League of CA Cities); Josh Kurpies (Office of Assemblymember Bloom); Leeor Alpern (South Coast AQMD)

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
   Councilmember Kevin McKeown (WSCCOG Vice Chair) called the meeting to order at 12:00 pm.

2. **WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF VOTING MEMBERS**

3. **ACTION ITEMS**
A. Approval of June 13, 2019 Draft Meeting Notes
A motion was made by Councilmember John Heilman (Secretary) and seconded by Stephanie Cohen (Supervisorial District 3) to approve the June 13, 2019 meeting notes. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Formation of the Regional Homelessness Strategic Plan Ad Hoc Committee
Winnie Fong (WSCCOG) and Alisa Orduna (City of Santa Monica) provided a brief overview on the proposed formation of the WSCCOG’s ad hoc committee to lead and support the region’s homelessness strategic plan. The WSCCOG Board engaged in a discussion and provided direction to the ad hoc committee in developing the strategic plan, which included the following: key action steps, leveraging additional resources, and seeking state funding to support planning and implementation efforts. A motion was made by Councilmember McKeown and seconded by Councilmember Heilman to approve the formation of the homelessness ad hoc committee to develop a regional homelessness strategic plan. The motion passed unanimously.

4. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S ORAL REPORT
Cecilia V. Estolano (Executive Director) provided a brief update on her recent meeting with Metro CEO Phil Washington and other subregional COG directors including information about Measure M’s 10-year revenue projections, Metro’s forthcoming congestion pricing, and updates on the NextGen Bus Study.

5. PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION WITH POSSIBLE ACTION
   A. Sepulveda Transit Corridor Project Update – Peter Carter, Senior Manager, Transportation Planning, Metro
   Peter Carter (Metro) briefed the WSCCOG Board on the updated new information regarding the refined alternatives of the project, evaluation of alternatives, ridership projections, and cost estimates for the Valley-Westside and Westside-LAX segments of the Sepulveda Transit Corridor. The WSCCOG Board members presented some questions about the alternatives and raised issues about potential traffic congestion for the proposed Sepulveda and Bundy Stations alternatives.

   B. Draft Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Methodology – Ma’Ayn Johnson Housing & Land Use Planner, SCAG
   Ma’Ayn Johnson (SCAG) briefed the WSCCOG Board on the regional determination process for the 6th cycle, including SCAG’s proposed RHNA methodology for three options. Ms. Johnson also provided the dates for forthcoming public hearings on the proposed RHNA methodology hosted by SCAG throughout the region.

6. LEGISLATION
   A. State Legislation and Recommended Positions
   Ms. Fong clarified to the WSCCOG Board that the matrix is not a recommendation for the Board to take action. The purpose of the guide is to inform individual cities with recommended positions to take action within their respective city councils as a way to align legislative positions across the region.

7. RECEIVE AND FILE
   A. Transportation Working Group Meeting Notes
8. ANNOUNCEMENTS

9. FUTURE MEETING LOCATIONS AND AGENDA ITEMS

10. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

11. ADJOURN
   The WSCCOG Board adjourned at 1:19 p.m.
DATE: October 10, 2019
TO: Westside Cities Council of Governments Board
FROM: Westside Cities Council of Governments Staff
SUBJECT: Executive Director’s Report

WSCCOG Mobility Study/Multi-Year Subregional Program Request for Proposal Update
SCAG released the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the WSCCOG Mobility Study on August 30, 2019 (refer to Attachment A for the RFP). The proposals were due on September 30, 2019 and the SCAG Proposal Review Committee (PRC) are currently reviewing and evaluating the proposals. The PRC is expected to interview the consultants on the week of October 14th. PRC will select the final consultant by the end of October and the Notice to Proceed (NTP) and contract execution will occur in December. The WSCCOG Mobility Study will be completed by June 30, 2020. This study will inform the WSCCOG’s Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) process under Measure M and the development of the list of projects for the MSP 5-year plan, which will be completed by December 31, 2020.

California Air Resources Board Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT) Regulation
The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is currently finalizing its Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT) regulation to require manufacturers to sell an increasing percentage of zero emission medium- and heavy- duty trucks to reduce air pollutants and protect the public health in our communities (refer to Attachment B for a factsheet on the ACT regulation).

A staff proposal will be publicly released on October 22nd and presented to the CARB board on December 12th. The Sierra Club and the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) have informed the WSCCOG Executive Director that the draft rule that has been circulated is fairly weak and would only result in 4 percent of trucks on California’s roads in 2030 to be zero-emission. Cities bear the health burdens of truck pollution and are uniquely positioned to advocate for Governor Newsom and CARB to adopt a stronger rule. Diesel trucks account for nearly 60 percent of the smog-forming nitrogen oxides and 80% of the soot from motor vehicles and trucks are also a major contributor to GHG pollution.

The CARB Board is anticipated to make a final decision in mid-2020 on its proposal to accelerate a large-scale transition of zero-emission medium-and heavy-duty vehicles from Class 2B to Class 8. The time is crucial to ensure CARB consider a strong ZEV requirement. Cities and local elected leaders are being invited to sign-on to a letter drafted by UCS and Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) (refer to Attachment C for a template) or to submit their own letter to demonstrate their support for a strong and effective ZEV mandate for trucks. Below is the contact information for any questions related to the ACT regulation and the draft rule.

Katherine Garcia
Policy Advocate, Sierra Club California
katherine.garcia@sierraclub.org

Jimmy O’Day
Senior Vehicles Analyst, Union of Concerned Scientists
jodea@ucusa.org
I. SUMMARY

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is soliciting proposals in response to Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 20-014, Westside Mobility Study Update.

The RFP is comprised of the following parts presented herein as Attachments:

Attachment 1 – Proposal Information, Organization, and Content
Attachment 2 – Scope of Work
Attachment 3 – Proposal Evaluation Form
Attachment 4 – Interview Evaluation Form
Attachment 5 – Line Item Budget (Cost Proposal)
Attachment 6 – Debarment and Suspension Certification
Attachment 7 – Conflict of Interest Form
Attachment 8 – Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)
Attachment 9 – Vendor Information
Attachment 10 – Notice Regarding California Public Records Act

II. PROPOSAL TIME LINE
(Subject to Change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFP Released</td>
<td>August 30, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline to Submit Questions on PlanetBids</td>
<td>September 11, 2019</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posting of Answers to Questions (if any)</td>
<td>September 16, 2019</td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Due Date</td>
<td>September 30, 2019</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Proposals</td>
<td>Week of October 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Interviews</td>
<td>Week of October 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Selection</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Execution/NTP</td>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

Upload one (1) PDF copy of your Technical Proposal (file cannot exceed 10MB) into SCAG’s solicitation management system (PlanetBids) at http://www.planetbids.com/portal/portal.cfm?CompanyID=14434#. Upload your Cost Proposal as a separate Excel file in PlanetBids (from the rest of your Technical Proposal) using the SCAG Line Item Budget PRIME and SUB Templates available at SCAG’s Website http://scag.ca.gov/opportunities/Pages/BusinessWithSCAG.aspx. Complete and upload a separate Excel file for each sub.

You MUST upload your submittal via PlanetBids. No other means of submission shall be accepted by SCAG. If you need assistance, contact the SCAG staff identified in Section IV below before the Due Date/Time (allow sufficient time before the due Date/Time).
SCAG must receive proposals by the Proposal Due Date/Time (time to be determined by SCAG’s/PlanetBids time clock). Any proposal received after the Proposal Due Date/Time will be rejected.

All submissions are considered a matter of public record.

Note: “proposer,” “consultant,” and “firm” may be used interchangeably throughout this document.

IV. SCAG CONTACT
Lori J. Tapp, C.P.M., Contracts Administrator
Southern California Association of Governments
900 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 236-1957
Email: tapp@scag.ca.gov

The Contracts Administrator is the only person to contact during the selection process, and may be contacted at any time during the process.

V. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
Questions must be submitted in writing via PlanetBids under this solicitation number. Answers to the questions will be posted on SCAG’s solicitation management system under the corresponding RFP typically no later than three (3) working days after the deadline to submit questions.

VI. PRE-PROPOSAL CONFERENCE
N/A

VII. CONTRACT TYPE
Contract Type: Firm Fixed Price

Note: If a Firm Fixed Price Contract, SCAG intends to pay upon task completion. However, firms may propose a payment schedule for SCAG’s consideration. Consultants must propose in United States currency and shall be paid with the same.

Funding for this project is contingent upon availability of funds at the time of contract award. As directed by the Regional Council, it is SCAG’s policy not to disclose a project’s budget.

VIII. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE
For Tasks 1-5: The work must be completed by June 30, 2020.
For Task 6: The work must be completed by December 31, 2020, with an annual update conducted in 2021, 2022, and 2023.

IX. DBE PROGRAM
This procurement does not require DBE participation and there is no specific numerical DBE goal assigned to this project. However, proposers are encouraged to make every reasonable effort to solicit DBE firms to participate as subcontractors, service providers, and suppliers on this project. See Attachment 8 for additional information.
X. **SELECTION PROCESS**

1. Proposals will be ranked in accordance with the criteria described in Attachments 3 and 4.

2. Proposers may or may not be invited for an interview.

3. SCAG does not reimburse proposers for any cost of proposal preparation (including but not limited to parking, printing, postage, travel, etc.), even in the event of RFP cancellation.

4. Communication between the proposer and any member of the Proposal Review Committee during the selection process is prohibited, except when and in the manner expressly authorized in this RFP. Violation of this restriction is grounds for disqualification.

5. SCAG shall award the contract for this RFP to the firm that it deems to have provided the best value to SCAG or the firm SCAG deems to be the best qualified for contract award (or both).

6. Every proposal submitted is considered a firm offer that must be valid for a minimum of ninety (90) calendar days.

7. All proposers should be aware of the Insurance Requirements for contract award. The Certificate of Insurance must be provided by the successful proposer prior to contract award. A contract may not be awarded if insurance requirements are not met. The insurance requirements may be viewed on SCAG’s website at: [http://scag.ca.gov/business/](http://scag.ca.gov/business/) under Section 43 of SCAG’s Contract Template.

   Endorsements for the following are necessary as a part of meeting the insurance requirements:

   - Commercial General Liability
   - Business Auto Liability
   - Workers’ Compensation/Employer’s Liability

   Endorsements shall include:

   - Additional Insured
   - Primary, Non-Contributory
   - Waiver of Subrogation
   - Notice of Cancellation

   **THE ENDORSEMENTS TO ALL OF THE POLICIES MUST BE ATTACHED TO THE CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE.**

8. The successful proposer will be required to sign SCAG’s standard Contract Template (available at [http://scag.ca.gov/business/](http://scag.ca.gov/business/)) in order to receive the contract award. **Proposer must identify in their proposal the specific requested modification(s), if any, to the terms and conditions in SCAG’s Contract Template.** Any request to modify the terms and conditions must also include an explanation or reason for the proposed change. **If the proposer does not include the specific requested modification(s) along with the explanation or reason for the proposed change at the time they submit their proposal, SCAG shall not consider, review, allow or accept any deviation from the terms and conditions of SCAG’s Contract Template.** If SCAG is unable to negotiate final contract
terms and conditions that are acceptable to SCAG, SCAG reserves the right to award the contract to another proposer.

Please be advised that, SCAG may only consider minor modifications that clarify clauses in its existing contract template, and shall not entertain making major/substantive changes to or removing any clause, specifically:

10. Invoicing for Payment
11. Invoicing Format and Content
15. Penalty
18. Work Products and Related Work Materials
19. Ownership, Confidentiality, and Use of Work Products
27. Indemnity
43. Insurance

CONTRACT LANGUAGE IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE BY SCAG PRIOR TO CONTRACT EXECUTION.

9. SCAG shall only award a contract to a offeror who SCAG determines has an adequate financial management and accounting system as required by 48 CFR Part 16.301-3, 2 CFR Part 200, and 48 CFR Part 31 or successors there to.

XI. SCAG RIGHTS
1. SCAG reserves the right to:
   A. Disqualify any and all proposals that are not submitted in accordance with the required format described in this RFP;
   B. Disqualify any and all proposals that don’t comply with SCAG’s Conflict of Interest Policy;
   C. Reject any and all proposals submitted;
   D. Waive what SCAG deems to be a minor irregularity in a firm’s submission;
   E. Request additional information;
   F. Award all or part of the work contemplated in this RFP;
   G. Remedy errors in the RFP;
   H. Cancel the entire RFP;
   I. Issue subsequent RFP;
   J. Approve or reject the use of a particular subconsultant/supplier;
   K. Negotiate with any, all or none of the proposers. If SCAG is unable to negotiate final contract terms and conditions that are acceptable to SCAG, SCAG reserves the right to award the contract to another proposer;
   L. Award a contract to other than the lowest priced proposal;
   M. Award a contract without interviews, discussions or negotiations;
   N. Award a contract to one or more proposers;
   O. Only award a contract or any portion thereof to a firm that possesses a valid business license. Firms must possess the license from any city or state by the RFP due date. SCAG must be provided with a copy of this license, if requested; and
   P. Only award a contract or any portion thereof to a firm that passes any references checks.

2. If applicable, SCAG reserves the right to have software developed under SCAG’s contract, not incorporate proprietary and/or third party software components. This does not preclude the development of deliverables which interface with commonly-available off-the-shelf software.
However, consultants must determine in advance whether SCAG already has, or is willing to procure, appropriate licenses for any proprietary and/or third party software that would be required. Consultants must also provide the impacts of any enhancements and upgrades. SCAG will require delivery of documentation and source code for all electronic intellectual property developed under a SCAG contract prior to releasing final payment to the consultant.

XII. NOTIFICATION OF RIGHT TO PROTEST CONTRACT AWARD
Proposers have the right to protest the contract award in compliance with SCAG’s Policy on Contract Award Protests, which can be viewed online at SCAG internet home page [www.scag.ca.gov](http://www.scag.ca.gov) under “Doing Business with SCAG.” A written protest must be filed with SCAG’s Executive Director, or designee (Chief Operating Officer or Deputy Executive Director) within five (5) working days after posting of the Notice of Intent to Award. SCAG will not accept any verbal protests. The protest must be a detailed, written statement of the protest grounds and reference the RFP number and name of the designated Contracts Administrator. The protest must be submitted to SCAG’s Executive Director or designee via certified mail using the following address:

   Executive Director  
   Southern California Association of Governments  
   900 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 1700  
   Los Angeles, CA 90017-3435

The contract award is held up when SCAG’s Executive Director or designee receives the protest on time. The contract may not be awarded until the protest is either withdrawn or SCAG’s Executive Director or designee has rendered a decision.
PROPOSAL INFORMATION, ORGANIZATION, AND CONTENT

All proposals shall contain the following information, at a minimum:

1. **TITLE PAGE**
   Provide the following on the Title Page:
   - RFP Number
   - Title of the Project
   - Name and Address of Firm
   - Phone Number of Firm - Do not include non-business (personal) phone numbers or address in as this information may become public under the California Public Records Act (see Attachment 10)
   - Prime Contact Person
   - Email Address of the Prime Contact Person
   - Signature of the Individual Authorized/Obligated to Commit the Firm to this Project

   Cover letter should be addressed to the attention of the Contract Administrator

2. **TABLE OF CONTENTS**
   - A clear identification of the materials by section and page numbers.

