GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
JOINT MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS and EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 2, 2019
5:30 p.m. Buffet
6:00 p.m. Meeting

Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Boulevard
Paramount, California

AGENDA

STAFF REPORTS AND OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE IN THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS OFFICES, 16401 PARAMOUNT BOULEVARD, PARAMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. ANY PERSON HAVING QUESTIONS CONCERNING ANY AGENDA ITEM MAY CALL THE COG STAFF AT (562) 663-6850.

FOR YOUR INFORMATION: The Board of Directors will hear from the public on any item on the agenda or an item of interest that is not on the agenda. The Board of Directors cannot take action on any item not scheduled on the agenda. These items may be referred for administrative action or scheduled on a future agenda. Comments are to be limited to three minutes for each speaker, unless extended by the Board of Directors, and each speaker will only have one opportunity to speak on any one topic. You have the opportunity to address the Board of Directors at the following times:

A. AGENDA ITEM: at this time the Board of Directors considers the agenda item OR during Public Comments, and

B. NON-AGENDA ITEMS: during Public Comments, comments will be received for a maximum 20-minute period; any additional requests will be heard following the completion of the Board of Directors agenda; and

C. PUBLIC HEARINGS: at the time for public hearings.

Public comment is welcome. If you would like to address the Board, please keep your comments brief and complete a speaker card for the President.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL – BY SELF INTRODUCTIONS

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA - This is the time and place to change the order of the agenda, delete or add any agenda item(s).

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS - Three minutes for each speaker.
VI. MATTERS FROM STAFF

A. January 1, 2020 Board Meeting – Review Attendance Count for Alternate Dates
B. December 4th Meeting – Confirmed

VII. CONSENT CALENDAR: All items under the Consent Calendar may be enacted by one motion. Any item may be removed from the Consent Calendar and acted upon separately by the Board of Directors.

A. Approval of Minutes – Minutes of the Board of Directors Meeting of September 4, 2019, are presented for approval. (Pg. 4)
B. Approval of Warrant Register - Request for Approval of Warrant Register Dated October 2, 2019 (Pg. 12)
C. Local Agency Investment Fund Statement (Pg. 27)
D. Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) Final Report (Pg. 29)
E. Report from the Conservancy Committee – No Report
G. Report from the Gateway Water Management Authority (Pg. 31)
H. Report from the I-710 Corridor Project – (Pg. 34)
I. Report from the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Corridor Cities Committee – No Report
J. Report from PATH (COG Homeless Program Implementation Agency – No Report
K. Cap and Trade Update – No Report
L. Matters from The I-5 Consortium Cities Joint Powers Authority – No Report
M. Matters from the League of California Cities (Pg. 36)
N. Matters from Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) – No Report
O. Matters from Eco-Rapid Transit (WSAB) – (Pg. 39)
P. Matters from the South Coast AQMD & CARB – No Report
Q. Matters from the Metro Gateway Cities Service Council – (Pg. 42)
R. Matters from the Metro Eastside Transit Corridor (Gold Line) Phase II – No Report
S. Matters from the Port of Long Beach – No Report
CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

A MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS A THROUGH S.

VIII. REPORTS

5 Min
A. Report from the Gateway Cities COG Transportation Committee – Oral Report (Robert Garcia/Sharon Weissman)

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT

10 Min
B. Rose Institute Report on 2020 Census – Presentation by Douglas Johnson Fellow, Rose Institute of State and Local Government at Claremont McKenna College

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT

10 Min
C. Request to Fund Multi-year Sub-regional Program (MSP) for Active Transportation (AT) (Pg. 44)

SUGGESTED ACTION: APPROVE RECOMMENDATION

5 Min
D. Proposed Memorandum of Understanding Regarding I-710 Clean Truck Program (Pg. 50)

SUGGESTED ACTION: APPROVE SIGNING ON TO THE MOU BY THE GATEWAY CITIES COG

5 Min
E. Report Re EPA Communications to California (Pg. 64)

SUGGESTED ACTION: RECEIVE AND FILE REPORT

IX. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

X. MATTERS FROM THE PRESIDENT
A. Appointment of Immediate Past President Fernando Dutra to COG Transportation Committee

XI. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 8:00 p.m. unless the Board of Directors votes to extend the time limit. Any items on the agenda that are not completed will be forwarded to the next regular Board of Directors meeting scheduled for Wednesday, November 6, 2019, 6:00 PM.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT THE COG OFFICE AT (562) 663-6850. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENT TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.
GCCOG President Diane DuBois called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM.

PRESENT: President Diane DuBois, Lakewood
Member Tony Lima, City of Artesia
2nd Vice President Cinde MacGugan Cassidy, City of Avalon
Member Ali Saleh, City of Bell
Member Raymond Dunton, City of Bellflower
Member Lisseth Flores, City of Bell Gardens
Member Naresh Solanki, City of Cerritos
Member Oralia Rebollo, City of Commerce
Member Emma Sharif, City of Compton
Member Elizabeth Alcantar, City of Cudahy
Member Alex Saab, City of Downey
Member Jesse Alvarado, City of Hawaiian Gardens
Member Jhonny Pineda, City of Huntington Park
Member Cory Moss, City of Industry
Member John Lewis, City of La Mirada
Member Rex Richardson, City of Long Beach
Member Marisela Santana, City of Lynwood
Member Ricardo Lara, City of Maywood
Member Angie Jimenez, City of Montebello
Member Margarita Ríos, City of Norwalk
Member Brenda Olmos, City of Paramount
Member Brent Tercero, City of Pico Rivera
Member Joe Angel Zamora, City of Santa Fe Springs
1st Vice President Maria Davila, City of South Gate
Member William Davis, City of Vernon
Immediate Past President Fernando Dutra, City of Whittier
Member Antonio Chapa, Office of Supervisor Hilda Solis

ABSENT:
Member Roberto Uranga, City of Long Beach
Member Edward H. J. Wilson, City of Signal Hill
Member Herlinda Chico, Office of Supervisor Janice Hahn
Member Lacey Johnson, Office of Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas
Member Bonnie Lowenthal, Port of Long Beach (ex officio)
ALSO PRESENT: Lakewood City Manager Thaddeus McCormack; Julia Brown, Community Relations Manager, Sharon Weissman, Metro Board Deputy to Director Robert Garcia; Sarah Patterson, Regional Affairs Officer, SCAG; Melani Smith, Senior Director, TOC, Metro; Dano Ortega, DMH SPA 7; Danielle Soto, SCAQMD; Daisy Gomez, DMH LA County; Brenda Chour, DMH; Mark Stowell, La Mirada; Kristine Guerrero, League of California Cities; GCCOG Executive Director Nancy Pfeffer; GCCOG Deputy General Counsel Ivy Tsai; GCCOG Transportation Analyst Karen Heit; GCCOG Chair of Economic Working Group, Jerry Caton; GCCOG Consultant Norm Emerson; GCCOG Staff Sandra Mora; GCCOG Staff Stephanie Cadena; GCCOG Staff Joel Arevalos, and GCCOG Staff Genny Cisneros.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Member Brenda Olmos, City of Paramount.

Roll call was taken through self-introductions.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

There were no public comments.