3. **TECHNICAL APPROACH**
   - A statement and discussion of the project objectives, concerns, and key issues.
   - The technical approach for performing the tasks must include a detailed Scope of Work along with the process for executing the requirements and objectives of the project.
   - A discussion of the difficulties expected or anticipated in performing the tasks, along with a discussion of how the consultant proposes to overcome or mitigate against those difficulties.
   - A detailed schedule for completion of the work, including performance and delivery schedules indicating phases or segments of the project, milestones, and significant events.
   - A statement of the extent to which the consultant’s proposed approach and Scope of Work will meet or exceed the stated objectives discussed in this RFP. Furthermore, a discussion of how the consultant would modify the project, and/or schedule to better meet these objectives.

4. **LINE ITEM BUDGET (COST PROPOSAL)**
   - Proposals must include a Line Item Budget in the format and detail shown in Attachment 5 (in United States currency). The same detailed budget is required of each subconsultant.
   - Upload your Cost Proposal as a separate Excel file in PlanetBids (from the rest of your proposal) using the SCAG Line Item Budget PRIME and SUB Templates available at SCAG’s Website http://scag.ca.gov/opportunities/Pages/BusinessWithSCAG.aspx. Complete and upload a separate Excel file for each sub.

5. **PROFILE OF FIRM**
   - A statement indicating if the firm is local or national and a summary of representative experience relevant to the work described in the Scope of Work for this RFP.
   - The location and telephone number of the office from which the work is to be done.
   - Identification of the individuals who will perform the work, including officers, project manager and key staff. State the time commitment and include resumes for key individuals. Do not include social security numbers, non-business (personal) phone numbers or address in a resume as
this information may become public under the California Public Records Act (see Attachment 10).

6. REFERENCES
   • Provide a list of at least three references, including the names of contact persons within the firms. References should not include any SCAG staff or SCAG Regional Council Members.

7. REQUIRED FORMS
   • The Debarment and Suspension Certification (Attachment 6) must be fully completed by all parties to the proposal (prime and all subconsultants).
   • The SCAG Conflict of Interest Form (Attachment 7) must be fully completed by all parties to the proposal (prime and all subconsultants).
   • All proposers must ensure that they have fully completed a Vendor Information Form (Attachment 9).
   • All proposers must fully complete the Notice Regarding California Public Records Act (Attachment 10) – regardless of whether or not proposer is requesting to exempt proposal from disclosure under the California Public Records Act.

The selected consultant may be required to complete a Federal Form W-9 (for payment purposes) which may also be obtained on-line at [www.scag.ca.gov](http://www.scag.ca.gov) under “Doing Business with SCAG.”

**IMPORTANT NOTE:**
The selected consultant (awardee) must be prepared to provide SCAG any of the following documents if requested:
   • Time Sheet (that must account for the total activity for which each employee is compensated not just SCAG time)
   • Payroll register
   • Indirect cost audit
   • U.S. federal tax return
SCOPE OF WORK:
WESTSIDE MOBILITY STUDY UPDATE

BACKGROUND

The Westside Cities Council of Governments (WSCCOG) is a joint powers authority created by the cities of Beverly Hills, Culver City, Santa Monica, West Hollywood, the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles (see Attachment A). The mission of the WSCCOG is to engage in regional and cooperative planning and coordination of government services and responsibilities to assist the member cities in the conduct of their affairs.

In 2003, the WSCCOG Board of Directors commissioned a Westside Mobility Study (Study) that supported an interjurisdictional approach to transportation planning and addresses issues of regional importance. The Study focused on practical short-term and longer-term transportation solutions, ranging from improved transit stops and improved arterial efficiency to construction of two regional rail lines, as well as funding considerations. Since the release of the 2003 Study, the WSCCOG had engaged in the following planning efforts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>WSCCOG approved recommendations for the Westside Bicycle Infrastructure Priority Corridor Gap Closures, which identified five priority interjurisdictional corridors for closing the gaps in current bicycle infrastructure (see Attachment B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Metro approved the Westside Cities Mobility Matrix report prepared by Fehr &amp; Peers, which served as the initial step to identifying transportation programs and projects that require funding as part of the Metro’s Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>WSCCOG Board approved a preliminary list of transportation priorities for its inclusion of the Los Angeles County Traffic Improvement Plan (Measure M) expenditure plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>WSCCOG identified the Active Transportation/1st and Last Mile Connections Program as the program for its Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) 5-Year Plan under the Measure M expenditure plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCAG and the WSCCOG is seeking a consultant to update the 2003 Westside Mobility Study to reflect current infrastructure improvements and future mobility trends, such as first/last mile connectivity, active transportation, and emerging mobility technologies. The update to the 2003 study, defined hereinafter as the WSCCOG Mobility Report, will also identify new interjurisdictional projects and investments that address issues for all transportation modes, as well as improve access to the Westside for disadvantaged communities to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and promote social equity.

The consultant shall also assist the WSCCOG in developing its Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) 5-Year Plan for its Active Transportation/1st and Last Mile Connections Program under the Measure M expenditure plan. The development of the MSP 5-Year Plan will run concurrently with the tasks outlined for the updated Study. The consultant is encouraged to identify opportunities to leverage the work completed as part of the WSCCOG Mobility Report to facilitate the MSP planning process. This may include identifying eligible transportation projects that meet readiness requirements, developing project descriptions, identifying project timelines and phasing, outlining funding sources, and describing completed or planning public outreach processes.

The anticipated project timeline for the consultant to complete the WSCCOG Mobility Report is June 2020, whereas the MSP 5-Year Plan shall be completed by December 2020, with an annual update conducted in 2021 and 2022.

**SCOPE OF WORK**

**Task 1. Kick of Meeting and Project Management**

**Task 1.1: Kick-Off Meeting with Consultant**
Once a consultant has been selected, a kick-off meeting will be held to establish expectations and ensure that project goals and objectives are clear.

**Task 1.2: Establish Project Work Plan**
The consultant will be required to develop a project work plan, which includes a project schedule. On-going project management tasks will include meetings, agenda preparation, minute summaries of meetings, and action item matrices for all project related meetings. Minutes will be prepared at least five (5) working days after a project meeting and shall include an action matrix as required. Team meetings will include the consultant’s project manager and other key members, WSCCOG staff, SCAG staff, and WSCCOG Transportation Committee members as necessary to review project status/progress, as well as to resolve key issues and potential problems.

**Task 1.3: Invoicing**
Consultant shall prepare monthly progress reports with invoices that document the project status information to the project team and stakeholders as per SCAG terms and conditions. Consultant shall submit complete invoice packages to SCAG based on percent of work completed basis.

**Task 1.4: Quarterly Reporting/Fiscal Management**
Consultant shall establish clear and continuous lines of communication between consultant, City PM and SCAG PM, ensuring that expectations are mutually defined and achieved.
Consultant shall communicate information to the client and stakeholders on a biweekly basis, which will be accomplished via the following methods:

- Utilization of available cloud-based document sharing services, such as Google Drive, DropBox or similar service approved by the SCAG PM, for draft report distribution, review, and comment by stakeholders; and
- Bi-weekly online meetings conducted via GoToMeeting, or similar as approved by the SCAG Project Manager, ensuring broad stakeholder attendance and comment

- Responsible Party: SCAG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Kick-off meeting, agenda, and summary notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Revised project scope and schedule, as needed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Monthly status reports to SCAG and City PMs; Monthly invoicing with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>timecards/receipts, description of daily work and percent complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reporting to SCAG, as per SCAG terms and conditions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Biweekly communication with City’s PM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task 2. Review of Current Conditions**

**Task 2.1: Review Relevant Documents**

Numerous planning documents and studies have been prepared by various agencies since 2003. These documents include:

- Existing documents, such as Metro Exposition Corridor Transit Neighborhood Plan, LADOT Westside Mobility Plan (an update to the Coastal Transportation Corridor Specific Plan and West LA Transportation Specific Plan), Westside Subregional Mobility Matrix, SCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, Big Blue Bus Expo Integration Study, Culver City Bus Short Range Transit Plan, Culver City Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan/Action Plan, Metro Sepulveda Transit Corridor Study, City of Los Angeles Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan, City of Los Angeles Mobility Hubs – A Reader’s Guide, Metro’s Long Range Transportation Plan, Metro Active Transportation Strategic Plan, I-105 Corridor Sustainability Study, West Hollywood Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Plan, local Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs, and other local planning documents within the subregion
- Drafts of current planning studies underway, if available, such as the Crenshaw/LAX Northern Extension Feasibility Study, SCAG I-405 Corridor Master Plan, and Metro’s Countywide Baseline Conditions Analysis
- Datasets used to produce the documents listed above in the first bullet point and other major city planning studies

SCAG, and WSCCOG will provide the relevant documents. The consultant will review these documents to obtain a better understanding and in-depth knowledge of the subregion’s planning efforts as a whole. The consultant will provide a high-level evaluation summary of the documents of the following:
• Identify how the studies align with each other, as well as potential gaps from the planning documents to be addressed in future studies
• Identify potential projects and partnerships for interjurisdictional collaborations for all modes of transportation that enhance regional mobility, accessibility, and promote safety and social equity.

It is important to note that Metro is currently working with the COGs to prioritize projects and conduct community outreach throughout the Measure M and LRTP process. The consultant should focus on coordination efforts to avoid duplicating outreach efforts and utilize resources in the most efficient manner to assure the updated plan generates timely projects and benefits to the COG member cities.

Task 2.2: Existing Conditions Analysis
Concurrent with Task 2.1, the consultant will utilize existing documents and other resources to compile and integrate the data of existing conditions in the Westside subregion. This includes data on safety, automobile trip patterns, transit, pedestrian, bicycle and other active transportation modes. Caltrans, SCAG, and WSCCOG will also provide the additional data to the consultant, if necessary. Activities will include the following:

• Indicate gaps in existing and ongoing studies identified in Task 2.1
• Analyze data that support the activities in Task 3 (Bicycle Infrastructure Priority Corridor) and Task 5 (Mobility Centers and Needs Analysis). Analysis include the following:
  o Analyze vehicle flow data, such as annual daily traffic, congestion, collision and delay patterns
  o Analyze bicycle and pedestrian counts
  o Analyze bus and rail trip counts throughout the subregion
  o Analyze data on shared-use mobility (e.g., carsharing, ridesourcing, bikesharing, micro-mobility and micro-transit) and examine how it overlays with the existing transit network
• Analyze origin-destination data, including information generated through cell phones where available
• Analyze safety conditions through records of severe injury and fatal collisions

Create clear visualizations of the existing conditions sufficient to build an understanding of inter-jurisdictional transportation conditions. Materials from this task will be used to inform subsequent analysis, be used in the outreach tasks, and be incorporated in the final report as determined by the SCAG Project Manager. Any GIS produced maps must include FGDC compliant metadata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Memorandum on the summary of planning documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Memorandum on the summary of findings on existing conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Bicycle Infrastructure Priority Corridors Update

In 2011, the WSCCOG initiated a Bicycle Safety Awareness Coordination Plan to identify key corridors to close the gaps in the current bicycle infrastructure in the subregion. The goal of the recommended gap closures is to create a basic regional bicycle system that provides both north/south and east/west connections, and also connects all WSCCOG jurisdictions with each other. In 2012, WSCCOG identified five (5) priority corridors for bicycle infrastructure improvements, which were not covered in the 2003 Study. The objective of this task is to update the priority corridors and develop action steps for potential collaborative projects and network gap closures.

#### Task 3.1: Bicycle Infrastructure Priority Corridors Analysis

The consultant will update the priority corridors with information from the current planning documents, as well as identify completed or planned projects along the corridors. The consultant will use bicycle counts from Task 2.2 to identify any high-level gaps in interjurisdictional bike network planning. The consultant will also overlay the existing bikeshare/scooter share stations that are located along these corridors to identify potential challenges and need for bicycle infrastructure improvements to increase ridership and promote safety.

#### Task 3.2: Stakeholder Outreach

The consultant shall solicit feedback from and share findings with relevant stakeholders on how to better improve the subregional bicycle priority corridors as part of outreach associated with Tasks 4 and 5.

#### Task 3.3: Recommended Strategy

Based on the findings from Task 3.1 and Task 3.2, the consultant will prepare a summary memorandum that highlights portions of the corridors that still need to be addressed in terms of infrastructure improvements. If needed the memo may recommend potential projects along the corridors that serve new demands and/or fill network gaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Draft memorandum on the bicycle infrastructure priority corridors analysis and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Draft materials for stakeholder outreach; Advertisement and promotion of each meeting/engagement, agendas, meeting minutes, and a technical memorandum summarizing stakeholder input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Draft strategy memorandum; Any GIS produced maps must include FGDC compliant metadata.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task 4. Mobility Centers and Needs Analysis

The consultant will identify mobility centers and destinations in the subregion that generate transportation demand and activity based on current and planned land uses. These centers combine transportation modes, local job density, housing density, and the presence of major trip generators such as institutions and visitor-serving destinations. The analysis may look at existing and future centers, and should investigate accessibility and ease of use, by walking, bicycling, existing bus and rail transit, bikeshare, carshare, shared scooters, and microtransit.
services. The consultant will work with WSCCOG to develop a framework for prioritizing multimodal investments that facilitate access to and from these centers of activity.

**Task 4.1: Identify and Prioritize Major Activity Centers**
The consultant will utilize demographic, employment and land use data sets to identify major activity centers. The consultant should identify available data that they will use for current conditions, and identify any data to be provided by SCAG or WSCCOG cities. Future land use changes would be incorporated from adopted plans. The consultant will create maps, charts and other visualizations of existing and future activity centers to be used in outreach, evaluation and the final report. All digital material will meet accessibility standards for public sector agencies.

**Task 4.2: Identify Multi-modal Transportation Scenarios**
The consultant will identify high-level scenarios for increasing access to major activity centers identified in Task 4.1. Scenarios will look at a variety of transit, bike, pedestrian and multi-modal connectivity options/improvements that reduce demand for automobile trips to and from the centers. Improvements can include new services or facilities, and improvements that reduce travel times or eliminate blockages and network gaps.

Improvements may include transit facilities, system extensions, bike networks, first/last mile connections, pedestrian facilities and micro-mobility and micro-transit services. Particular attention should be paid to high-capacity facilities and improvements that improve non-SOV travel times. Improvements may also include bus stop and layover zones, transit shelters with real-time arrival information, bikeshare stations, carshare facilities, taxi waiting and call areas, pedestrian signal timing and phasing, WI-FI service, signage to direct people to the various assets, bicycle storage and repair facilities, retail, and open space.

**Task 4.3: Develop Framework for Prioritizing Improvements that Facilitate Multimodal Access to Major Activity Centers**
The consultant will develop a framework for prioritizing improvements that enhance multimodal access to the subregion’s major activity centers. The framework will consider the findings of current conditions from Task 2, as well as review bicycle and pedestrian counts, bus and rail trip counts throughout the subregion, and the presence of locations that generate significant numbers of pedestrians.

**Task 4.4: Stakeholder Outreach**
The objective of this outreach is to share findings and solicit feedback from key stakeholders on transportation scenarios as well as seek input on the infrastructure and improvement needs for the major activity center. Consultant will convene up to five (5) stakeholder interviews and/or two (2) focus groups with input from Caltrans, SCAG, and WSCCOG. The stakeholders shall include, public agencies (Metro, LADOT), and public and private stakeholders (local businesses, schools, members of neighborhood associations, community based organizations, and members of the elderly and disabled communities, and colleges and universities) and various community groups (including, but not limited to, Investing in Place, Leadership for Urban Renewal Network ([LURN]), People for Mobility Justice ([PMJ]), Los Angeles Aging Advocacy Coalition ([LAAAC]), and American Association of Retired Persons ([AARP])).
Task 4.5: Recommended Strategy
Based on the findings from Task 4.1 through Task 4.4, the consultant will draft a recommended strategy, in the form of decision-making framework, on how to better facilitate multimodal transportation access to priority activity centers. The strategy will also outline action steps for the Westside cities to implement in pursuing the recommended multimodal projects that facilitate access to major sub-regional activity centers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Draft list of major activity centers and selection criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Draft memorandum on Multi-Modal Transportation Scenarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Draft memorandum on multimodal accessibility to major activity centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Draft materials for stakeholder outreach; Attendance as specified in the task, agendas, meeting notes, and a technical memorandum summarizing stakeholder input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Draft decision-making framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task 5. Final Report – Westside Mobility Study Update

Task 5.1: Memorandum to Guide Subregional Decision-Making Framework
The consultant will summarize and prioritize the decision-making framework identified in Tasks 2 through 5 and develop recommendations of next steps for the WSCCOG and its member jurisdictions to pursue funding opportunities for implementation. This project will provide the critical funding necessary to craft a decision-making framework for a coordinated approach throughout the subregion.

Task 5.2: Draft Final Report
The consultant will summarize all findings, stakeholder outreach, and proposed strategies into the final report. The draft report will be reviewed by WSCCOG, SCAG, and Caltrans for up to 10 business days. The consultant will incorporate comments and concerns in the Final Study.

Task 5.3: Final Report
Comments and recommendations by WSCCOG, SCAG, and Caltrans staff will be incorporated into the Final Plan. All collected data, information, deliverables, and tools developed for this project will be provided to SCAG, Caltrans, and WSCCOG staff upon the delivery of the Final Report. If they occur during the term of the consultant contract, a presentation unveiling the report and proposed action steps for further implementation will be scheduled at a WSCCOG Board meeting for approval and adoption. If the presentation occurs outside of the term of the contract the consultant will prepare presentation materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Draft memorandum describing the decision-making framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Develop draft final report for review and comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Develop final report and presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 6. Develop WSCCOG’s Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) 5-year Plan

The objective of this task is to assist the WSCCOG in developing a preliminary list of projects and a 5-Year Plan for its Multi-Year Subregional Program (MSP) under Measure M. Metro provides a five-year Measure M programming funding forecast for each MSP, based on the amounts provided in the Measure M expenditure plan. The WSCCOG is estimated to receive $19 million for its Active Transportation/1st and Last Mile Connection Program for the first five-years of the expenditure plan.

As part of Metro’s MSP process, WSCCOG must provide a detailed list of projects that meet readiness thresholds, outline project timelines and phasing, identify allocated and anticipated funding sources, and define the process for public participation. The public participation process should focus on soliciting feedback from targeted stakeholders to ensure that the MSP reflects the priorities of local and subregional communities. To facilitate the development of the MSP 5-Year Plan, WSCCOG prepared a preliminary list of projects for the Westside Mobility Matrix in 2015, and an initial plan for the Public Participation Element as part of the MSP process (see Attachment D).

The consultant shall deliver draft materials for each sub-task under Task 6. The consultant will ask WSCCOG Transportation Working Group to review and approve of recommendations and findings before transmitting materials to the WSCCOG Board for review and consideration.

Task 6.1. Public Participation Element

1. Review the WSCCOG’s initial plan for the Public Participation Element (see Attachment D) and provide additional recommendations for ongoing outreach activities as part of the planning and implementation process for the MSP 5-Year Plan, which may include the following:
   a. Updating stakeholder lists
   b. Defining outreach strategies across a variety of platforms for specific communities and stakeholders
   c. Outlining a proposed mix of stakeholder meetings, focus groups, interviews, charrettes, and/or online and social media engagement.
   d. Identifying opportunities for stakeholders to submit comments and feedback
2. In accordance with Metro’s Measure M Administrative Procedures document, draft the Public Participation Element for the MSP 5-Year Plan that outlines the outreach processes and documented outcomes
3. Submit draft Public Participation Element to the WSCCOG Transportation Working Group for review

Task 6.2. Develop a Preliminary List of Projects

1. Coordinate with WSCCOG Transportation Working Group to conduct the following:
   a. Review the Westside Cities Mobility Matrix and coordinate with the WSCCOG to understand project scope and priorities
   b. Conduct an initial analysis to identify eligible projects that were not included in the Mobility Matrix, including detailing project eligibility, documenting the program nexus, and outlining preliminary budgets and timelines
2. Coordinate with the WSCCOG Transportation Working Group and key stakeholders to develop a draft framework to evaluate and prioritize projects, as well as apply performance metrics
a. The prioritization framework may consider local and subregional benefits, project eligibility, project readiness, as well as qualitative benefits related to mobility, economic vitality, accessibility, safety, sustainability, and quality of life.

3. Refine the draft framework based on feedback from the WSCCOG Transportation Working Group and key stakeholders, and ensure that they conform with Metro’s MSP guidelines.

4. Develop a preliminary list of prioritized projects to the WSCCOG Transportation Working Group for review and consideration.

**Task 6.3. Project Implementation Schedule**

1. Coordinate with sponsoring entities to develop a project implementation schedule
   a. Compile and review implementation schedules for each project
   b. Coordinate with WSCCOG staff and member jurisdictions to ensure that timelines identify project milestones, outline project phasing, and describe final project delivery commitments
   c. Develop a 5-year funding program organized by fiscal year (July – June). The timeline included in the 5-year plan will be based on project schedules and availability of funding. The schedule should be structured to allow for ongoing project tracking and to facilitate annual updates.

2. Submit draft project implementation schedule to the WSCCOG Transportation Working Group to review

**Task 6.4. Stakeholder Outreach**

1. Present initial findings and recommendations
   a. Present the preliminary project list, prioritization framework, and initial timelines to WSCCOG representatives and key stakeholders in accordance with the Public Participation Element in Task 6.1
   b. Incorporate stakeholder input in the final MSP 5-year plan and list of projects

**Task 6.5. Finalize MSP 5-Year Plan and List of Projects**

1. Compile a finalized project list that includes the following information for each project:
   a. Requested funding amounts, including annual expenditures and funding by fiscal year
   b. Project timing/schedules and phasing
   c. Allocated and anticipated funding sources, including all non-MSP funding
   d. Project descriptions with sufficient detail to establish a nexus with the MSP category and apply qualitative performance measures related to mobility, economic vitality, accessibility, safety, as well as sustainability and quality of life
   e. Final project delivery commitment

2. Coordinate with Metro staff to review project eligibility and appropriate program nexus

**Task 6.6. Finalize MSP 5-Year Plan and Supporting Materials**

The consultant shall prepare the MSP 5-Year Plan that includes the following information:

1. Final Public Participation Element that outlines outreach processes and documented outcomes
2. Final list of projects within the subregion that will can be implemented within the 5-year MSP planning timeline
3. Descriptions for each project, including sufficient detail to establish a nexus with the MSP category
4. Qualitative performance measures for each project related to mobility, economic vitality, accessibility, safety, and/or sustainability and quality of life
5. Potential funding sources, including all non-MSP funding, for each project
6. Project timing/phasing and final project delivery commitments
7. Proposal on annual updates

The review and approval process for the MSP 5-Year Plan is outlined below:

1. Initial Draft
   a. WSCCOG Transportation Working Group will review the initial draft and provide comments within ten (10) business days
   b. The consultant shall incorporate comments and edits to the initial draft
   c. Consultant shall present the initial draft to the WSCCOG Board

2. Final Draft
   a. The consultant shall incorporate comments and edits from the WSCCOG Board
   b. WSCCOG Transportation Working Group will review the final draft and provide comments within ten (10) business days
   c. The consultant shall incorporate the comments and edits from the WSCCOG Transportation Working Group and submit the final draft to the WSCCOG Board for final approval before submission to the Metro Board

3. Annual Update
   a. The consultant will draft a memo that details a process or methodology for completing annual updates to the project list after the MSP is adopted.
   b. The consultant shall provide updates to the MSP 5-year plan and list of projects in FY 2021-2022 and FY 2022-23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Draft MSP Public Participation Element; Final MSP Public Participation Element; updated stakeholder lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>Draft prioritization framework for projects; Preliminary list of prioritized WSCCOG projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Draft project implementation schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Stakeholder meetings, focus groups, interviews, charrettes, and/or online and social media engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Final list of prioritized WSCCOG projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>Final WSCCOG MSP plan and supporting materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advanced Clean Trucks
Accelerating Zero-Emission Truck Markets
Last Updated: July 2, 2019

This factsheet describes the proposed Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT) Regulation and how the California Air Resources Board plans to accelerate the first wave of zero-emission trucks.

What are California’s air quality and climate targets?
California faces very challenging mandates to reduce air pollutants to protect public health and to meet state climate change targets including:

- Federal health-based ambient air quality standards (key dates in 2023 and 2031)
- 40% reduction in greenhouse gases (GHG) by 2030;
- 80% reduction in GHGs by 2050; and
- 50% reduction in petroleum use by 2030

Meeting all of these goals requires a bold transformation in all sectors including stationary, industrial, residential, and transportation with significant contributions from public agencies, private businesses and individuals.

Why do we need zero-emission technology in the transportation sector?
Mobile sources and the fossil fuels that power them are the largest contributors to the formation of ozone, greenhouse gas emissions, fine particulate matter (PM2.5), and toxic diesel particulate matter. In California, they are responsible for approximately 80% of smog-forming nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions. They also represent about 50% of greenhouse gas emissions when including emissions from fuel production, and more than 95% of toxic diesel particulate matter emissions. Zero-emission vehicles have no tailpipe emissions. When compared to diesel vehicles, they are two to five times more energy efficient, reduce dependence on petroleum, and reduce GHG emissions substantially.

What is the Advanced Clean Truck Regulation?
The proposed Advanced Clean Truck Regulation is part of a holistic approach to accelerate a large-scale transition of zero-emission medium-and heavy-duty vehicles from Class 2B to Class 8. The proposal is subject to change until the Board makes a final decision, expected in 2019 or 2020. The proposed regulation has two components including a manufacturer sales requirement, and a reporting requirement:

- **Zero-emission truck sales**: Manufacturers who certify Class 2B-8 chassis or complete vehicles with combustion engines would be required to sell zero-emission trucks as an increasing percentage of their annual California sales from 2024 to 2030. By 2030, zero-emission truck/chassis sales would need to be 50% of class 4–8 straight trucks sales and 15% of all other truck sales.

- **Company and fleet reporting**: Large employers including retailers, manufacturers, brokers and others would be required to report information about shipments and shuttle services. Fleet owners, with 100 or more trucks, would be required to report about their existing fleet operations. This information would help identify future strategies to ensure that fleets purchase available zero-emission trucks and place them in service where suitable to meet their needs.

What types of trucks are currently suitable for electrification?
Today, electric drivetrains are well suited to operating in congested urban areas for stop-and-go driving where conventional engines are least efficient. Battery-electric and fuel-cell electric
trucks, buses, and vans already are being used by fleets that operate locally and have predictable daily use where the trucks return to base to be charged or fueled.

Are any zero-emission trucks commercially available?  
There are more than 70 different models of zero-emission vans, trucks and buses that already are commercially available from several manufacturers. Most trucks and vans operate less than 100 miles per day and several zero-emission configurations are available to serve that need. As technology advances, zero-emission trucks will become suitable for more applications. Most major truck manufacturers have announced plans to introduce market ready zero-emission trucks in the near future.

What does it cost to charge a battery electric truck?  
The electricity cost to charge battery electric trucks varies based on how fast you charge, the utility rate, and the time of day. A calculator for estimating electricity cost is at ACT Charging Calculator. In many cases, a fleet owner who also owns charging stations and charges trucks overnight can have little to no net electricity costs after the low carbon fuel standard credits in California are included (CARB LCFS Program).

How can fleet owners afford to operate zero-emission trucks?  
Zero-emission trucks have higher upfront costs but have lower operating costs than conventional trucks. Today, the total cost of ownership in California can be comparable to conventional trucks for certain duty cycles without grants or rebates. As battery prices fall and technology continues to improve, the total cost of ownership is expected to become more favorable. Incentives are currently available to offset some or all of the higher vehicle capital costs and some of the early infrastructure costs to help fleets begin transitioning to zero-emission vehicles now.

What incentives are available for purchasing zero-emission trucks?  
Several funding programs are available to support the use of advanced technologies administered by state agencies, federal agencies, and local air districts. For example, the Hybrid and Zero-Emission Truck and Bus Voucher Incentive Project provides point-of-sale rebates to offset the upfront cost of advanced technologies. A list of all zero-emission vehicles that are currently eligible for funding is available at California HVIP. For more information about funding opportunities visit CARB Incentive Programs.

Where can I get more information?  
Information about the Advanced Clean Trucks Regulation and upcoming meetings and events is available at ACT Website. If you have questions or wish to obtain this document in an alternative format or language, call (916) 323-2927. For TTY/TDD/Speech-to-Speech users, dial 711 for the California Relay Service.
Dear Governor Newsom,

We, the undersigned California Mayors and local elected leaders write to express our strong support for California adopting a strong zero emission vehicle (ZEV) requirement for medium- and heavy-duty vehicles to reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

Our cities have significant air pollution challenges — 7 of the 10 most polluted regions in the country are found in California — and climate change is only making smog worse. Air pollution causes significant health impacts — especially to kids and families that live close to truck corridors. Furthermore, the increased residential truck traffic from the proliferation of home delivery and next day shipping is further exacerbating local air pollution in all of California’s communities.

Adopting a strong ZEV mandate for trucks will not only help clean our air, but will also help our cities benefit from the jobs and investment potential of clean truck manufacturing and building electric vehicle infrastructure. We applaud the California Air Resource Board’s efforts in undertaking the Advanced Clean Trucks Rule and urge the adoption of strong zero-emission vehicle targets that will protect our communities from harmful air pollution and address the largest source of carbon pollution in the United States.