Under items from staff, Nancy Pfeffer, COG Executive Director, explained the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Webinar Notice that was placed at their places. An additional informational paper was the River and Mountains Conservancy (RMC) notice. Pfeffer went on to discuss the COG’s Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) grant which is coming to an end. TCC is designed to serve the top 5% of disadvantaged communities. Northern California factions are trying to stretch the definition to include the top 10% as there aren’t any of the top 5% in northern California. She stated that the COG, along with LA County, is pushing back on changing the formula until all of the 5% cities receive funding. The Executive Director then pointed out a letter from Assembly Member Garcia who did not vote consistent with the COG’s desires on the CEQA exemption for housing (SB 450). She also added a response to an inquiry from Member Jhonny Pineda concerning the COG’s potential for levying taxes.

The last matter was a reminder that the deadline for the applying for the SB 2 planning funds is November 30.

Executive Director Pfeffer opened a discussion on the conflict with the COG Board meeting date of January 1, 2020. COG staff circulated an email poll and was unable to get a quorum; and therefore, will be recirculating the poll. An additional conflict exists with the scheduled December 4th meeting where there is a conflict with the City of Paramount’s Christmas celebration. Genny Cisneros noted that there was a discussion of moving the meeting to another venue, she indicated that she did find an alternative location to Paramount but there was a significant nonrefundable deposit. President DuBois asked if there is a viable alternative to have a December meeting; Pfeffer stated that allowing COG staff and Treasurer to approve expenses was a possibility with a follow-
on meeting to ratify those expenses. Ray Dunton expressed concern about the possibility of missing two months. Board Members from Bell and Bellflower offered locations within their cities as possible alternatives. Other Board Members offered various locations including the new Long Beach City Hall. Pfeffer said that an additional poll would be circulated for a new date for the January meeting.

Consent Calendar - It was moved by Member Dunton and seconded by Member Solanki to approve the Consent Calendar. The Consent Calendar was approved unanimously.

President DuBois introduced Melani Smith, Senior Director TOC, LA Metro, who provided an overview of the West Santa Ana Branch/Eco-Rapid Transit Corridor (WSAB/Eco-Rapid Transit) Transit Oriented Development Strategic Implementation Plan (TODSIP). Smith reviewed the process which began in 2016 with a $2 million grant from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). She stated that the process was fueled and created by the local jurisdictions and LA County. Each City contributed to the development of the TOD implementation activities. She went over the outreach strategy which include coordinating with the cities and having pop-ups in various community events to gather general public input.

Smith talked about the planning ahead and how that process supports cohesive planning in the communities. She emphasized enabling people to stay within their communities in addition to creating new housing and business opportunities.

She discussed the methodology for dividing the stations into five typologies and assigning strategies to each station. She talked about governance, equitable development, affordable housing, transit supportive planning, place-making, mobility, access and connectivity, and sustainability and resilience to promote a healthy environment. Each strategy may or may not apply to each individual station depending upon the station area. She explained the five station typologies and the recommended land uses. She went over the high-level design principles which are a good place to start specific planning. She focused on the information that was provided on each station area to assist the city with moving forward further planning activities.

She went over the MTA support for cities from SB-1 funding to certain cities.

Immediate Past President, Fernando Dutra, asked how the information was collected from the cities and what marketing information was gathered, Smith gave the name of the marketing company that did the work. There was discussion on what was the next step for the TODSIP and how would the cities implement these strategies.

It was moved by Member Richardson and seconded by Member Zamora to ask for the MTA representatives to request additional funding to further this effort. The item was approved unanimously.
President DuBois introduced the next item concerning the RHNA allocations prefacing that this year the numbers are worse. She turned to Executive Director Pfeffer to explain the process and the differences. Pfeffer discussed the changes and how there are more sticks than carrots with this new RHNA process.

GCCOG Assistant Planner, Stephanie Cadena, took over and explained how the SCAG RHNA subcommittee works and how the RHNA allocation process works. She indicated that Long Beach Councilmember Rex Richardson represents our subregion on the committee. She talked about the methodology review process. She went over the comment letter in the packet that is due Friday. She went over the COG review of the methodology and the various elements of the comment letter. Cadena indicated that the Planning Directors had several meetings on this letter and the City Manager’s Steering Committee reviewed the letter twice as well. Pfeffer stated that the RHNA numbers exceeded the COGs wildest estimates by over 300,000 units. She went over some of the compliance for the RHNA counts. COG President Diane DuBois asked if all of the cities have been advised about the numbers, she then called for discussion.

Councilman Rex Richardson spoke having been part of the Committee stated that LA County was not organized like Orange County. He reviewed the SCAG process and how Orange County jurisdictions collectively fought their numbers. Richardson stated that there needs to be conversation regarding a focused response to the RHNA allocations. He went on discuss the need to respond to the methodology and the need for individual cities to also send letters similar to the COG letter and the City of Long Beach letter.

It was moved by Member Richardson and seconded by Member Pineda to approve the letter and provide sample letters to cities for their use. The item was approved unanimously.

President DuBois introduced Gilbert Saldate, the COG Homelessness Coordinator, he remarked on how well the LCAs work for the individual cities. He commented that he will work to reenergize the connection with the cities, LCAs and service providers; identifying people within each city that work closely with the LCA and the homeless population. He discussed Results Based Accountability (RBA) to measure the results of existing efforts and to identify what can be done better. Saldate then introduced the LA County Department of Mental Health team; Homeless Outreach Mobile Engagement (HOME) unit that works with the severely mentally ill and are willing and able to work with the most severe mentally ill cases. The team is also willing to work with the cities to provide them with assistance to move this population into shelters and access services.

Saldate also indicated that he needs more participation on the Gateway Cities Homelessness Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) led by the City Manager of Lakewood, Thaddeus McCormack. Saldate talked about the County’s Measure H staff and how they have a slightly different culture for resolving homelessness at the County level and how he intends to get the County to a shared place of understanding. He
challenged the County to work with the cities on Individual plans that suit each city. He wants to help the cities get their available funding; including Measure H and SB 2, and is planning to provide workshops and technical assistance opportunities for cities.

It was moved by Member Solanki and seconded by Member Pineda to receive and file the item. The item was approved unanimously.

President DuBois introduced Karen Heit, COG Transportation Analyst, who gave reports and recommendations for COG support for two pieces of legislation; HR 2723 and SB 127.

She began with HR 2723, sponsored by Congressmember Alan Lowenthal. She began by stating that H.R. 2723 offers a dedicated revenue source by implementing a proposed national 1% waybill fee. The entity paying for the cargo to be shipped via ground transportation within the United States would be required to pay a fee of 1% of the total cost of transportation.

She went on to explain that potential expenditures for this fund coincide well with project and programmatic elements of the I-710 and SR-91/I-605/I-405 Corridor projects. Qualifying projects could include capital freight projects on roads, rail, intermodal connectors, including first and last mile connectors, rail grade separations, on-dock rail and landside infrastructure on ports and airports included in a State Freight Plan. An important element of this proposal is the minimum five-percent of funds that will be made available under the Program each fiscal year for zero-emission freight demonstration projects.

She finished with stating that the MTA supports this bill and is pulling together a Los Angeles County Goods Movement Strategic Plan in coordination with regional partners, including the Gateway Cities COG, that are involved with the goods movement sector. President DuBois called for questions.

Oralia Rebollo, City of Commerce, asked how much money was going to be allocated to local entities. Heit stated that the bill would establish goods movement fund but did not establish rules for distribution other than broad categories. Additional rules will have to be developed for distribution for state, regional and local entities.