A strong mandate will help introduce more zero-emission vehicles and technologies in California and ensure we aren’t left behind as global markets rapidly move towards zero emission transportation solutions. A strong mandate will also provide certainty for manufacturers and fleet operators, reduce greenhouse gases, protect public health, and allow our cities to continue moving towards our climate and clean air goals.

In developing the Advanced Clean Trucks Rule, we encourage California to consider a standard that:

- Puts more zero-emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles on the road faster;
- Ensures all classes of trucks have zero-emission vehicle sales beginning in 2024;
- Simultaneously supports a complementary market for zero-emission vehicles; and
- Prioritizes communities disproportionately impacted by transportation emissions.

We will continue to support actions to protect the health of our communities and our environment and look forward to a strong final rule.

Sincerely,

Cc: Mary Nichols, Chair, California Air Resources Board
DATE: October 10, 2019
TO: Westside Cities Council of Governments Board
FROM: Westside Cities Council of Governments Staff
SUBJECT: SCAG Regional Housing Need Determination

Background
On August 22, 2019 the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) provided the SCAG with a Regional Housing Need Determination of 1,344,740 housing units for the period between June 2021 and October 2029. On September 5th, SCAG staff proposed to file an objection to HCD’s determination claiming that their preferred methodology would result in a determination ranging between 823,808 to 920,772 units. In letters and in-person comments, Regional Council members and the general public expressed both support and opposition to HCD’s determination (refer to Attachment A for the meeting minutes):

- Supporters of HCD’s determination claimed that a higher housing production target would help address rising housing costs and expanding homeless populations.
- Opponents of HCD’s determination claimed that an objection could result in a more realistic goal while preserving the region’s “bottom-up” approach to housing production.

Ultimately, the Regional Council authorized SCAG to send an objection letter to HCD on the determination. On September 18th, SCAG officially filed the objection letter on the following grounds (refer to Attachment B for the objection letter):

1. HCD’s determination did not use SCAG’s RTP/SCS Growth Forecast as required by statute
2. HCD compared overcrowding and cost-burden rates to national averages instead of averages of comparable regions as required by statute
3. HCD used vacancy rate standards that SCAG staff view as unreasonable
4. HCD failed to deduct household growth on tribal land from its determination

SCAG presented two alternative methods for determining SCAG’s housing need, which differ most significantly regarding (2) and (3) above.

- According to the tables at the end of SCAG’s objection letter, using a different overcrowding rate proposed by SCAG would lower the determination by 151,653 housing units.
- Using a different cost-burden adjustment proposed by SCAG would lower the determination to a range between 72,694 and 96,449 units.
- Using a different vacancy rate proposed by SCAG would lower SCAG’s determination to a range between 62,923 and 112,128 units.
- Along with the relatively minor adjustments suggested by (1) and (4), this would result in a final determination ranging from 823,808 to 920,772 units.
Next Steps
HCD is required by statute to provide a final written determination within 45 days of receiving an objection. Additionally, the next regular meeting of the RHNA Subcommittee is scheduled for Monday, October 7, 2019 to discuss the SCAG staff recommendation draft RHNA allocation methodology.
AGENDA ITEM 3
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
900 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1700, Los Angeles, California 90017
October 3, 2019

NO. 614
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 2019


In conjunction with the Regional Conference and General Assembly, the Regional Council of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) held its regular meeting at the SCAG main office, 900 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1700, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

Members Present
Hon. Bill Jahn, President
Hon. Rex Richardson, 2nd Vice President
Hon. Clint Lorimore
Hon. Alan D. Wapner, Imm. Past Pres.
Supervisor Luis Plancarte
Supervisor Kathryn Barger
Supervisor Karen Spiegel
Supervisor Linda Parks
Hon. Jan Harnik
Hon. Mike T. Judge
Hon. Ben Benoit
Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker
Hon. Kathleen Kelly
Hon. Rey Santos
Hon. Frank Navarro
Hon. Larry McCallon
Hon. Deborah Robertson
Hon. L. Dennis Michael
Hon. Ray Marquez

Big Bear Lake
Long Beach
Eastvale
Ontario
Palm Desert
Simi Valley
Wildomar
El Centro
Palm Desert
Beaumont
Colton
Highland
Rialto
Rancho Cucamonga
Chino Hills

District 11
District 29
District 4
SBCTA
Imperial County
Los Angeles County
Riverside County
Ventura County
RRTC
VCTC
Air District Representative
District 1
District 2
District 3
District 6
District 7
District 8
District 9
District 10
### Members Present...continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Michael Carroll</td>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>District 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steve Nagel</td>
<td>Fountain Valley</td>
<td>District 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Cecilia Iglesias</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>District 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Charles Puckett</td>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>District 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Stacy Berry</td>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>District 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Art Brown</td>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td>District 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Marty Simonoff</td>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>District 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Sonny Santa Ines</td>
<td>Bellflower</td>
<td>District 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Sean Ashton</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>District 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Emma Sharif</td>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>District 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ali Saleh</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>District 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Dan Medina</td>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>District 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Margaret Clark</td>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>District 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steve De Ruse</td>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>District 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jorge Marquez</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>District 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Margaret E. Finlay</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>District 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Teresa Real Sebastian</td>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td>District 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steve Tye</td>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>District 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Tim Sandoval</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>District 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Gazeley</td>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>District 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Judy Mitchell</td>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>District 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Meghan Sahli-Wells</td>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>District 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jess Talamantes</td>
<td>Burbank</td>
<td>District 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steven Hofbauer</td>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>District 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. David Shapiro</td>
<td>Calabasas</td>
<td>District 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Carmen Ramirez</td>
<td>Oxnard</td>
<td>District 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. David Pollock</td>
<td>Moorpark</td>
<td>District 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Tim Holmgren</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>District 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Joe Buscaino</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steve Manos</td>
<td>Lake Elsinore</td>
<td>District 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Lyn Semeta</td>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>District 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Rita Ramirez</td>
<td>Victorville</td>
<td>District 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Megan Beaman Jacinto</td>
<td>Coachella</td>
<td>District 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Hector Pacheco</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td>District 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Rusty Bailey</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>District 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Marisela Magana</td>
<td>Perris</td>
<td>District 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Randall Lewis</td>
<td>Lewis Group of Companies</td>
<td>Business Representative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Members Not Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Don Wagner</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Hilda Solis</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Curt Hagman</td>
<td>San Bernardino County</td>
<td>San Bernardino County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Predmore</td>
<td>Holtville</td>
<td>ICTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Peggy Huang</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>TCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Fred Minagar</td>
<td>Laguna Niguel</td>
<td>District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Wendy Bucknum</td>
<td>Mission Viejo</td>
<td>District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Trevor O’Neill</td>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>District 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Tri Ta</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>District 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td>District 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Lena Gonzalez</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>District 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jonathan Curtis</td>
<td>La Cañada Flintridge</td>
<td>District 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Gilbert Cedillo</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paul Krekorian</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Bob Blumenfield</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 49/Public Transit Rep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. David Ryu</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paul Koretz</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Nury Martinez</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Monica Rodriguez</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Marqueece Harris-Dawson</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Curren D. Price, Jr.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Herb Wesson, Jr.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mike Bonin</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mitch O’Farrell</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. José Huizar</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Brian McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td>District 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Eric Garcetti</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Tribal Gov’t Reg’l Plng Board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff Present

- Kome Ajise, Executive Director
- Darin Chidsey, Chief Operating Officer
- Debbie Dillon, Chief Strategy Officer
- Joann Africa, Chief Counsel/Director of Legal Services
Art Yoon, Director of Policy and Public Affairs
Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer
Julie Loats, Chief Information Officer
Sarah Jepson, Interim Director of Planning
Tess Rey-Chaput, Office of Regional Council Support

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Bill Jahn, President, asked the members to observe a moment of silence and remember the victims who were impacted by the devastation of the hurricane in the Bahamas; the victims of the recent shootings in Texas and including the families of the victims of the vessel fire in Santa Cruz, California.

President Jahn called the meeting to order at 12:15PM and asked First Vice President Rex Richardson to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

President Jahn introduced two of SCAG’s Scholarship Award recipients who are in the audience today, Morgan Kopecky and Shaun Howard.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

President Jahn announced that the public comment cards that were received were regarding Agenda Item No. 2. He stated that he will be announcing the speakers at the time when the item is taken up.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

President Jahn announced that Agenda Item Nos. 3 through 11 of the Consent Calendar will be acted upon first, followed by Agenda Item Nos. 1 and 2.

President Jahn noted that Agenda Item No. 9, ‘September’ is Pedestrian Safety Month, is dedicated to educating drivers and pedestrians about safe roadway habits. He asked the members to stop by the Reception area as Go Human is showcasing a ‘pop-up’ parklet from the Go Human Challenge. SCAG staff will be available to answer questions and provide a demonstration to help support member jurisdiction’s efforts and deepen community engagement related to traffic safety.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items
3. Minutes of the Meeting – August 1, 2019

4. 2021 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines

5. SB 664 (Allen) – Electronic Toll and Transit Fare Collection Systems

6. SCAG Memberships and Sponsorships

7. Contracts $200,000 or Greater: 18-040-C01, Regional Data Platform

Receive and File

8. Monthly State and Federal Legislative Update

9. ‘September’ is Pedestrian Safety Month

10. Purchase Orders $5,000 - $199,999; Contracts $25,000 - $199,999; and Amendments $5,000 - $74,999

11. CFO Monthly Report

A MOTION was made (Walker) to approve the Consent Calendar, Agenda Item Nos. 3 through 7; Receive and File Items 8 through 11. Motion was SECONDED (Navarro) and passed by the following votes:


AGAINST: None (0)

ABSTAIN: None (0)

President Jahn announced that former City of Murrieta Councilmember and SCAG’s First Vice President Randon Lane accepted a position in the U.S. Department of Transportation in Washington, D.C. Because Councilman Lane was not able to formally express his good wishes to the Regional Council, President Jahn announced that staff had arranged for him to appear live on-
screen. Randon Lane made remarks.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Nomination for SCAG 2019-2020 Second Vice President Resulting from SCAG Vacancy

President Jahn introduced the item and asked Nominating Committee Chair Alan D. Wapner to provide a report.

Chair Wapner reported the Nominating Committee met and reviewed applications from six (6) candidates for the open position to serve as Second Vice President for the balance of the 2019-20 term. While all candidates were equally qualified, Chair Wapner stated the Nominating Committee unanimously nominated Councilmember Clint Lorimore, Eastvale, District 4. A MOTION was made (Wapner) to approve the nomination of Clint Lorimore as Second Vice President for the balance of the 2019-20 term as recommended by the Nominating Committee MOTION was SECONDED (Spiegel).

Before the vote, President Jahn accepted a nomination from the floor from Councilmember Meghan Sahli-Wells, Culver City, District 41, who nominated Supervisor Linda Parks, Ventura County, as Second Vice President for the balance of the 2019-20 term. MOTION was SECONDED (Real Sebastian).

At this point in time because there were two (2) nominations, Nominating Committee Chair Wapner offered that for ease of administration to handle the motions at the same time—whereby when voting on the electronic device for this item only—the selection of number 1 on the device would represent a vote for Councilman Lorimore and the selection of number 2 on the device would represent a vote for Supervisor Parks. Staff confirmed the Regional Council members’ understanding before proceeding with the vote which resulted as follows:

VOTE FOR CLINT LORIMORE:
Bailey, Barger, Benoit Berry, Brown, Buscaino, Carroll, Clark, De Ruse, Finlay, Gazeley, Harnik, Hofbauer, Iglesias, Jahn, Judge, Kelly, Lorimore, Manos, J. Marquez, R. Marquez, McCallon, Nagel, Navarro, Plancarte, Puckett, Richardson, Robertson, Saleh, Sandoval, Santa Ines, Santos, Shapiro, Simonoff, Spiegel, Tyre, Viegas-Walker, and Wapner (38).

VOTE FOR LINDA PARKS:

After the voting was closed, President Jahn announced there were 38 votes for Clint Lorimore and
16 votes for Linda Parks. On behalf of the Regional Council, President Jahn congratulated Second Vice President Lorimore and asked him to join the Officers on the dais. Second Vice President Lorimore made remarks.

2. Regional Housing Need Determination from HCD

President Jahn introduced the item and reported the State of California Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) provided SCAG a regional housing need determination of 1,344,740 housing units for the SCAG region on August 22, 2019. He stated the agenda item relates to the regional housing need determination and not how we distribute the RHNA allocation or methodology. President Jahn stated that per statute, SCAG may object to the regional determination provided by HCD. Therefore, the recommended action today is to authorize the Executive Director to file an objection to HCD on the regional housing need determination. President Jahn emphasized that policy discussions will be an important next step in the process. He asked Executive Director Kome Ajise to provide background information.

Mr. Ajise stated there are grounds to file an objection to HCD regarding the regional determination. He emphasized the recommended action is not necessarily a protest of the RHNA determination of 1,344,740 housing units for the SCAG region; rather, is based on technical data and the process of a reasonable application of the methodology. Per statute, Mr. Ajise explained that SCAG may file an objection and provide a proposed alternative for the regional housing need determination. Mr. Ajise asked Kevin Kane, SCAG staff, to provide further clarification on the technical basis of the objection.

With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Kevin Kane, SCAG staff, provided background information on the consultation process with HCD. Mr. Kane stated the regional determination should be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan; the region’s population; and housing and employment projections which are the basis of the State and federal mandates for regional planning. Mr. Kane provided information for the process for an objection, citing Government Code Section 65584.01(c).

In closing, Mr. Kane stated the staff recommendation is to authorize the Executive Director to file an objection with HCD on the regional determination because of key technical issues such as: HCD did not use the appropriate population forecasts for the determination of the SCAG region’s housing needs and did not conduct a reasonable application of the methodology and assumptions pursuant to the statute.

President Jahn opened the Public Comment period.

Councilmember Marsha McLean, Santa Clarita, expressed appreciation for SCAG staff for scheduling a RHNA information session on the draft methodology in the City of Santa Clarita and supported
staff’s recommendation to file an objection to HCD regarding the regional housing need determination.

Ben Winter, staff for City of Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti, encouraged the Regional Council to accept HCD’s regional housing need determination for the SCAG region due to the current housing crisis. While the technical recommendation is appreciated, Mr. Winter expressed concerns on some of the recommendations which may result to a much lower housing target than what the state proposed.

Greg Spiegel, Inner City Law Center, expressed support for HCD’s regional housing need determination of 1.3 million housing units for the SCAG region. He cited examples of the challenges faced by the Center with families living in deplorable conditions due to lack of affordable housing and asked the Regional Council to support the regional determination that would prioritize social equity for more affordable housing where the jobs are located.

Steven Johnson, Tena Foundation, expressed support for HCD’s regional housing need determination of 1.3 million housing units which is necessary to the population of Southern California.

Terry Luedcke, Abundant Housing L.A., expressed concerns with the considerable amount of people living in the streets in tents or motor homes which is a result of a housing crisis that will need to be addressed and distribute affordable housing where the jobs and opportunities exist, regardless of any income level. He stated there is an opportunity now to make an improvement.

Leonora Camner, Abundant Housing L.A., expressed support for HCD’s regional housing need determination of 1.3 million housing units and will support an objection for a higher number of housing units to address homelessness in the SCAG region.

Connor Finney, CA Yimby, expressed support for HCD’s regional housing need determination and RHNA allocation strategy to address a housing crisis and urged SCAG to embrace solutions.

Michele Martinez, former SCAG President, stated that resources and funding are needed to allow growth for our communities and urged the members to negotiate future tax allocation.

Elizabeth Hansburg, People for Housing in Orange County, echoed comments made by Michele Martinez; expressed support for HCD’s regional housing need determination of 1.3 million housing units; and stated that cities must have good development.

President Jahn closed the Public Comment period.
President Jahn asked Chief Counsel Joann Africa to also acknowledge receipt of several public comment letters regarding Agenda Item No. 2. Ms. Africa noted for the record there were 46 letters that opposed HCD’s regional housing need determination; three (3) letters received in support of HCD’s regional housing need determination; one letter in support of SCAG’s filing an objection to HCD; and three (3) letters related to the RHNA methodology which will be reviewed by staff in the context of the methodology discussion.

For clarification purposes, Executive Director Kome Ajise stated that the recommended action by the Regional Council is to authorize the filing of an objection to HCD. He welcomed the comments that were expressed today and while acknowledging the importance to address the State’s housing crisis, he also noted the importance of ensuring a continued integrity in the regional planning process.

President Jahn opened the floor for comments from the members of the Regional Council.

Regional Council member Joe Buscaino, Los Angeles, District 62, stated he understands the concerns expressed today. The shortage of housing for all income levels is apparent due to homelessness or increased rents or housing prices that makes it very difficult to own a home. Councilmember Buscaino expressed his opposition to SCAG filing an objection to HCD on the regional housing need determination and urged the Regional Council to do the same.

Supervisor Kathryn Barger, Los Angeles County, asked for clarification regarding the RHNA determination of 1.3 housing units. Kome Ajise, Executive Director, responded that the objection to HCD is not the 1.3 housing units; rather the methodology that was used. Supervisor Barger emphasized the importance of a bottom-up approach and cautioned the members regarding unintended consequences. While she echoed the comments made by Mayor Garcetti at last month’s meeting, Supervisor Barger stated that “being bold will need to be done in a smart fashion.”

Regional Council member Meghan Sahli-Wells, Culver City, District 41, expressed opposition and stated that local input is based on local planning which created the housing crisis and cited her city as an example. She stated that sending an objection letter to HCD symbolizes an objection to the housing need determination of 1.3 million housing units which she believes is not unreasonable nor impossible.

Regional Council member Steve Manos, Lake Elsinore, District 63, stated there is no zoning or funding attached to HCD’s regional housing need determination of 1.3 million housing units. He stated CEQA, redevelopment agencies, affordable housing funds, reduction of mental health funds, displacement of mental health patients, increasing housing building standards and other causes result to a housing shortage. He stated this will only cause liability to cities and counties which the
City of Huntington Beach can attest to. Councilmember Manos urged support for an objection to the regional housing need determination.

Regional Council member Carmen Ramirez, Oxnard, District 45, cited her city as an example needing support, funding and resources to build affordable housing.

Regional Council member Rusty Bailey, Riverside, District 68, stated he is in agreement with the comments made today and sees this is an opportunity to exercise leadership and understanding that the SCAG region is unique. He emphasized the importance of sending a message to HCD that SCAG is a collaborative partner in solving the housing crisis. While the regional housing need determination of 1.3 million housing units is aspirational, it may not be reasonable and it is important for it to be provided with funding and resources.

Regional Council member Deborah Robertson, Rialto, District 8, asked a question if the cost-burden rate includes the resources to sustain the current population. Kevin Kane, SCAG staff, provided clarification.

Regional Council member Steve Hofbauer, Palmdale, District 43, echoed comments made by Regional Council member Steve Manos especially the loss of redevelopment funds. He expressed disappointment regarding the absence of funding support and cited examples of the challenges many cities face with building affordable homes.

Regional Council member Jan Harnik, RCTC, reminded the members of the recommended action today is about ‘process’ and not about the number [total housing units] and referenced the supplemental report that was provided to the members regarding staff’s technical analysis regarding the objection.

Regional Council member Kathleen Kelly, Palm Desert, District 2, stated the future conversations are not to be about the reasonableness of the allocation; rather about the next steps which are essential whether it is funding or public-private collaboration. She noted her support for Councilman Bailey’s comments on SCAG and HCD needing to be partners and including this part of the objection.

Supervisor Karen Spiegel, Riverside County, echoed the comments made by former SCAG President Michele Martinez. She emphasized the importance of the availability of resources as this is beyond building houses. Supervisor Spiegel also echoed the comments made by Councilman Bailey and acknowledged that the City of Riverside is the only city in the state trying to solve veteran homelessness. She stated the issue is about the process and not the number [housing units].

Regional Council member Margaret Finlay, Duarte, District 35, stated she is in agreement with the
comments made and explained the unintended consequences of Proposition 13. She suggested incentivizing corporations to build and attract jobs in parts of the state such as Visalia, Bakersfield, Fresno, etc.

Regional Council member Michael Carroll, Irvine, District 14, commented that the only level and place where the public derives a sense of trust is at the local government level. He expressed support for staff’s recommendation.

First Vice President Rex Richardson, Long Beach, District 29, asked a question regarding the consultation process with HCD. Kevin Kane, SCAG staff, responded regarding the two-stage consultation process with HCD.

Supervisor Kathryn Barger, Los Angeles County, asked for clarification regarding the methodology. Kevin Kane, SCAG staff, responded that the objection was based on SCAG’s growth forecast not being used; not using a comparable region standard; improved vacancy rate comparison; and other additional considerations such as excluding tribal lands and use of current data.

A MOTION was made (Bailey) to approve staff’s recommendation to authorize the Executive Director to file an objection to HCD on the regional housing need determination pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.01 (c) with direction to staff add that it is being done in collaborative spirit between SCAG and HCD and that SCAG proposes a robust and reasonable planning target to address the state housing crisis. Motion was SECONDED (Kelly) and approved by the following votes:


AGAINST: Buscaino and Sahli-Wells (2)

ABSTAIN: None (0)

BUSINESS REPORT

As the business representative, Ex-Officio Member Randall Lewis, advised the members that when working with their respective city staff to redefine “What is a house?” and “Where does the house go?” He stated that new solutions are different from the solutions of the past, such as an additional dwelling unit (ADU) or multi-generational house, a container, shelter or a smaller unit as there are a
number of housing innovations on where will the house go. Mr. Lewis suggested marketing the housing crisis to the general public and developers, HCD, the Governor and the entire state.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

President Jahn welcomed the following new members:

- RC Member Hector Pacheco, San Fernando, representing District 67
- SGVCOG subregional appointments of Cory Moss, City of Industry, to the Transportation Committee; Ed Reece, City of Claremont, to the Transportation Committee; and Tony Wu, City of West Covina, to the CEHD Committee

President Jahn also appointed the Councilmember Margaret Finlay to the Audit Committee and a President’s Appointment of Councilmember Jeremy Smith, Canyon Lake, to the Transportation Committee.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Kome Ajise, Executive Director, thanked staff and acknowledged their work to get the Supplemental Report regarding the objection to HCD to the Regional Council while also working on Connect SoCal. Mr. Ajise also thanked the Regional Council for an inspiring conversation—not only regarding housing—but also working collaboratively across jurisdictions to address the much-needed resources and capacity to build housing.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, President Jahn adjourned the Regional Council meeting at 2:03PM.
September 18, 2019

Mr. Doug McCauley
Acting Director
Housing & Community Development (HCD)
2020 W. El Camino Ave.
Sacramento, CA 95833

Subject: SCAG’s Objection to HCD’s Regional Housing Need Determination

Dear Mr. McCauley,

This letter represents the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)’s formal objection to HCD’s Regional Housing Need Determination as submitted to SCAG on August 22, 2019 and is made in accordance with Government Code Section 65584.01(c)(2)(A) and (B). At the outset, please know that SCAG is fully aware that the State of California is in the midst of a housing crisis and that resolving this crisis requires strong partnerships with state, regional and local entities in addition to private and non-profit sectors.

As such, SCAG desires to be an active and constructive partner with the State and HCD on solving our current housing crisis, and this objection should not suggest otherwise. We are in fact currently setting up a housing program that will assist our local jurisdictions on activities and policies that will lead to actual housing unit construction.

In the context of the 6th cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process, SCAG appreciates the collaboration with HCD as reflected in the numerous consultation sessions on the regional determination and other staff engagement on housing issues with the objective of making RHNA a meaningful step toward addressing our housing crisis.

As you are aware, HCD transmitted its Regional Housing Needs Determination of 1,344,740 units for the SCAG region last month. This number reflects the housing units that local jurisdictions in the region must plan for during the 8-year period from October 2021 to October 2029. At the September 5, 2019 meeting, SCAG Regional Council authorized staff to file an objection to HCD on regional housing need determination pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.01(c).
I would like to note that SCAG’s objection focuses on the process and adherence to state housing law requirements and not necessarily to the regional housing need determination number. The ultimate aim of this objection, as discussed at length by the Regional Council, is to ensure the most technically and legally credible basis for a regional determination so that the 197 local jurisdictions in the SCAG region can approach the difficult task of zoning to accommodate regional needs with the backing of the most robust and realistic target that is possible.

One of our major concerns is that HCD did not base its determination on SCAG’s RTP/SCS Growth Forecast, which was inconsistent with Government Code 65584.01(c)(2)(A). Another major concern is that pursuant to Government Code 65584.01(c) (2) (B), HCD’s determination of housing need in the SCAG region is not a reasonable application of the methodology and assumptions described in statute. Specifically, HCD compared household overcrowding and cost-burden rates in the SCAG region to national averages rather than to rates in comparable regions as statutorily required. These and two additional basis for objections are described in detail in the section below which also includes a deduction for household growth on tribal land and a concern that the vacancy rate standards used by HCD are not substantiated by data, analysis, or literature. In addition, the attached EXCEL worksheet and technical documentation contain SCAG’s alternative proposed 6th cycle RHNA determination, which would consist of a range of total housing unit need between 823,808 and 920,772.

BASIS FOR SCAG OBJECTION

Use of SCAG’s Population Forecast

HCD did not base its determination on SCAG’s RTP/SCS Growth Forecast, which was provided in the original consultation package and via follow-up email to HCD. Government Code 65584.01(a) indicates [emphasis added]:

“(a) The department’s determination shall be based upon population projections produced by the Department of Finance and regional population forecasts used in preparing regional transportation plans, in consultation with each council of governments. If the total regional population forecast for the projection year, developed by the council of governments and used for the preparation of the regional transportation plan, is within a range of 1.5 percent of the total regional population forecast for the projection year by the Department of Finance, then the population forecast developed by the council of governments shall be the basis from which the department determines the existing and projected need for housing in the region. If the difference between the total population projected by the council of governments and the total population projected for the region by the Department of Finance is greater than 1.5 percent, then the department and the council of governments shall meet to discuss variances in methodology used for population projections and seek agreement on a population projection for the region to be used as a basis for determining the existing and projected housing need for the region. If no agreement is reached, then the population projection for the region shall be the population projection for the region prepared by the Department of Finance as may be modified by the department as a result of discussions with the council of governments.”
SCAG projects total regional population to grow to 20,725,878 by October, 2029. SCAG’s projection differs from Department of Finance (DOF) projection of 20,689,591, which was issued by DOF in May, 2018, by 0.18%. The total population provided in HCD’s determination is 20,455,355, reflecting an updated DOF projection, differs from SCAG’s projection by 1.32%. As SCAG’s total projection is within the statutory tolerance of 1.5%, accordingly HCD is to use SCAG’s population forecast.

While HCD has emphasized that consistency in approach to the 6th cycle RHNA across regions is a priority, deference to the Council of Governments’ forecast as specified in statute is an important aspect of regional planning. Federal requirements for SCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan necessitate a forecast of population, households, and employment for evaluating future land use patterns and measuring future travel demand as well as air quality conformity under the federal Clean Air Act. In addition, under SB 375, the State requires SCAG to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy which is a coordination of transportation and land use in the regional planning process to achieve State’s climate goals. Both federal and State requirements are predicated on SCAG’s forecast of population, households and employment.

As a result, SCAG has a long-established and well-respected process for producing a balanced forecast of population, households, and employment for the region, the details of which can be found in each Regional Transportation Plan (e.g. http://scagrtpscs.net/Documents/2016/final/f2016RTPSCS_DemographicsGrowthForecast.pdf). SCAG’s quadrennial growth forecast begins with a consensus on appropriate assumptions of fertility, migration, immigration, household formation, and job growth by a panel of state and regional experts including members of DOF’s Demographic Research Unit. In addition, SCAG co-hosts an annual demographic workshop with the University of Southern California to keep state and regional experts and stakeholders appraised of demographic and economic trends (https://www.scag.ca.gov/calendar/Pages/DemographicWorkshop.aspx).

SCAG places a high priority on generating its own forecasts of population, households, and employment and ensuring the highest possible degree of consistency and integrity of its projections for transportation, land use, and housing planning purposes.

**Use of Comparable Regions**

Pursuant to Government Code 65584.01(c)(2)(B), HCD’s determination of housing need in the SCAG region is not a reasonable application of the methodology and assumptions described in statute. Specifically, HCD compared household overcrowding and cost-burden rates in the SCAG region to national averages rather than to rates in comparable regions as statutorily required.

SCAG’s initial consultation package provided an approach using comparable regions to evaluate household overcrowding. SCAG staff met with HCD staff in-person in both Los Angeles and Sacramento to discuss adjustment criteria and how to define a comparable region to Southern California, as our region’s size precludes a straightforward comparison. At the direction of HCD, SCAG staff refined its methodology for identifying comparable regions and provided a state-of-the-practice analysis supported by recent demographic and economic literature which determined
that the most appropriate comparison to the SCAG region would be an evaluation against the San Jose, New York, San Francisco, Miami, Seattle, Chicago, San Diego, Washington D.C., Houston, and Dallas metropolitan areas. Despite this collaboration on the subject between HCD and SCAG, HCD elected to reject this approach and instead used national average statistics, which include small metropolitan areas and rural areas having little in common with Southern California.

HCD’s choice to use national averages:

- Is inconsistent with the statutory language of SB 828, which added the comparable region standard to RHNA law in order to improve the technical robustness of measures of housing need.

- Is inconsistent with empirical data as economic and demographic characteristics differ dramatically based on regional size and context. For comparison, the median-sized metropolitan region in the country is Fargo, North Dakota with a population of 207,500. That is not a meaningful basis of comparison for the nation’s largest MPO.