There was discussion on whether the revenues accrued will be large enough for the entire country, as well as the 5% allocated for zero-emission vehicles being sufficient. Ray Dunton, City of Bellflower, made a motion not to support executing the recommended support letter. Member Dunton stated that there are a lot of taxes and very little benefit - $10 billion is too little benefit. Member Rex Richardson spoke in favor of supporting the bill. COG Counsel Ivy Tsai clarified the various Motions proposed for the bill and recommended a show of hands to get an accurate count.
The vote was recounted with 14 members voting not to execute the support letter. A show of hands was made to support the letter and the count was 8 members who supported the letter. The motion to support the bill failed.

Brent Tercero stated that not sending the letter wasn’t a snub just not a support. Jhonny Pineda said the COG should get involved with determining policy that impacts it.

There was additional discussion on the HR 2743. Member Richardson suggested inviting Lowenthal’s staff to discuss the Bill, Member Tercero reminded them that Lowenthal has to get his bills through Congress with considerations from other states.

In the future the COG will try and get someone from the Congressmember’s office to discuss the bill.

Heit next presented a report requesting conditional support for SB – 127 (Scott Wiener – San Francisco). This bill requires Caltrans to include Complete Streets improvements into the State Highway Operation Maintenance and Protection Program (SHOPP). The SHOPP Program is the allocation of state funds that are completely controlled by Caltrans for highway maintenance and safety improvements. The Bill requires Caltrans consider Complete streets elements where SHOPP projects on freeways or state highways cross over or under local streets; allowing for the use of SHOPP funds on Complete Streets items like sidewalk improvements or bike lanes.

COG staff is suggesting support for this Bill as it may help provide an additional source of funding for the COG arterial complete streets program. The draft letter makes suggestions for additional language that strengthens the need to work with local cities to conform to locally approved projects and plans. There was some discussion concerning the benefit to COG cities.

Member Jhonny Pineda made a motion to support SB-127 with suggested language changes, Member Alcantar seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Executive Director Pfeffer presented an item developed at the request of the Board concerning the make-up and origin of the City Manager’s Steering Committee. She reviewed the roles and responsibilities as stipulated in the JPA Agreement describing the City Manager’s Steering Committee. The primary duty of this Committee is to advise the COG Board. She reviewed the existing membership and anticipating upcoming vacancies that will be occurring due to three City Manager retirements.

It was moved by Member Lewis and seconded by Member Dunton to receive and file the item. The item was approved unanimously.

President DuBois asked if there were any questions on the written reports from Committees and outside Agencies; there were none.
Reports IX A-H & X A-H - It was moved by Member Cassidy and seconded by Member Pineda to receive and file reports. The motion was approved unanimously.

There were no announcements from the COG President.

President DuBois asked for any announcement from Board members. Member Tercero – Pico Rivera, brought up the tainted water issue within his city and asked if the COG can do something. There was discussion about putting together a committee to address the issue and reaching out to the Gateway Water Management Authority.

**Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 7:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Pfeffer, Executive Director
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM B
Approval of Warrant Register
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warrant No.</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Warrant Amount</th>
<th>Fund Title</th>
<th>Fund Code</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>003119-1</td>
<td>Antonio Luna</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee: Luna, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003119-10</td>
<td>Nancy Pfeiffer</td>
<td>4,504.73</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee: Pfeiffer, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003119-11</td>
<td>Gilbert A. Saldate</td>
<td>2,100.43</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee: Saldate, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003119-2</td>
<td>Emma J. Sharif</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee: Sharif, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003119-3</td>
<td>Edward H. Wilson</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee: Wilson, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003119-5</td>
<td>Joel Arredondo</td>
<td>1,993.04</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee: Arredondo, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003119-6</td>
<td>Stephanie Cadena</td>
<td>1,986.52</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee: Cadena, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antonio Luna</td>
<td>124.06</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Pfeiffer</td>
<td>4,504.73</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbert A. Saldate</td>
<td>2,100.43</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emma J. Sharif</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edward H. Wilson</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joel Arredondo</td>
<td>1,993.04</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Cadena</td>
<td>1,986.52</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,986.52</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant No</td>
<td>Payee</td>
<td>Warrant Amount</td>
<td>Fund Title</td>
<td>Fund Code</td>
<td>Transaction Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR1195-7</td>
<td>Generosa Citizens</td>
<td>3,581.65</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employees: Career, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Generosa Citizens</td>
<td>3,581.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR1195-8</td>
<td>Karen J. Hett</td>
<td>1,421.08</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employees: Hett, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Karen Z. Hett</td>
<td>1,421.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR1195-9</td>
<td>Sandra More</td>
<td>1,714.95</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employees: More, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Sandra More</td>
<td>1,714.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18004</td>
<td>William J. Davis</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employees: Davis, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total William J. Davis</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18005</td>
<td>Manual D. Delbos</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employees: Delbos, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Manual D. Delbos</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18006</td>
<td>Raymond Dunton</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employees: Dunton, Pay Date: 8/31/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Raymond Dunton</td>
<td>112.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,068.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant No.</td>
<td>Payee</td>
<td>Warrant Amount</td>
<td>Fund Title</td>
<td>Fund Code</td>
<td>Transaction Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091512-1</td>
<td>John Hancock USA</td>
<td>1,055.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>697 Deferred Compensation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091512-1</td>
<td>Ali Sales</td>
<td>117.50</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Stock; Pay Date: 9/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091512-2</td>
<td>Jose Avila</td>
<td>1,593.64</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Joel Pay Date: 9/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091512-3</td>
<td>Stephanie Cadena</td>
<td>1,919.52</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Cadena; Pay Date: 9/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091512-4</td>
<td>Peter Chavez</td>
<td>2,425.24</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Chavez; Pay Date: 9/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091512-5</td>
<td>Karen Z. Brit</td>
<td>3,182.30</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Brit; Pay Date: 9/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091512-6</td>
<td>Sandra More</td>
<td>2,046.43</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee More; Pay Date: 9/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant No</td>
<td>Payer</td>
<td>Warrant Amount</td>
<td>Fund Title</td>
<td>Fund Code</td>
<td>Transaction Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091519-7</td>
<td>Total Sandra Mom</td>
<td>2,046.43</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Pfeffer</td>
<td>4,107.07</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091519-8</td>
<td>Total Nancy Pfeffer</td>
<td>4,301.43</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbert A. Sadle</td>
<td>3,101.43</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18007</td>
<td>Total Gilbert A. Sadle</td>
<td>3,101.43</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Hancock USA</td>
<td>3,602.81</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total John Hancock USA</td>
<td>3,602.81</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18008</td>
<td>Mike Kodama</td>
<td>74.90</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Mike Kodama</td>
<td>74.90</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18009</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total AT&amp;T</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18010</td>
<td>Staples Credit Plan</td>
<td>192.96</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Staples Credit Plan</td>
<td>192.96</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18011</td>
<td>Kervin Misaki</td>
<td>537.15</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Kervin Misaki</td>
<td>537.15</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Employee Payroll: Pay Date: 4/15/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant No.</td>
<td>Payee</td>
<td>Warrant Amount</td>
<td>Fund Title</td>
<td>Fund Code</td>
<td>Transaction Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18012</td>
<td>Total Konica Minolta</td>
<td>537.15</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Rent/Lease for Konica Copier dated 9/5/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Konica Minolta</td>
<td>537.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18013</td>
<td>FEDEX</td>
<td>104.22</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Overnight Delivery of Time Sensitive Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total FEDEX</td>
<td>104.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18014</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Teleconference Services</td>
<td>257.28</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Monthly Charges for Teleconference Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total AT&amp;T Teleconference Services</td>
<td>257.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18015</td>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>223.70</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Monthly Charges for Telephone services 9/12 - 9/30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total AT&amp;T</td>
<td>223.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18016</td>
<td>Speedway Water</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Monthly Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Speedway Water</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18017</td>
<td>Verizon Wireless</td>
<td>98.14</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Cell Phone Charges Aug 16 - Sep 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Verizon Wireless</td>
<td>98.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor No</td>
<td>Payee</td>
<td>Warrant Amount</td>
<td>Fund Type</td>
<td>Fund Code</td>
<td>Transaction Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18014</td>
<td>Pinkney Brown Global Financial</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Purchase of Footage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Pinkney Brown Global</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18019</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ashburn</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Signed for Board of Directors Meeting, Sept 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Elizabeth Ashburn</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18020</td>
<td>Alex Sath</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Signed for Board of Directors Mtg, September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Alex Sath</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18021</td>
<td>Jesse Alvarez</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Signed for Board of Directors Mtg, September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Jesse Alvarez</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18022</td>
<td>Angel Jimenez</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Signed for Board of Directors Mtg, September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Angel Jimenez</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18023</td>
<td>Ansa Tech</td>
<td>$1,965.00</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Renewal License Microsoft Outlook Mail, ESET Sec Anti-Subrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant No.</td>
<td>Payee</td>
<td>Warrant Amount</td>
<td>Fund Title</td>
<td>Fund Code</td>
<td>Transaction Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18024</td>
<td>Total Sensus Thess</td>
<td>1,945.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Upgrade comp windows 2 users, software package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18025</td>
<td>Brenda Gilmore</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Submit for Board of Directors Mtg. September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19035</td>
<td>Total Gerald Cohan</td>
<td>5,679.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Economic Develop Consulting Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18037</td>
<td>Total Crouch</td>
<td>13,048.75</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Professional Services Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18038</td>
<td>DW Works, Inc.</td>
<td>45.51</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Business costs for Gilbert Saldiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18039</td>
<td>Total DW Works, Inc</td>
<td>45.51</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Business Costs for Julia Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18040</td>
<td>Total DW Works, Inc</td>
<td>45.51</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Advocacy Advisory Services for Sept 1-30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant No.</td>
<td>Payee</td>
<td>Warrant Amount</td>
<td>Fund Title</td>
<td>Fund Code</td>
<td>Transaction Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18010</td>
<td>Fernando Duran</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Signed for Board of Directors Mtg, September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18031</td>
<td>Luisa Flavia</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Signed for Board of Directors Mtg, September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18032</td>
<td>Total Lunch Plates</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Meals &amp; Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18033</td>
<td>Gilbert Salazar</td>
<td>251.26</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Meals &amp; Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18033</td>
<td>Institute for Local Government</td>
<td>5,792.50</td>
<td>Transformative Climate Coalition</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>Assisted Council Seven for the TCC Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18034</td>
<td>Joanny Pineda</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Signed for Board of Directors Mtg, September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18035</td>
<td>Jose Angel Zaraura</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Signed for Board of Directors Mtg, September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant No.</td>
<td>Payee</td>
<td>Payment Amount</td>
<td>Fund Title</td>
<td>Fund Code</td>
<td>Transaction Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18314</td>
<td>Total Joe Angel Zumbos</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Special Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18316</td>
<td>John Lewis</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Special Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18317</td>
<td>Total John Lewis</td>
<td>$1,645.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Professional Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Law Offices of Jones &amp; Meyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services Resolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18339</td>
<td>Julio Stewart</td>
<td>$1,301.00</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Planning Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB 2</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>Services for September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91865</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Julio Stewart</td>
<td>$6,300.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18339</td>
<td>Kau Consulting</td>
<td>$1,352.00</td>
<td>Kau</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug 25 - Sept 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,798.00</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug 25 - Sept 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,083.00</td>
<td>91865</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aug 25 - Sept 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Kau Consulting</td>
<td>$9,733.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gateway Cities Council of Governments
**Check/Voucher Register - Warrant Register**
**From 9/5/2019 Through 10/31/2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warrant No</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Warrant Amount</th>
<th>Fund Title</th>
<th>Fund Code</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18040</td>
<td>Ricardo Lira</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Respond for Board of Directors Mgt. September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Ricardo Lira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18041</td>
<td>Margarita Ross</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Respond for Board of Directors Mgt. September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Margarita Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18042</td>
<td>Nathaniel Slaunthi</td>
<td>153.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Respond for Board of Directors, September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Nathaniel Slaunthi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18043</td>
<td>Olinda Rebello</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Respond for Board of Directors Mgt. September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Olinda Rebello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18044</td>
<td>City of Paramount</td>
<td>4,361.88</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Office Space/Lease for the month of October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total City of Paramount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18045</td>
<td>City of Paramount</td>
<td>620.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Fixity Rental Month of August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total City of Paramount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Date: 11/1/2019*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warrant No.</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Fund Title</th>
<th>Fund Code</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18045</td>
<td>Total City of Paramount</td>
<td>623.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Administration 457 Def.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARIS</td>
<td>259.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Comp &amp; Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARIS</td>
<td>313.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total PARIS</td>
<td>572.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18047</td>
<td>Rex Richardson</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Spend on Board of Directors Mtg, September 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Rex Richardson</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18048</td>
<td>Rodger's Catering</td>
<td>127.50</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Catering Svc for Board of Directors Mtg Sept 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Rodger's Catering</td>
<td>127.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18049</td>
<td>Rodger's Catering</td>
<td>93.48</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Catering Svc for Economic Develop Mtg, Sept 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Rodger's Catering</td>
<td>93.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18050</td>
<td>Rodger's Catering</td>
<td>93.48</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Catering Svc for City Mgr Meeting Mtg, Sept 19, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Rodger's Catering</td>
<td>93.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant No.</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Warrant Amount</td>
<td>Fund Title</td>
<td>Fund Code</td>
<td>Transaction Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18031</td>
<td>Mohela Saturna</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Performed the Board of Directors Edgy, September 6, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Mohela Saturna</td>
<td>125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18032</td>
<td>Smith, Watts &amp; Hartmann LLC</td>
<td>3,196.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Consulting Services for the Month of September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Smith, Watts &amp; Hartmann LLC</td>
<td>3,196.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18055</td>
<td>Southeast Engineering &amp; Drafting</td>
<td>4,215.00</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>Engineering Support for S/S - 9/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast Engineering &amp; Drafting</td>
<td>620.00</td>
<td>S/d 2766</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>Engineering Support for S/S - 9/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast Engineering &amp; Drafting</td>
<td>2,900.00</td>
<td>S-710</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Engineering Support for S/S - 9/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southeast Engineering &amp; Drafting</td>
<td>8,300.00</td>
<td>914005</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>Engineering Support for S/S - 9/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Southeast Engineering &amp; Drafting</td>
<td>10,635.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18054</td>
<td>Stephanie Cadenza</td>
<td>61.48</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Mowing &amp; Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Stephanie Cadenza</td>
<td>61.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18055</td>
<td>Summit Geist Consulting</td>
<td>3,225.00</td>
<td>Transboundary Climate Change</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>Professional Consulting Services for Climate Change Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant No.</td>
<td>Issue Date</td>
<td>Warrant Amount</td>
<td>Fund Title</td>
<td>Fund Code</td>
<td>Transaction Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18056</td>
<td>09/08/2019</td>
<td>3,223.66</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Morgan for Board of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Directors Mag, September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18037</td>
<td>09/08/2019</td>
<td>1,128.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Consulting Services for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GCOG Housing Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18038</td>
<td>09/08/2019</td>
<td>2,712.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Funds Secured for Tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deposit - Aug 21 - Sept 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18039</td>
<td>09/08/2019</td>
<td>8,400.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Interest Due on LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18040</td>
<td>09/08/2019</td>
<td>125,006.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Cloud Based Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18041</td>
<td>09/08/2019</td>
<td>125,006.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>PAOP LOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due: 9/8/2019 - 9/7/2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warrant No.</th>
<th>Payee</th>
<th>Warrant Amount</th>
<th>Fund Title</th>
<th>Fund Code</th>
<th>Transaction Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>205-00191</td>
<td>John Hancock USA</td>
<td>1,025.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>435 Deferrred Compensation Plan Deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total John Hancock USA</td>
<td>1,025.00</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Interest Due on LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205-10011</td>
<td>Pacific Premier Bank</td>
<td>312.50</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Interest Due on LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Pacific Premier Bank</td>
<td>312.50</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>Interest Due on LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report Total</td>
<td>247,644.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ITEM C
August 2019 Local Agency Investment Fund Statement
Local Agency Investment Fund
P.O. Box 942809
Sacramento, CA 94209-0001
(916) 653-3001

September 25, 2019

LAIF Home
PMIA Average Monthly Yields

Tran Type Definitions

Account Number: 40-19-045

August 2019 Statement

Account Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Deposit:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance:</td>
<td>2,863.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Withdrawal:</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance:</td>
<td>2,863.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ITEM D
Transformative Climate Communities
Final Report
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Nancy Pfeffer, Executive Director
Stephanie Cadena, Assistant Planner

SUBJECT: Final Report for the Gateway Cities Climate Action Opportunity Assessment and Readiness Plan Project

Background

In 2017, the Gateway Cities COG received a Transformative Climate Communities planning grant from the Strategic Growth Council for $170,000 to develop a Climate Action Opportunity Assessment and Readiness Plan. The COG partnered with the Institute for Local Government and Sumire Gant Consulting to identify and match cities’ top sustainability projects with potential cap-and-trade funding programs. The project team developed climate funding packets with a roadmap, factsheets, and informational materials for all cities, in addition to individual climate action and readiness plans for selected jurisdictions. The project team also provided technical assistance to help cities prepare for current and upcoming funding cycles under the most relevant programs.

The project’s final report documents the project’s outcomes, summarizes all tasks and deliverables, and highlights lessons learned, including challenges faced by disadvantaged communities and opportunities to improve the readiness and capacity of Gateway Cities to compete effectively for climate funding programs. Recommendations for the state to improve readiness and capacity are as follows:

- Provide greater assurance and predictability of funding cycles
- Develop factsheets for each funding program
- Increase funding for planning grants
- Turn to existing partnerships for support
- Capitalize on regional projects and programs
- Focus technical assistance for disadvantaged communities.

These opportunities are described in greater detail in the Final Report.

The terms of our grant agreement require the COG Board to certify the final report for submission to the Strategic Growth Council.

Recommended Action

Adopt and certify Final Report for submission to the Strategic Growth Council.

Attachment

Gateway Cities Climate Action Opportunity Assessment and Readiness Plan: BUILDING CAPACITY FOR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

FINAL REPORT

September 2019
Gateway Cities Climate Action Opportunity Assessment and Readiness Plan:
Building Capacity for Disadvantaged Communities

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2017, the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (COG) received a Transformative Climate Communities planning grant from the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) for $170,000 to develop a Climate Action Opportunity Assessment and Readiness Plan. The COG partnered with the Institute for Local Government (ILG) and Sumire Gant Consulting to identify cities’ multiple-benefit, greenhouse gas reduction projects that qualify for cap and trade funding, and assess readiness and capacity for cities to effectively compete for this funding. This effort highlighted the challenges and inequity that Gateway cities face in their efforts to access climate action funding intended to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Given the challenges, the following opportunities to address them are suggested:

CHALLENGE MEETS OPPORTUNITY

- **Predictable Annual Funding Cycles**
  Preparation for climate action funding is often a multiyear effort, but many grants are not predictably available on a year to year basis. More predictable grant cycles would help disadvantaged communities and other grant applicants to commit the limited staff and resources required to prepare projects for funding.

- **Climate Action Fund Fact Sheets**
  To simplify the accessibility of all climate action funding programs going forward, each funding program should include a fact sheet with the application package to help potential applicants determine at a glance whether they should invest their limited time to read the entire package.

- **Increase Funding for Planning Grants**
  Planning grants would be extremely helpful for disadvantaged communities to invest their limited time and resources for the multiyear efforts required to successfully prepare and compete for climate action funding, most of which focuses solely on implementation.

- **Collaborate with LA County to Seek AHSC Funding**
  Los Angeles County and the Gateway Cities COG are exploring a collaboration to assist Gateway cities to identify affordable housing developers to invest in their disadvantaged communities and secure Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities (AHSC) program funding for both affordable housing and sustainable transportation improvements.

- **Capitalize on Regional Projects and Programs**
  Several regional programs and projects provide opportunities to incentivize and focus efforts within the Gateway Cities sub-region to guide investments and access to climate action funding going forward, e.g. the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and the West Santa Ana Branch (WSAB) Transit Corridor.

- **Focused Technical Assistance for Gateway’s Disadvantaged Communities**
  Investing in localized technical assistance for disadvantaged communities as a three-year pilot within the Gateway Cities sub-region could be a multiyear investment that prepares disadvantaged communities to equitably compete for climate action funding programs that require a multiyear effort.
California’s climate action funds are designed to address the environmental challenges facing disadvantaged communities that have historically experienced the negative impacts of transportation and industrial facilities that are often disproportionately located in low-income communities of color. This effort by the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (COG) to assess readiness and capacity for its communities to compete for climate action funding highlights the challenges that these communities face in their efforts to access funding intended to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

The Gateway Cities Council of Governments (COG) is made up of 27 cities located in southeast Los Angeles County, and includes the Port of Long Beach and unincorporated communities of Los Angeles County. The Gateway Cities sub-region is home to more than 2 million residents that are 63% Latino, 10% Asian, 10% Caucasian and 9% African-American. All but one of the 27 Gateway cities includes at least one census tract in the top 25% most disadvantaged communities statewide.

- Notably, nearly a quarter (23%) of California’s 397 most-disadvantaged (top 5%) census tracts are concentrated in the Gateway Cities sub-region.
- The Gateway Cities sub-region is home to 24 cap and trade facilities that must either purchase GHG emissions credits or reduce emissions to continue operating.
- As home to the Port of Long Beach and neighbor to the Port of Los Angeles, the Gateway Cities sub-region has long experienced adverse environmental impacts associated with the heavy concentration of goods movement and industry.
- The I-710 freeway provides direct access to the San Pedro Bay Port complex, and serves as a primary access corridor to other freeways as well as the intermodal rail terminals that handle the majority of international intermodal cargo.
- Numerous freight rail lines operate throughout the Gateway Cities sub-region, as well as five intermodal freight facilities within and bordering the area.

These primary sources of GHG also contribute to poor air quality in the South Coast Air Basin, which has been designated as a nonattainment area with respect to the federal air quality standards for both ground-level ozone (smog) and fine particulate matter (PM2.5).