- Is inconsistent with HCD’s own internal practice for the 6th cycle of RHNA. The regional need determination for the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), issued on July 18, 2019, was the first 6th cycle RHNA determination following SB 828’s inclusion of the comparable region standard. During their consultation process with HCD, SACOG also produced a robust technical analysis to identify comparable regions for the purposes of using overcrowding and cost-burden statistics to determine regional housing needs. However, HCD’s final determination for SACOG used this analysis while the SCAG region was held to a different and less reasonable standard.

**Improved Vacancy Rate Comparison**

HCD seemingly uses unrealistic comparison points to evaluate healthy market vacancy, which is also an unreasonable application of the methodology and assumptions described in statute. While SB 828 specifies a vacancy rate for a healthy rental housing market as no less than 5 percent, healthy market vacancy rates for for-sale housing are not specified. HCD’s practice is to compare actual, ACS vacancy rates for the region versus a 5 percent total vacancy rate (i.e. owner and renter markets combined).

During the consultation process, SCAG discussed this matter with HCD staff and provided several points of comparison including historical data, planning standards, and comparisons with other regions. In addition, SCAG staff illustrated that given tenure shares in the SCAG region, HCD’s suggestion of a 5 percent total vacancy rate is mathematically equivalent to an 8 percent rental market vacancy rate plus a 2.25 percent for-sale housing vacancy rate. However, in major metropolitan regions, vacancy rates this high are rarely experienced outside of severe economic recessions such as the recent, housing market-driven Great Recession. Given the region’s current housing shortage, the high volume of vacant units envisioned in HCD’s planning target would be rapidly absorbed, making it an unrealistic standard.
SCAG staff’s original suggestion of 5 percent rental vacancy and 1.5 percent for-sale vacancy (resulting in a 3.17 percent total vacancy rate based on current tenure shares) is in fact higher than the observed rate in the comparable regions defined above. It is also above Federal Housing Authority standards for regions experiencing slow or moderate population growth. It is also above the very liberal standard of 6 percent for for-rent housing and 2 percent for for-sale housing suggested by the California Office of Planning and Research (equivalent to 3.90 percent total vacancy based on SCAG tenure shares) which would also be a more reasonable application of the methodology.1

Additional Considerations

In addition to the three key points above, SCAG’s proposed alternative includes several other corrections to technical shortcomings in HCD’s analysis of regional housing needs.

1. HCD’s evaluation of replacement need is based on an arbitrary internal standard of 0.5 percent to 5.0 percent of total housing units. 2010-2019 demolition data provided by DOF suggest that over an 8.25-year period, it is reasonable to expect that 0.14 percent of the region’s total housing units will be demolished, but not replaced. This would form the basis of a more reasonable housing needs determination, as DOF’s survey represents the most comprehensive and robust data available.

2. Anticipated household growth on tribal land was not excluded from the regional determination as indicated in the consultation package and follow-up communications. Tribal entities within the SCAG region have repeatedly requested that this estimate be excluded from the RHNA process entirely since as sovereign nations, state law does not apply. SCAG’s proposed approach is to subtract estimates of household growth on tribal land from the regional determination and ensure that these figures are also excluded from local jurisdictions’ annual progress reports (APRs) of new unit construction to HCD during the 6th cycle.

3. A refinement to the adjustment for cost burden would yield a more reasonable determination of regional housing needs. SCAG has repeatedly emphasized the shortcomings of and overlap across various ACS-based measures of housing need. Furthermore, the relationship between new unit construction and cost burden is poorly understood (i.e., what will be the impact of new units on cost, and by extension, cost-burden). Nonetheless, SCAG recognizes that the region’s cost burden exceeds that of comparable regions and proposes one modification to HCD’s methodology, which currently considers cost burden separately by lower and higher income categories.

While housing security is dependent on income, it is also heavily dependent on tenure. While spending above 30 percent of gross income on housing for renters can reflect true housing insecurity, spending above this threshold for owners is substantially less problematic. This is particularly true for higher income homeowners, who generally benefit from housing shortages as it results in home value appreciation. Thus, a more reasonable application of cost burden

---

statistics would exclude cost-burden experienced by moderate and above-moderate owner households and instead make an adjustment based on three of the four income and tenure combinations: lower-income renters, higher-income renters, and lower-income owners.

4. From our review, HCD’s data and use of data is not current. In large metropolitan regions, there is no reasonable basis for using 5-year ACS data, which reflects average conditions from 2013 to 2017. For cost-burden adjustments, HCD relies on 2011-2015 CHAS data. By the beginning of the 6th cycle of RHNA, some of the social conditions upon which the determination is based will be eight years old.

During the consultation process, SCAG staff provided HCD with Excel-version data of all inputs needed to replicate their methodology using ACS 2017 1-year data (the most recent available); however, this was not used. The Census bureau is scheduled to release ACS 2018 1-year data on September 26, 2019. SCAG staff would support replicating the same analysis, but substituting 2018 data when it becomes available in order to ensure the most accurate estimates in planning for the region’s future.

Finally, given that the manner and order in which modifications are made affects the total housing need, the attachments demonstrate two alternatives with varying interpretations of three of the above points (see boldface, red text in attachments):
- Vacancy rate comparison – SCAG’s originally proposed values versus an alternative which emerged from the consultation process
- Replacement need – DOF survey value versus HCD’s current practice
- Cost burden measure – whether or not to include higher-income homeowners in this adjustment

We appreciate your careful consideration of this objection. RHNA is a complex process and we recognize the difficult positions that both SCAG and HCD are in but are hopeful that our agencies can reach a reasonable conclusion with respect to the regional need determination. Please contact me if you have questions. I look forward to continuing our close partnership to address the housing crisis in our state.

Sincerely,

Kome Ajise
Executive Director

Attachments
1. SCAG Alternative Determination
2. Excel version: SCAG Alternative Determination and supporting data
3. HCD Letter on Regional Need Determination, August 22, 2019
### Attachment 1
**SCAG Alternative Determination**

1. **OPTION A: SCAG region housing needs, June 30 2021-October 1 2029 (8.25 Years)**

2. **Population: Oct 1, 2029 (SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS Forecast)**
   - 20,725,878

3. **- Less Group Quarters Population (SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS Forecast)**
   - -327,879

4. **Household (HH) Population, Oct 1, 2029**
   - 20,397,998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Formation Groups</th>
<th>SCAG Projected HH Population</th>
<th>Headship rate - see Table 2</th>
<th>Projected Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 15 years</td>
<td>3,812,391</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,668,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24 years</td>
<td>2,642,548</td>
<td>147,005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 years</td>
<td>2,847,526</td>
<td>864,349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 years</td>
<td>2,821,442</td>
<td>1,304,658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 years</td>
<td>2,450,776</td>
<td>1,243,288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64 years</td>
<td>2,182,421</td>
<td>1,116,479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 years</td>
<td>1,883,181</td>
<td>1,015,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 84 years</td>
<td>1,167,232</td>
<td>637,415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>590,480</td>
<td>339,727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Projected Households (Occupied Unit Stock)**
   - 6,668,498

6. **Tenure Share (ACS 2017 1-year)**
   - Owner: 52.43% Renter: 47.57%

7. **Households by Tenure**
   - 3,496,058 Owner, 3,172,440 Renter

8. **Healthy Market Vacancy Standard**
   - 1.50% Owner, 5.00% Renter

9. **SCAG Vacancy (ACS 2017 1-year)**
   - 1.13% Owner, 3.30% Renter

10. **Difference**
    - 0.37% Owner, 1.70% Renter

11. **Vacancy Adjustment**
    - 12,953 Owner, 53,815 Renter, 66,768 in total

12. **Overcrowding (Comparison Point vs. Region ACS %)**
    - 5.20% Owner, 9.82% Renter, 4.62% in total

13. **Replacement Adj (Actual DOF Demolitions)***
    - 0.14% Owner, 9.335 in total

14. **Household Growth on Tribal Land (SCAG Estimate)**
    - -2,766

15. **Occupied Units (HHs) estimated June 30, 2021 (from DOF data)**
    - -6,250,261

16. **Cost-burden Adjustment (Comparison Point vs. Region)**
    - 23,969

17. **6th Cycle Regional Housing Need Assessment (RHNA)**
    - 823,808
### OPTION B: SCAG region housing needs, June 30 2021-October 1 2029 (8.25 Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population: Oct 1, 2029 (SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS Forecast)</th>
<th>20,725,878</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Less Group Quarters Population (SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS Forecast)</td>
<td>-327,879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Household (HH) Population, Oct 1, 2029 | 20,397,998 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Formation Groups</th>
<th>SCAG Projected HH Population</th>
<th>Headship rate - see Table 2</th>
<th>Projected Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 15 years</td>
<td>3,812,391</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,668,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 24 years</td>
<td>2,642,548</td>
<td>147,005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 34 years</td>
<td>2,847,526</td>
<td>864,349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44 years</td>
<td>2,821,442</td>
<td>1,304,658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 54 years</td>
<td>2,450,776</td>
<td>1,243,288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 64 years</td>
<td>2,182,421</td>
<td>1,116,479</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - 74 years</td>
<td>1,883,181</td>
<td>1,015,576</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 - 84 years</td>
<td>1,167,232</td>
<td>637,415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>590,480</td>
<td>339,727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Projected Households (Occupied Unit Stock) | 6,668,498 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+ Vacancy</th>
<th></th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Renter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Share (ACS 2017 1-year)</td>
<td>52.43%</td>
<td>47.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households by Tenure</td>
<td>3,496,058</td>
<td>3,172,440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Market Vacancy Standard</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG Vacancy (ACS 2017 1-year)</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
<td>3.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Adjustment</td>
<td>30,433</td>
<td>115,973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| + Overcrowding (Comparison Point vs. Region ACS %) | 5.20% | 9.82% | 4.62% | 308,264 |
| + Replacement Adj (HCD minimum standard) | 0.50% | 33,340 |

| - Households Growth on Tribal Land (SCAG Estimate) | -2,766 |

| - Occupied Units (HHs) estimated June 30, 2021 (from DOF data) | -6,250,261 |

| + Cost-burden Adjustment (Comparison Point vs. Region) | 47,724 |

| 6th Cycle Regional Housing Need Assessment (RHNA) | 920,772 |
Cost Burden Adjustment: A cost-burden adjustment is applied to the projected need by comparing the difference in cost-burden by income and tenure group for the region to the cost-burden by income and tenure group for comparable regions.

Vacancy Adjustment: Pursuant to Government Code 65584.01, a 5% minimum is considered to be healthy market vacancy in the for-rent housing market. Vacancy rates in the for-sale market are unspecified in statute. SCAG's analysis of vacancy rates suggests a healthy market standard of 5% for for-rent housing and 1.5% for for-sale housing. After extensive consultation with HCD, a review of historical trends, regional and national comparison, and various planning standards, a more liberal vacancy standard of 6% for for-rent housing and 2% for for-sale housing may also be supported by this analysis. These standards are compared against ACS 2017 1-year data based on the renter/owner share in the SCAG region.

Overcrowding Adjustment: In regions where overcrowding is greater than the Comparable Region Rate, an adjustment is applied based on the amount the region's overcrowding rate (9.82%) exceeds the Comparable Region Rate (5.20%). Data is from 2017 1-year ACS.

Replacement Adjustment: A replacement adjustment is applied based on the current 10-year average % of demolitions according to local government annual reports to Department of Finance. While these data suggest an adjustment of 0.14% is most appropriate, SCAG recognizes that HCD's internal practice is to use an adjustment factor of 0.5%.

Occupied Units: Reflects DOF's estimate of occupied units at the start of the projection period (June 30, 2021).
### Option A: Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) Determination

**SCAG Region**  
**June 30, 2021 through October 1, 2029**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Housing Unit Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very-Low *</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>212,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>124,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>140,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Moderate</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>346,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>823,808</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Extremely-Low 14.6% included in Very-Low Category

### Income Distribution: Income categories are prescribed by California Health and Safety Code (Section 50093, et.seq.). Percents are derived based on ACS reported household income brackets and county median income, then adjusted based on the percent of cost-burdened households in the region compared with the percent of cost burdened households nationally.

### Option B: Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) Determination

**SCAG Region**  
**June 30, 2021 through October 1, 2029**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Housing Unit Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very-Low *</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>231,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>135,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>159,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Moderate</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>394,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>920,772</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Extremely-Low 14.6% included in Very-Low Category
DATE: October 10, 2019
TO: Westside Cities Council of Governments Board
FROM: Westside Cities Council of Governments Staff
SUBJECT: Housing and Homelessness-Related Funding Sources

SB 2 Planning Grants and Technical Assistance
Earlier this year, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) released a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for local agencies to apply for grants from the Building Homes and Jobs Fund (SB 2, Chapter 364, Statutes of 2017). These grants are intended to provide funding and technical assistance (TA) to local governments and help cities and counties prepare, adopt, and implement plans and process improvements that streamline housing approvals and accelerate housing production. Funding will help cities and counties:

- Accelerate housing production
- Streamline the approval of housing development affordable to owner and renter households at all income levels
- Facilitate housing affordability, particularly for lower- and moderate-income households
- Promote development consistent with the State Planning Priorities
- Ensure geographic equity in the distribution and expenditure of the funds

Eligible activities may include:

- Updates to general plans, community plans, specific plans, local planning related to implementation of sustainable communities strategies, or local coastal plans.
- Updates to zoning ordinances.
- Environmental analyses that eliminate the need for project-specific review.
- Local process improvements that expedite local planning and permitting.

The grant application filing period is now open and goes through November 30, 2019. The grant performance period will extend to June 30, 2022.

Technical Assistance
A consultant team led by PlaceWorks has been contracted by HCD to provide TA to jurisdictions applying for the SB2 planning grants throughout the application period. This is a great opportunity as the technical assistance (TA) is no cost to the cities and will be hands-on. TA will include a wide array of support including the following:

1. Applicant assistance is specific to helping local governments obtain a planning grant through the SB 2 Planning Grants program. Assistance includes:
   - Identifying eligible activities and brainstorming ideas on how to best utilize the Planning Grants program
   - Answering questions
• Reviewing draft applications and providing feedback before they are officially submitted to HCD
• Housing element compliance for jurisdictions that do not have a compliant housing element
• Jurisdictions who need additional assistance in submitting their 2017 or 2018 Annual progress reports
• Sample applications
• Scopes of work and RFPs

2. Ongoing regionally tailored technical assistance includes a menu of services and tools that are available to all local governments and can be customized to serve the unique needs of the different regions throughout the state. Tools and resources include:
   • Toolkits on the priority policy areas
   • Samples, best practices, and model ordinances
   • Webinars and workshops
   • Peer-to-peer learning collaboratives

The TA contacts for the Los Angeles region are listed below:

• Jonathan Nettler: jnettler@placeworks.com
• Colin Drukker: cdrukker@placeworks.com

Local Government Planning Support Grants Program (AB 101)
Signed by Governor Newsom in July 2019, AB 101 makes available $250 million split between cities and counties, and regional agencies for planning activities to accelerate housing production and facilitate implementation of Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). These dollars may be used for:

• Rezoning and updating planning documents;
• Completing environmental clearance to eliminate need for project-specific review;
• Infrastructure planning; and
• Developing or improving accessory dwelling unit ordinance.