As this report reveals, state policies that earmark a percentage of the funding for the top 5% of disadvantaged census tracts are helpful, but do not go far enough given the challenges these vulnerable...
communities face in competing for climate action funds. This underscores the need for greater efforts to ensure cap and trade funding reaches communities where the emissions and impacts are greatest. Under existing state cap and trade programs, Gateway Cities are required to compete for climate action funding against better-resourced cities and sub-regions. This inequity must be addressed.

**CHALLENGE MEETS OPPORTUNITY**

In the design and management of climate action funds, efforts have been made to enable disadvantaged communities to fairly compete for this funding in the face of historical inequity. However, the findings of this assessment show that more needs to be done to expand and support the ability of disadvantaged communities to provide not only a level playing field, but also the means for them to effectively compete for this funding as it becomes available.

The limited response of disadvantaged communities to compete for climate action funds as currently designed is sometimes misconstrued as a lack of desire or interest, even on the part of cities that are most negatively impacted and most in need of climate action funding to address those impacts. Nothing could be further from the truth. The findings of this project clearly demonstrate that these cities are interested in pursuing this funding, they simply lack the time and resources required to compete effectively when they are challenged to prioritize seeking this complex array of climate action funding over their primary mission of providing community services and maintaining public infrastructure. And while this discussion focuses on the Gateway Cities, it is likely that these challenges are similarly experienced by other disadvantaged communities across the state. The discussion below highlights the challenges that many communities in southeast Los Angeles face, as well as opportunities to address these challenges and the historical inequity that exacerbates them.

**CHALLENGES**

While much climate action funding is prioritized for disadvantaged communities, these communities are often constrained in their ability to secure this funding. The state has offered a myriad of different climate action grant opportunities that are not predictable in terms of availability, consistency or eligibility, leaving disadvantaged communities at a loss for the time required to compete for climate action funding.

The challenges that were identified during this project’s initial assessment of 26 Gateway cities’ readiness to compete for climate action funding (during Tasks 1 and 2) continued to plague the seven cities selected for additional technical support in the final delivery of this project (Tasks 3 and 4). Those seven cities included a mix of smaller and larger cities scattered throughout the Gateway Cities sub-region: Artesia, Bellflower, Commerce, Compton, Cudahy, Norwalk, and Paramount.

---

3 Long Beach was not included in the initial assessment since the city had already demonstrated the capacity to successfully compete for climate action funding.
The decision to provide additional support for only seven of the 26 Gateway Cities’ disadvantaged communities was made based on the budget limitations of this project. However, given the findings and the clear need, the decision was ultimately made to provide some level of support for each of the Gateway cities.  

**Limited Capacity**

As identified early on, limited capacity continued to be a challenge with the seven selected Gateway cities. The initial conference call with the Institute for Local Government (ILG), the COG’s project partner, was scheduled with four cities after one email was sent to them. With the other three, the COG followed up with five or more emails and telephone calls which speaks to their limited capacity, not to a lack of interest or need. In two instances, the meetings with ILG had to be rescheduled when the cities were unable to join the call due to unexpected circumstances. This extended effort to engage is indicative of the limited capacity of disadvantaged communities to devote time and resources to speculative funding efforts without some commitment of capacity enhancement. Such capacity enhancement might include hands-on support to complete grant applications and assistance in providing required information and resources needed to adequately prepare projects to qualify for funding.

Three Gateway cities have fewer than 10 full time employees, and two more have fewer than 20. One of the seven selected cities, Cudahy, has only seven full-time employees, including the City Manager. The 2010 census estimates Cudahy’s population at about 25,000, although the city speculates it is double that in reality. The limited capacity of the city’s staff is clear, yet the City Manager continually expressed his and the City Council’s strong interest to secure climate action funding and bring in affordable housing to address the overcrowded living conditions that their community is experiencing.

Artesia is an excellent example of how building capacity to compete for climate action funding within a disadvantaged community increases the likelihood of success in securing that funding. One of the smaller cities in the Gateway, Artesia successfully competed independently for an Urban & Community Forestry grant for one of their priority projects to develop an Urban Forest Master Plan during the term of this project. Because it was the only city able to provide the additional information ILG required in a timely manner, Artesia was able to receive direct support from ILG in preparing a grant application which was not initially a part of the technical assistance offered to cities. As a result, Artesia was able to submit a grant application for the Artesia Botanical Garden through the Statewide Park Development and Community Revitalization Program (SPP) grant, which had only

---

See Exhibit 2.
recently been released and was due in less than two months. Artesia had also successfully secured a state earmark to partially fund that project independent of this project effort.

Artesia’s City Manager, who has served since 2013, is both supportive and committed to this process. Despite their small size, Artesia has 37 full-time employees with dedicated staff that have primary responsibility to complete grant applications. They followed up proactively with the COG and ILG throughout the life of this project. This is a level of effort and sustained leadership required to be most successful within the limited technical assistance available through this project as well as the technical assistance available for individual climate action funding programs.

Norwalk had also already completed applications for the priority projects they had identified previously for climate action funding, and therefore did not require additional assistance from ILG. The third largest city in the Gateway Cities region, Norwalk has a strong bench of consultants that they regularly use to complete their grant applications. Within the current cycle they were awarded an Active Transportation Planning grant to develop a Bicycle Master Plan, which they had previously identified as one of their top priorities. And they were in the process of resubmitting another of their top priorities, the Greening Project on Studebaker Avenue, which they had unsuccessfully submitted previously for an Urban Greening grant. Norwalk is also receiving technical assistance to secure SB2 funding to develop Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Prototype Plans to aid developers and residents in creating additional housing units for their community. Norwalk had listed the pursuit of AHSC funding for affordable housing project as one of their top priorities, but the development did not meet the minimum thresholds under that program.

The remaining five cities were either challenged to provide ILG with additional information needed in time to proceed with the technical advice that ILG could provide within the structure of this grant, or the climate action programs that could fund their priority projects were past the current year’s cycle and it was not known at the time if or when those funding sources would be offered in 2020. Cities were instructed to sign up for notifications from those funds to receive updates when applications would be available. Some of the priority projects were also not fully ready for submittal based upon the eligibility requirements of certain climate action funds; therefore, additional work would be required by the city before they would be able to submit a viable application for funding.

The challenges and limited capacity of these disadvantaged cities to respond promptly to ILG’s requests for additional information resulted in an opportunity lost. As a result, ILG was not able to provide those cities with the additional support that they had intended given the timeline of this project. And those cities that had expressed a strong interest in receiving the technical assistance provided through this grant, were ultimately not able to access it.

The proliferation of different grants with changing guidelines also continued to be a challenge. Cities had previously expressed their frustration with the volume and variety of climate action funding programs and the time commitment required to determine which grants would best fit their needs to fund priority projects.
Because new climate action funds had recently issued a Notice of Funding Availability, ILG focused on providing information on climate action funds that were currently available during the final phase of this project (June, 2019), and asked the seven cities whether they could identify projects that could fit within the parameters of that funding.

- One was the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) Program grant, whose application was due by June 17, 2019. While some were able to identify projects that might qualify for that funding, cities were not ready to apply within the short timeline.
- The second was the Statewide Park Development and Community Revitalization Program (SPP) grant which was due by August 5, 2019. Fortunately, as described above, Artesia was able to submit the Artesia Botanical Garden project through this program with grant writing assistance from ILG.

Generally, however, cities were either unable to identify fitting projects, or those projects that would qualify were also not yet ready to submit for funding. The lack of success with this approach is not surprising given the cities’ capacity limitations.

Despite these limitations, ILG was able to capitalize on these conference calls with Gateway cities to address several other programs to assist them in their efforts going forward:

- SB2 Planning Grants go directly to local governments to update general plans, community plans, specific plans, and local planning related to implementation of sustainable community strategies or local coastal plans. During the course of this grant, ILG continued to urge and assist cities to take necessary actions to qualify for this funding. SB2 will provide grants up to $625,000 to cities based on population through a non-competitive process to those that meet the qualification threshold and can demonstrate that their planning activity has a nexus to accelerating housing production.
- CivicSpark is a Governor’s Initiative AmeriCorps program dedicated to building capacity for local public agencies to address community resilience issues such as climate change, water resource management, housing and mobility. CivicSpark fellows can provide 11 months of quality capacity building support at a low cost to local governments. The COG has worked with two Civic Spark fellows to temporarily expand its capacity to assist member cities and has achieved long-term results, including the recently completed Gateway Climate Action Framework.
- ILG’s Beacon Program provides a framework for cities and counties to share best practices and gain recognition for their sustainability achievements. Importantly, Beacon cities also receive regular notification of education and grant opportunities, along with year-round support from ILG staff beyond this grant.

**Leadership Turnover**

Generally, too much leadership turnover can interrupt the successful flow of any organization. This continued to be a factor throughout the term of this project. Three Gateway cities were led by interim city managers during the initial phase of this project, and in the case of Pico Rivera, the interim City Manager/Public Works Director had recently resigned and both positions were waiting to be filled. Four cities had newly appointed Public Works Directors, including two of the seven selected cities - Paramount, who had recently appointed their Public Works Director in the early phase of this project,
and Commerce, who brought on a new consultant/Public Works Director in the later phase of this project.

Both Compton and Commerce experienced leadership turnovers during the final phases of this project. In Commerce, the Assistant City Manager spearheading the city’s effort left in the final phase of this project to become City Manager in another Gateway city. This left the newly-contracted Public Works Director to follow up on projects that were not officially within his purview. In Compton, an election changed the make-up of the City Council, resulting in a change of leadership at the City Manager and Assistant City Manager level. Compton’s Assistant City Manager had also been spearheading the city’s effort. Compton’s three priority projects were Public Works projects for which climate action funding was not available within this project’s schedule and thus ILG was not able to provide the city with additional support. However as discussed in the next section, the Community Development Director was able to provide some assistance with a developer interested in applying for AHSC funding in future rounds.

Limited City Funding

Funding is a challenge for cities large and small to maintain adequate staffing and resources to provide basic public services. So unsurprisingly, interest in climate action funding was initially high when presented as an opportunity to replace general fund and other local dollars that were already committed to existing capital projects, or to close funding gaps for future projects. The cost of public services and the elimination of redevelopment funding at the local level only add to the challenge for cities to promote economic development and to attract affordable housing development.

As a result, the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program grants were particularly attractive. When the COG made cities aware of the availability of AHSC funding to provide financing for both affordable housing and mixed-use developments with at least 20% affordable housing, 11 cities expressed interest in competing for that funding. As a result, the COG hosted a Gateway Cities AHSC Workshop with ILG on April 22, 2019 with the participation of the Strategic Growth Council and their Technical Assistance provider that included roundtable discussions with cities that were already working with developers, as well as those that were interested in attracting affordable housing along the planned West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor that traverses diagonally through the Gateway Cities area.

Additional follow up conference calls were arranged for the cities and developers that were most ready to proceed, however none are ready to submit for the 2020 AHSC process due to a number of factors:

- In Norwalk and Commerce, the for-profit developers were not willing to meet the AHSC requirement that the average affordability of all Restricted Units within the Project be no greater than 50% of the Area Median Income (AMI). However, those developments are moving forward without the AHSC funding.
In Compton and Downey, the heavy lift to prepare a project to qualify for AHSC funding has proven challenging; however, follow-up conversations between the cities, the developers, and local AHSC technical assistance has provided the developers and cities with actionable steps to be ready for the 2021 round of AHSC funding.

While very much interested, the other cities were also not far enough along to be ready to apply for AHSC funding now.

Multiyear Effort Required to Access Climate Action Funding

As the COG began working with cities to identify specific climate action funding that would fit their needs, we found that many of the climate action funding programs require a multiyear effort to meet the threshold to apply for this funding. Qualifying for AHSC and TCC implementation in particular can be a heavy lift for any city, and even more so with the limited capacity of these disadvantaged communities. It requires a sustained effort over time, which is particularly difficult for cities with small staffs and limited capacity that experience regular turnover not only at the top, but within key leadership and staff positions.

Multiyear efforts should require some assurance of multiyear availability of funding. Presently, each climate action funding grant has its own guidelines and requirements, many with unpredictable funding cycles. Without some assurance that the specific funding program will be available on an ongoing, annual basis, a sustained multiyear effort to qualify for funding programs that may not be available in the future is a real barrier. The majority of Gateway cities have had some success securing climate action funding in the past, but primarily with established programs with which they have some familiarity and that are offered on a predictable annual schedule, such as the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP).

Few cities, particularly disadvantaged communities, can challenge their limited capacity to prepare for a funding program that may not be available in upcoming years. With AHSC, cities know that funding will be available next year if they are not ready to apply and they know in general what the requirements will be and the eligible uses of funds since the guidelines are also fairly consistent.

OPPORTUNITIES

As noted above, the challenges that disadvantaged communities face in accessing climate action funding can be daunting, but there are actions that can be taken now to lessen the impacts of these challenges and increase the likelihood that funding to reduce greenhouse gas emissions will reach those cities that need it most.

The following recommendations are discussed in detail below as opportunities to improve the readiness and capacity of disadvantaged communities to effectively compete for climate action funding.
Predictable Annual Funding Cycles

As previously noted, preparation for climate action funding is often a multi-year effort, but many grants are not predictably available on a year to year basis. Each year, state agencies invest cap-and-trade auction proceeds in communities throughout California via the California Climate Investments Program (CCIP). Four programs account for 60% of cap-and-trade proceeds, and have continuous allocations each year, including AHSC, Low Carbon Transit Operations, Transit and Intercity Rail Capital, and High-Speed Rail.

The remaining 40% is allocated annually by the Legislature through programs that are more challenging for disadvantaged communities to access due to their unpredictable funding levels, schedules and guidelines. Providing greater assurance and predictability of grant cycles for other climate action funding would help disadvantaged communities to commit limited staff time and resources to prepare projects to qualify for funding for upcoming rounds. The COG’s effort to educate disadvantaged communities about the availability of AHSC funding did not result in successful applicants for 2020, but knowing that there will be future rounds of funding has at least two Gateway cities and developers investing their time and resources into developing successful applications for 2021.

Climate Action Funding Fact Sheets

To address the challenges of limited capacity and the proliferation of climate action funding available, the Gateway Cities COG simplified the process with the creation of individual fact sheets. ILG was asked to develop fact sheets for the funding programs that most aligned with the Gateway cities’ priority projects, including Transformative Climate Communities (TCC), Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC), and Urban Greening. These fact sheets provide a quick reference to help cities determine which funding sources are a good fit for that city’s projects. Funding fact sheets should be available for all climate action funding programs in the future, particularly programs that are not offered on a regular schedule.

To simplify the accessibility of all climate action funding programs going forward, it is recommended that each funding program develop a fact sheet within the Notice of Funding Availability. This would help all potential applicants determine at a glance when the application is due, how the funding can be used, how much funding is available, whether matching funds are required, and other pertinent information that would help any city determine whether they should invest the additional time to read the entire funding package.
Increase Funding for Planning Grants

Only a few climate action funds provide access to planning grants, which help cities prepare to successfully compete for implementation grants in the future. Planning grants would be extremely useful for disadvantaged communities to fund the multiyear efforts required to successfully prepare and compete for climate action funding. The earlier cited examples of Norwalk and Artesia illustrate the success that is possible with advance planning.