$125 million in one-time funding is available for regional agencies that administer the RHNA. The other $125 million made available to cities and counties will be based upon the following population-based formula shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction Population</th>
<th>Grants Available (in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 750K</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 300K</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 100K and 299K</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 60K and 99K</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 20K and 59K</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 19K</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCAG is expected to be eligible for up to $50 million of these dollars to administer the RHNA and provide other planning services to local cities and counties. SCAG will be developing an application package to HCD and apply for these funds. HCD is anticipated to produce guidelines for the application process to position SCAG to apply for funding in Spring 2020. Pending HCD approval, the proposed programs and grant resources would be incorporated into SCAG’s
Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Overall Work Program. SCAG will develop an application process for the region’s cities and counties to begin applying for funding in early 2021.

**Homelessness Funding and Programs (AB 101)**

AB 101 makes $650 million available for one-time grants to cities, counties, and continuums of care to support regional coordination, expand or develop local capacity, and address immediate homelessness challenges. All awards will be based on the applicant’s proportionate share of the state’s total homeless population.

- $275 million will be available to cities or a city and county that has a population of more than 300,000
- $175 million will be available to counties
- $190 million will be available to continuums of care

**County of Los Angeles - Innovation Fund for Local Cities Combatting Homelessness**

On September 10, 2019, the County Board of Supervisors approved the Innovation Fund for Local Cities Combatting Homelessness (refer to Attachment A), which directs the Chief Executive Office (CEO) to develop a framework to provide $6 million in available Measure H carryover funds from FY 2018-19 to the COGs to serve as an intermediary to distribute the funds to the cities. According to the County Homeless Initiative team, the funding allocation per COG may be determined by the 2019 homeless count.

This fund is intended to support cities and the COG in activities that align with the County’s Homeless Initiative Action Plan and are consistent with Priority Area 1 and Priority Area 2 from the previous Request for Proposal (RFP) to support implementation of the cities’ homelessness plans:

- Priority Area 1: to increase the supply of supportive and interim housing for people experiencing homelessness
- Priority Area 2: to enhance the effectiveness of the County service systems for those experiencing and/or at-risk of homelessness.

The COGs are currently working closely with the County Homeless Initiative team to draft the framework for the use of the funds for the County Board to consider in late October.
INNOVATION FUND FOR LOCAL CITIES COMBATTING HOMELESSNESS

Homelessness is a regional crisis, and one of the top priorities of the Board of Supervisors is to continue strengthening the collaboration between the County and diverse stakeholders, including the 88 cities in this region. Cities have an important role and a unique perspective on the solutions to homelessness, and the County values each city’s distinct perspectives, resources and challenges.

In November 2017, interested cities were awarded planning grants to develop city-specific plans to prevent and combat homelessness, through an initiative created by L.A. County and United Way of Greater Los Angeles’ Home for Good Funders Collaborative and financed by an allocation of more than $2 million from the County Board of Supervisors. 41 cities developed homelessness plans, demonstrating a high level of engagement from stakeholders across the region.

In September 2018, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors approved $9 million in Measure H funding to bolster the work of cities in implementing these plans. The funds were committed to support implementation of the plans in two Priority Areas: Priority Area 1 focused on increasing the supply of permanent and interim housing for people experiencing homelessness and Priority Area 2 focused on enhancing County service systems for those experiencing and/or at-risk of homelessness.
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Through an RFP solicitation process, $8.2 million in funding was awarded to support 34 city proposals covering 31 cities. 19 proposals were funded under Priority Area 1, including projects focused on feasibility studies for motel conversions, motel vouchers, modular housing, Accessory Dwelling Units, inclusionary zoning and property acquisition for interim and permanent housing. 15 proposals were funded under Priority Area 2, including projects focused on case managers, housing navigators, and homeless coordinators, as well as safe storage and shower services and social enterprise/employment training programs.

Although this process resulted in a high level of engagement from cities, the process presented challenges for smaller cities that lack the capacity and infrastructure to pursue complex grant processes. The rigorous review, resubmission and contracting processes that structured the city grant process may have discouraged some of the nine cities who completed homelessness plans but did not submit proposals.

Homelessness is a complex humanitarian crisis that will take truly innovative solutions to combat. Cities who have an interest in incubating and implementing novel approaches to providing housing and supportive services to those in need should receive support from the unprecedented level of funding currently committed to the cause of addressing homelessness in LA County.

The County and local cities share the same goal: to end homelessness for the most vulnerable in our region and to enhance public safety and health for all. However, the strategies that work to address homelessness from a large, regional perspective are not necessarily the same strategies that work to address homelessness in smaller jurisdictions.

Given the demonstrated level of engagement by cities through the city homelessness planning process, it is imperative that the County continue to strengthen its partnerships with cities to combat this complex humanitarian crisis.

**WE, THEREFORE MOVE** that the Board of Supervisors:

Direct the CEO to report back to the Board in 45 days with a framework to provide $6 million in available Measure H carryover funds from FY 2018-19 to Councils of Government to support activities that (a) align with the Board-approved, Homeless Initiative Action Plan to Prevent and Combat Homelessness (b) are consistent with Priority Areas 1 and 2 outlined in the recent RFP to support implementation of the city homelessness plans.

# # #
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DATE: October 10, 2019
TO: Westside Cities Council of Governments Board
FROM: Westside Cities Council of Governments Staff
SUBJECT: Report from WSCCOG Regional Homelessness Strategic Plan Ad Hoc Committee

Background
The Regional Homelessness Strategy Plan Ad Hoc Committee (Ad Hoc Committee) is tasked with guiding a strategic planning process to develop the WSCCOG Homelessness Strategic Action Plan (Plan). This plan differs from previous individual efforts and homelessness studies by proposing to build a blueprint to address homelessness from a regional perspective through increased data coordination, regional assessment of needs, and leveraging of local, County, and state funding opportunities. The Plan will include regional homelessness data, an assessment of housing and supportive service needs, prioritization of key strategies, identification of public owned land for new development opportunities, and a funding plan to incorporate new state and federal resources.

Ad Hoc Committee Members
The Ad Hoc Committee members consist of members of the WSCCOG Homelessness Working Group, County Homeless Initiative Team, and Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority (LAHSA). The Ad Hoc Committee also invites staff from various city departments, public agencies, and local community partners to share information specific to the meeting’s topic and discuss how to effectively align our strategies and activities together.

Ad Hoc Committee Study Sessions
Since August 2019, the Ad Hoc Committee meets twice a month to guide the development of the Plan by discussion various topics relevant to homelessness. Below is a list of topics scheduled for the Ad Hoc Committee’s study sessions between August and November:

- August
  - Kick-off meeting
  - Topic #1: Data
- September
  - Topic #2: Outreach Services
  - Topic #3: Prevention services
- October
  - Topic #4: Housing
  - Topic #5: Behavioral Health
- November
  - Topic #6: Public Health/Public Safety
Topic #1: Data

Purpose of the Meeting
Identify who is homeless in the Westside region and understand how data is shared and collected.

Guest Speaker/Presentation
• Michael Ludwig, LAHSA Data and Research Department
• Steven Rocha, LAHSA HMIS Unit

Topic #2: Outreach Services

Purpose of the Meeting:
Identify the current gaps and needs of the current outreach services in our region.

Guest Speaker/Presentation
• LaCheryl Porter, Chief Operating Officer/Acting President & CEO, St. Joseph Center
• Dawan Moses, Director of Outreach, St. Joseph Center
• Jasmine Lucas, Program Manager E6 Outreach, St. Joseph Center

Topic #3: Prevention Services

Purpose of the Meeting:
Learn about existing programs and effective strategies that prevent homelessness and how our subregion can participate and/or replicate, such as rapid rehousing, workforce development, and diversion.

Guest Speaker/Presentation
• Elizabeth Macias, LA:RISE Program Director, Los Angeles City Economic and Workforce Development Department
• Charisse Mercado, Rapid Rehousing Coordinator, LAHSA
• Alex Devin, Problem-Solving Manager, LAHSA

Overarching Themes and Policy Considerations
Based on our meetings, the overarching themes and potential policy considerations are listed below. The policy considerations will be further refined for the strategic plan with each key action steps throughout the Ad Hoc Committee’s study sessions.

1. Data
   A. Increase data sharing and standardize data collection across the subregion.

2. Leveraging Resources
   A. Align subregional resources to address gap in public resources, such as Measure H.

3. Workforce Development
   A. Encourage local employers in the subregion to hire formerly incarcerated and homeless individuals.
4. Outreach Services Profession
   A. Support the recruitment and training of outreach workers to meet demand.
   B. Support the retention of outreach workers with extensive field experience in the subregion.

5. Communication Strategy
   A. Standardize a regional communication strategy to inform the progress and updates of outreach and other efforts to prevent and combat homelessness.
   B. Develop standards for referrals and other forms to streamline the engagement process across the subregion.

6. Consistent Training
   A. Encourage cities to enroll in training programs offered by the County, such as LAHSA, Department of Health Services, and others, to promote standardized procedures and best practices.
DATE: October 10, 2019
TO: Westside Cities Council of Governments Board
FROM: Westside Cities Council of Governments Staff
SUBJECT: State Legislation Update

The State Legislature concluded its first year of its two-year session on September 13, 2019. The Governor has until October 13, 2019 to sign or veto any bill passed by the Legislature. Councilmember Kevin McKeown (City of Santa Monica) who serves as theWSCCOG’s representative on the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission (SMBC) shared with the WSCCOG an update on AB 1511 (Bloom), which may potentially result in a renegotiation of SMBC’s memorandum of understanding and impact WSCCOG’s seat on the commission, has been vetoed by the Governor on September 27th (refer to Attachment A). Additionally, SCAG (refer to Attachment B) and the League of California Cities (refer to Attachment C) have shared with the WSCCOG their summary of the first half of the session.

The Legislature is scheduled to return to Sacramento on January 6, 2020 for the second half the session. Bills that did not advance in the Legislature during 2019 may be taken up again in 2020. WSCCOG will continue to monitor these 2-year bills along with new legislation proposed by state lawmakers related to issues relevant to the WSCCOG’s legislative platform. WSCCOG staff will also continue to work with the Westside cities to track and compile their cities’ legislative bill positions to discuss at future WSCCOG board meetings.
SEP 27 2019

To the Members of the California State Assembly:

I am returning Assembly Bill 1511 without my signature.

This bill transfers responsibility for the administrative services for the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission from the State Water Resources Control Board to the State Coastal Conservancy.

I appreciate the efficiencies gained by linking the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission to the State Coastal Conservancy. However, the State Water Resources Control Board is better equipped with both staff and resources to provide administrative services to the Commission. Additionally, this bill would require the Commission to expand their authority to include water supply and broaden the water quality authority. It is not clear that the Commission has the appropriate expertise to fulfill this direction.

Sincerely,

Gavin Newsom
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The California Legislature adjourned on September 13, 2019, concluding the first year of its two-year 2019-20 session. The September 13 date also marked the deadline for bills to be passed by the Legislature and sent to Governor Newsom. The Governor has until October 13, 2019 to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature. From immunization exemptions to independent contractors, Sacramento was awash with major issues impacting the lives of Californians. The following report provides background on some of these issues.

BACKGROUND:
The Legislature first convened for the 2019-20 session on December 3, 2018, when new members were sworn in and Senate and Assembly desks were opened for bill introductions. The Legislature reconvened on January 7, 2019, which marked the start of official business for the 2019-20 session, as well as the start of Gavin Newsom’s term as Governor. Since the start of session, more than 3,000 bills and resolutions were introduced.

The Legislature concluded the first year of its two-year session on September 13, 2019. The Governor has until October 13, 2019 to sign or veto any bill passed by the Legislature. The Legislature is scheduled to return to Sacramento for the second half of its two-year session on January 6, 2020. Bills that did not advance in the Legislature during 2019 may be taken up again in 2020 (referred to as two-year bills).

This report includes updates on housing-related budget bills, which have been the primary focus of SCAG legislation department toward the end of this year’s legislative session. In addition, a brief update on major Assembly Bills (AB) and Senate Bills (SB) is highlighted below. While the subject matter of many of the late, major bills is outside the scope of SCAG’s legislative platform, they highlight the issues of importance to the state legislature.
**Housing-Related Budget Bills:**

**AB 101 – Housing Trailer Bill** – AB 101 is the comprehensive budget trailer bill dealing with housing production and homeless initiatives. The measure funds the newly created Local Government Planning Support Grants program, which provides one-time funding of $250 million split between cities and counties, and regional agencies to help update planning documents. The $125 million to cities and counties will be based upon the following population-based formula:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction Population</th>
<th>Grants Available (in thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 750K</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 300K</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 100K and 299K</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 60K and 99K</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 20K and 59K</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 19K</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$125 million in one-time funding for regional agencies is provided for councils of governments that administer the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The legislation also details judicial remedies for jurisdictions not in compliance with state housing law, specifically through fees and other penalties. Governor Newsom signed AB 101 on July 31, 2019.

**SB 113 – Housing Clean-Up Technical Language** – SB 113 is referred to as a “clean-up” bill, meaning that it clarifies some of the provisions of the housing trailer bill described above. Specifically, AB 113 adds the Council of San Benito County Governments to the list of eligible COGs in the central coast multiagency working group identified in the Local Government Planning Support Grants program. This measure also specifies that COGs are allowed to apply for a portion of the Local Government Planning Support Grants Program to assist with putting together an application for the remainder of the funds for which they are eligible. The Governor is expected to sign this measure.

**Major Legislation from the 2019 Session**

**AB 5 (Gonzalez, D-San Diego)** – AB 5 codifies the decision by the California Supreme Court in Dynamex Operations West, Inc. vs. Superior Court of Los Angeles, which established a three-prong test for determining whether a worker is an independent contractor or an employee. Negotiations on what professions would receive exemptions from the three-prong test dominated the debate on this bill. Governor Newsom signed AB 5 into law on September 18, 2019 and the measure will take effect on January 1, 2020.

**AB 74 (Ting, D-San Francisco)** – AB 74 is the Budget Act for Fiscal Year 2019-2020. The measure totals $214.8 billion. AB 74 also details the expenditure plan for cap-and-trade funding, amounting to almost $1.5 billion. Cap-and-trade expenditures fund programs dealing with greenhouse gases,
clean vehicles and buses, and other programs. AB 74 was approved by the Governor on June 27, 2019.

**AB 235 (Mayes, R-Yucca Valley)** – AB 235 would have assisted the Pacific Gas and Electric Company in paying off up to $20 billion dollars in wildfire claims stemming from a series of devastating fires that occurred in 2017 and 2018. Although the measure had made progress in the Legislature, Assemblymember Mayes announced on September 6, 2019 that AB 235 would be a two-year bill, meaning that it would no longer be considered this year, but could be reconsidered in 2020.

**AB 392 (Weber, D-San Diego) / SB 230 (Caballero, D-Salinas)** – Both AB 392 and SB 230 are measures that address police use-of-force. These bills were considered competing measures, but a compromise was reached during a Senate Public Safety Committee hearing that made passage of SB 230 contingent upon passage of AB 392. AB 392 passed the Assembly (Y:68; N:0; NVR:12) and Senate (Y:34; N:3; NVR:3), and was approved by Governor Newsom on August 19, 2019. SB 230 passed the Assembly (Y:79; N:0; NVR:0) and Senate (Y:39 N:0 NVR:0), and was approved by Governor Newsom on September 12, 2019. These measures will take effect on January 1, 2020.

**AB 1482 (Chiu, D-San Francisco)** – AB 1482 would impose a rent cap of 5 percent per year plus inflation on rent increases in certain apartments statewide through 2030. This measure passed the Senate (Y:25; N:10; NVR:5) on September 10, 2019 and the Assembly (Y:48; N:26, NVR:5) on September 11, 2019. The Governor is expected to sign AB 1482.

**SB 1 (Atkins, D-San Diego)** – SB 1 would have enacted the California Environmental, Public Health, and Workers Defense Act of 2019 with the purpose of ensuring that protections afforded to Californians under federal environmental and labor laws and regulations as of January 2017, remain in place in the event that President Trump weakens or repeals any of those federal laws or regulations. This measure passed the Assembly (Y:48, N:22, NVR:9) on September 13, 2019 and passed the Senate (Y:26, N:14, NVR:0) on September 14, 2019. Governor Newsom indicated that he will veto SB 1, though he has not done so yet.

**SB 276 / SB 714 (Pan, D-Sacramento)** – SB 276 would alter the process on how immunization exemptions are granted to children attending school. This measure passed the Assembly (Y:48; N:18; NVR:13) and Senate (Y:28; N:11; NVR:1). Late amendments requested by the Governor on this issue led to a gut-and-amend on SB 714, which passed the Assembly (Y:43; N:14; NVR:12) and Senate (Y:27; N:11; NVR:2). The Governor signed both of these measures on September 9, 2019.
TO: Westside Cities COG Board Members
FROM: Jeff Kiernan, Regional Public Affairs Manager, League of California Cities®
RE: League Update for COG Meeting on October 10, 2019 (prepared 10/3/2019)

--

**Local Issues / Legal Update**

**Cannabis:** Last week, the House passed H.R. 1595 (Perlmutter), the SAFE Banking Act, with a vote of 321 to 103. This bill would give banks “safe harbor” for providing the cannabis industry with access to banking and other financial services. The bill is awaiting action in the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs.

Here in CA, the League continues to await a trial date over the lawsuit with the Bureau of Cannabis Control’s regulations that require cities to allow delivery in violation of Prop 64. We are hopeful that the Court will select a date by the end of the year.

**Small Cells / FCC:** The League of CA Cities is part of a coalition that includes, the National League of Cities and many cities around the country that are challenging the FCCs regulations restricting government fees, leases, & permitting review of small cell wireless infrastructure in the 9th Circuit. The League is also reviewing options challenging the FCC’s preemption actions related to cable franchising which would include expanding the wireless telecom preemptions (i.e. leases, fees & permitting) to cable providers’ small cell infrastructure.

The League continues to support S. 2012 (Feinstein) & H.R. 530 (Eshoo) that would repeal the FCC’s 2018 action and oppose S. 3157 (Thune), the STREAMLINE Act, which would codify these regulations in legislation. None of these bills appear poised to move anytime soon.

**State Legislation**

This year, the League submitted 17 requests for signatures and 16 requests for vetoes. As of 10/2 the Governor had signed 9 of the bills we were requesting action on. The Governor has until October 13 to sign or veto the remaining bills.

**LEAGUE SUPPORTED BILLS – SIGNED by the Governor**

Clarifies that a candidate running for office is authorized to use campaign funds to pay for childcare expenses.

**AB 836** (Wicks) Wildfire Smoke Clean Air Centers.
Establishes the Wildfire Smoke Clean Air Centers for Vulnerable Populations Incentive Pilot Program. This grant program seeks to create a network of clean air centers by providing funding to public facilities for smoke-protective filtration systems.

**AB 1079** (Santiago). Telecommunications. Privacy Protections.
Authorizes public safety agencies to test the systems that respond to 911 calls or communicate threats to life or property on unpublished or unlisted telephone numbers without first obtaining the subscriber's express consent.

**AB 1637** (Smith) Unclaimed Property Law.
Authorizes the State Controller to automatically allocate to a state or local agency, without the requirement for an agency to file a claim, any unclaimed property in that agency’s name received as part of the Controller’s unclaimed property database.

**SB 209** (Dodd) Office of Emergency Services. Wildfire Forecast and Threat Intelligence Integration
Establishes the Wildfire Forecast and Threat Intelligence Integration Center to serve as the State’s integrated central organizing hub for wildfire forecasting, weather information, and threat intelligence gathering.

Requires law enforcement agencies to maintain a use of force policy. Requires each agency to make its use of force policy accessible to the public. Standardizes use of force training and education for officers across California through both coursework and uniform minimum guidelines on use of force, as developed by the Commission on POST.

Requires telecommunications service providers to submit a specified outage notification to the Office of Emergency Services (OES) when a telecommunications outage impacting 911 service and emergency notifications occurs. The Office of Emergency Services is then responsible for notifying the appropriate county offices of emergency services, public safety answering points (PSAPs), and sheriffs for areas affected by an outage.

**LEAGUE OPPOSED BILLS – Signed by the Governor**

Prohibits the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) and the California State Teachers' Retirement System (CalSTRS) from investing in an investment vehicle issued or owned by the government of Turkey, if the federal government of the United States (U.S.) imposes sanctions on the government of Turkey for failing to officially acknowledge its responsibility for the Armenian Genocide, among other provisions.

**SB 542** (Stern) Workers’ Compensation.
Creates a new presumption of industrial causation for all mental health conditions or mental disabilities that result in a diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder, or mental health disorder that develops or manifests itself during a period when a firefighter or peace officer is in service of the department.

**SIGNATURE REQUESTED - No Action by the Governor (as of 10/2/2019)**

**AB 344** (Calderon) New Beginnings California Program.
Establishes the New Beginnings California Program, which will provide annual matching funds to up to 50 cities, counties, or local continuum of care programs to expand or continue employment programs for homeless individuals.

**AB 1110** (Friedman) Rent Increases. Noticing.
Lengthens the notification time requirement a tenant must receive before the effective date of specified rent increases.

Requires a state agency that is responsible for infrastructure projects to produce a list of priority infrastructure projects for funding consideration by the boards of the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS), California State Teachers' Retirement System (CalSTRS) and the boards of investment and retirement for 1937 Act county retirement systems (CERL), respectively, and the state agency to provide further project information to the board upon request.

***SB 5** (Beall, McGuire, Portantino) Affordable Housing and Community Development Investment Program.
Establishes a new, local-State partnership to provide up to $2 billion annually to fund State approved
affordable housing, infrastructure, and economic development projects that also support State policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, expand transit oriented development (TOD), address poverty, and revitalize neighborhoods.

**SB 137** (Dodd) Federal Transportation Funds. State Exchange Programs.
Authorizes Caltrans to expand the existing Match-Exchange Program to regions with populations greater than 200,000 that would allow the department to swap its funds with federal funds local agencies receive for transportation projects, for purposes of reducing duplicative federal environmental review requirements.

Grants general law cities the ability to adopt two majority-winner voting methods for local elections: top-two primary and ranked choice voting.

Prohibits landlords from discriminating against tenants who rely upon housing assistance paid directly to landlords, such as a Section 8 voucher, to help them pay the rent.

*SB 344* (McGuire) UUT Prepaid Mobile Telephony Collection.
This measure grants a one-year extension of a sunset date to the Local Prepaid Mobile Telephony Services Collection Act (Local Prepaid MTS) until January 1, 2021, to ensure the affected local agencies can continue to implement this law and collect revenue needed for local services.

*SB 531* (Glazer) Local Agencies. Retailers.
Prohibits future sales tax agreements between local agencies and retailers with a warehouse, sales office, or fulfillment center that results in a shift of sales taxes from other jurisdictions.

Requires telecommunications service providers to submit a specified outage notification to the Office of Emergency Services (OES) when a telecommunications outage impacting 911 service and emergency notifications occurs. The Office of Emergency Services is then responsible for notifying the appropriate county offices of emergency services, public safety answering points (PSAPs), and sheriffs for areas affected by an outage.

**SB 681** (Stern) Local Referenda and Charter Amendments. Withdrawal.
Provides local jurisdictions with the ability to withdraw referenda or charter amendments up to 88 days prior to an election.

**VETO REQUESTED - No Action by the Governor (as of 10/2/2019)**

**AB 68** (Ting) Land Use. Accessory Dwelling Units.
Significantly amends the statewide standards that apply to locally-adopted ordinances concerning accessory dwelling units (ADUs). Changes include: prohibits minimum lot size requirements; requires at least 850 sq.ft. per ADU; and requires approval within 60 days.

**AB 171** (Gonzalez) Employment. Sexual harassment.
Creates another pathway for costly litigation against employers for issues that are already protected under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) by adding sexual harassment retaliation protections to the Labor Code.

*Governor Action: Pending*

**AB 314** (Bonta) Public employees. Labor relations. Release time.
Creates a uniform and expanded standard of time off without loss of compensation for public employees to engage in activities related to employer-employee relations, also known as “release time.”
Imposes an extensive and onerous list of conditions that would overly restrict a local agency from offering economic incentives (with their own funds) to locate a warehouse.

**AB 881** (Bloom) Accessory Dwelling Units.  
Prohibits a local jurisdiction from requiring a property owner live in the main house or one of the accessory structures. Requires local agencies to ministerially approve ADUs on lots with residential or mixed-use zones. Adds a definition of "public transit" to mean a location, including, but not limited to, a bus stop or train station, where the public may access buses, trains, subways, and other forms of transportation that charge set fares, run on fixed routes, and are available to the public.

**AB 931** (Boerner Horvath) Local Boards and Commissions. Representation. Appointments.  
Prohibits cities, with populations over 50,000, from having nonelected local boards and commissions comprised of more than 60 percent of the same gender identity beginning January 1, 2030.

Requires all public agencies to store all public records transmitted electronically for at least two years. Additionally, prohibits local agencies from filing a state mandate claim because the bill states that it furthers the California Public Records Act (CPRA).

**AB 1297** (McCarty) Firearms. Concealed Carry License.  
Requires, rather than authorizes, a local licensing authority to charge a fee that is equal to the reasonable costs associated with processing a concealed carry weapon (CCW) license application, issuing a CCW license, and enforcing the license. The bill would also remove the current prohibition on charging more than $100 for the fee.

Prohibits the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) and the California State Teachers' Retirement System (CalSTRS) from investing in an investment vehicle issued or owned by the government of Turkey, if the federal government of the United States (U.S.) imposes sanctions on the government of Turkey for failing to officially acknowledge its responsibility for the Armenian Genocide, among other provisions.

**AB 1483** (Grayson) Housing Data. Collection and Reporting.  
Requires local jurisdictions to provide public information regarding its zoning ordinances, development standards, fees, exactions, and affordability requirements. This information must be available on the local jurisdiction’s internet website.

Shortens the notice requirement in criminal cases when a defendant files a motion to discover police officer misconduct from 16-days to 10-days. Creates a limited exception to the prohibition on the release of supervisiorial officer records.

**AB 1763** (Chiu) Planning and Zoning. Density Bonuses. Affordable Housing.  
Expands the existing Density Bonus Law (DBL) to require a city or county to award a developer significantly more density, additional concessions and incentives, and greater allowable height if 100% of the units in a development are restricted to lower income households.

**SB 13** (Wieckowski) Accessory Dwelling Units.  
Prohibits local jurisdictions from imposing any impact fees on ADUs less than 750 square feet, and limit the charge on ADUs over 750 square feet to 25 percent of the fees otherwise charged for a new single-family dwelling on the same lot. Prohibits replacement parking when a garage, carport, or covered
parking structure is demolished or converted into an ADU. This measure also prohibits owner occupancy requirements.

*SB 330 (Skinner) Housing Crisis Act of 2019.*
Declares a statewide housing crisis and for a five-year period freezing nearly all development related fees once a developer submits a “preliminary” application, including essential project specific fees.

**SB 518 (Wieckowski) Civil Actions. Settlement Offers.**
Removes a key provision in current law that encourages settlements and avoids costly litigation in disputes between parties involving the Public Records Act.
The State Legislature concluded its first year of its two-year session on September 13, 2019 and is expected to reconvene on January 6, 2020 for the second half the session. The WSCCOG Executive Director invited local state lawmakers in the Westside subregion to provide an update on their efforts and plans for next year’s session on legislation related to housing, homelessness, and transportation.

Assemblymember Richard Bloom (AD 50) is scheduled to attend the meeting to engage with the WSCCOG board members on local priorities. The WSCCOG also invited other state lawmakers, including Senator Ben Allen (SD 26), Senator Holly Mitchell (SD 30), Councilmember Sydney Kamlager-Dove (AD 54), and Assemblymember Autumn Burke (AD 62), which have yet to be confirmed for this meeting.
1. **WSCCOG Mobility Study Update**
   A. Representatives from the cities of Santa Monica, Culver City, and West Hollywood are on the review committee
      i. Reviews will be scheduled during the week of October 14th
      ii. We will also schedule the evaluation meeting/call during the week of October 7th
      iii. Goal is to select consultant by the end of October
   B. RFP says contract will start in December

2. **Metro Updates**
   A. SB 1 Update
   B. Metro Congestion pricing feasibility study update
   C. Understanding How Women Travel - Report by Metro
      i. Madeleine mentioned that Sheila Kuehl wanted this report to come to the full board
         1. Although many of the report’s recommendations are long-term, Kuehl will ask what interim actions Metro’s staff can take
         2. Kuehl will also ask how these actions can be folded into Metro’s NextGen Bus Study
            a. For example, women tend to make many off-peak trips, and the NextGen redesign may focus on expanding off-peak service
      ii. Eric noted that NextGen will likely include more all-day service to support regular trips and not just commute trips
         1. Harassment incidents are happening with people in close quarters, so Metro’s crowding standards may be contributing to these problems
      iii. Madeleine mentioned that NextGen’s changes are coming soon, so they would like input from the WSCCOG Transportation Working Group members
         1. They are expecting new preliminary routes in the fall, but they are not sure when they will be shared

3. **SCAG Updates**
   A. Connect SoCal Job Center Strategies
   B. SCAG region Airport Passenger Demand Forecasts

4. **Other**
   A. Invitation to the Construction Network/Kelly Asper VIP Breakfast event (see attachment)
      i. For COGs/JPAs to market the subregional projects to the consulting/construction industry to generate interest and competition to implement those projects.
         1. Diana mentioned they are not prepared to discuss I-10/Robertson
         2. Madeleine mentioned that they are not able to discuss Metro’s Sepulveda Transit Corridor project with construction companies