Active Transportation Program (ATP) planning grants have been available to cities for many years, and the projects that result from those plans are most often successful in being awarded implementation funding because of the effort and community engagement that has been completed during the planning process. TCC grants offer limited planning funding on a much smaller scale (only three will be awarded in this cycle) and the availability of any planning money year to year is always in question. Given the complexity of TCC grants, planning grants should be available annually.

Three Gateway cities (Lynwood, Montebello and Paramount) included the development of a Climate Action Plan for their city as one of their top priorities, and expressed an interest in applying for a TCC planning grant. Four more included a general plan update to incorporate climate action goals and policies, and in total, 14 of the 26 Gateway cities expressed an interest in securing planning grants for these and other planning efforts.

At the time of ILG’s conference calls with cities in Task 4, it was doubtful whether TCC planning grants would be available in the current cycle, so technical assistance for that planning grant was not offered. The availability of TCC planning grants has since been announced, but only three are available for the entire state.

Collaborate with Los Angeles County to Seek AHSC Funding

Eleven cities expressed an interest in developing affordable housing with the help of AHSC funding, but many are challenged to attract affordable housing developers to invest in their disadvantaged communities. Los Angeles County and the COG are exploring a collaboration to assist in that effort which would allow them to secure AHSC funding for sustainable transportation improvements and programs as well as affordable housing. Los Angeles County was successful in securing funds for three affordable housing projects in the previous AHSC funding cycle. This continued collaboration could help Gateway cities to attract affordable housing development to compete for future rounds of AHSC funding.

Capitalize on Regional Projects and Programs

Several regional programs and projects provide opportunities to incentivize and focus efforts within the Gateway sub-region to guide investments and access to climate action funding going forward, particularly in support of AHSC and TCC projects.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) provides guidance in determining the total number of new homes cities need to build and how affordable those homes need to be in order to meet the housing needs of people at all income levels. As such, RHNA provides an incentive for cities to
partner with affordable housing developers to pursue AHSC funding which could help them meet their allocation requirements.

The West Santa Ana Branch Transit Corridor, the LA River/Lower LA River Revitalization Plan, and the 710 Freeway early action projects also provide synergistic opportunities within the Gateway to expand affordable housing, achieve greenhouse gas reductions through transportation improvements, and encourage mixed-use economic development within cities individually and collectively within those project areas. Given the limited capacity of individual cities, reimagining funding processes to support collaborative project development that maintains cities’ autonomy and control would be a worthwhile effort to ensure that disadvantaged communities are able to capitalize on these longer-term regional projects which are currently being planned.

Provide Focused Technical Assistance for Gateway’s Disadvantaged Communities

The experience of cities throughout the state demonstrates that technical assistance is key to successfully securing funds, and should be continued. A study of the AHSC program specifically found that those cities that received comprehensive technical assistance overwhelmingly outcompeted those who did not. Further, the study acknowledged that projects serving disadvantaged communities were less likely to make it to the full application stage at all without technical assistance.

The experience in the Gateway Cities has demonstrated that more than remote technical assistance is needed to help disadvantaged communities do the heavy lift to qualify and apply for climate action funding programs that often require multiyear efforts. This is particularly true for cities that do not experience sustained multiyear leadership.

Gateway cities shared that they most often rely on the COG to provide information and support in identifying which climate action funding is available, but the COG also has limited capacity to keep abreast of the details of each climate action fund and each city’s ongoing needs that align with those funds. This gap between the availability of climate action funds and identifying how each city can fund or provide matching funds for priority projects needs to be closed. This project has been a good first step as a method to make cities aware of the variety of climate action funding programs available and how they may fit cities’ existing needs. However, their limited capacity makes it unlikely

---

5 Autumn Bernstein, MS candidate UC Davis Institute for Transportation Studies, UC Davis Report to the Strategic Growth Council, Evaluation of the Technical Assistance Pilot for the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Grant Program, July 2017.
that this information will be helpful beyond the scope of this project, when new funding becomes available in the future.

Ongoing Climate Action Funding Workshops for the Gateway Cities, similar to the AHSC workshop, attended by relevant state staff and technical advisors, can help these disadvantaged communities to connect the dots between available funding and their current and future needs. But it still requires further effort to provide real technical assistance for the multi-year multi-step process to get projects ready to compete for this funding.

The Strategic Growth Council could allocate a portion of the statewide technical assistance budget to fund localized technical assistance for disadvantaged communities within the Gateway Cities sub-region as a three-year pilot program. Such a pilot would be useful in assessing an approach that specifically prepares disadvantaged communities to equitably compete for this funding. A three-year investment to fund localized technical assistance within the COG structure would provide a sustained level of support to help Gateway cities become more familiar with the many climate action funding programs available and to incorporate regular multiyear planning and preparation to successfully compete for that funding over time.

CONCLUSION

The primary purpose of this Gateway Cities Climate Action Opportunity Assessment and Readiness Plan is to build capacity within the Gateway Cities’ disadvantaged communities to compete effectively for climate action grant funding now, and in the future. It builds on the completion of the Gateway Climate Action Planning (CAP) Framework which provides cities with the data to develop their own Climate Action Plan, and tools to calculate and monitor GHG emissions reductions within their respective cities.

The Gateway Cities COG is positioned to provide cities with some of the support that they need as this project has demonstrated, but the COG too is limited in its capacity to provide the level of support required to ensure each city’s ability to successfully compete for climate action funding. As noted, there are low- and no-cost opportunities to address the challenges that disadvantaged communities face in accessing climate action funding, including more predictable annual funding cycles and developing climate action funding fact sheets. And there are opportunities to partner with more resourced agencies.
like Los Angeles County who are supportive of collaborating with Gateway cities to help secure AHSC funding for affordable housing.

However, given the unique challenges and characteristics of the Gateway Cities sub-region, there is also an opportunity to explore whether some form of off-the-top funding could address the inequity that the very nature of the cap-and-trade process may create. And given that the majority of climate action funding will continue to be made available on a competitive basis, these disadvantaged communities should also receive targeted localized technical assistance for at least three years. Multyear technical assistance is needed to build the capacity of these cities to follow through on the multyear process required to successfully compete for the most resourced climate action funding programs. These equitable investments are meaningful steps to address the inequity that is inherent within the cap-and-trade program.
The City of Artesia

August 2019
Growing Sustainable Communities
Funding Opportunity Milestones

UG: Urban Greening
AHSC: Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities*
TCC: Transforming Climate Communities*
EEM: Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation*
SB2: Building Homes and Jobs Act
SPP: Statewide Park Development and Community Revitalization Program

* Annual appropriations

- Technical assistance workshops are available between Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) release and the application due date
- Proposals are accepted from the date NOFA is released
- Disclaimer: dates are subject to change. Please check individual program’s websites and sign up for email updates.
City of Artesia Potential Projects

Artesia Botanical Garden
The City of Artesia acquired approximately 1.43 acres of land to be converted into public greenspace. The city’s vision is to create a mini Griffith Park with ample green space and community amenities. In order to achieve this vision, the city needs to remove select existing trees, plant new trees to increase the density of the tree canopy, design a new water supply system, install new wells, identify additional carbon-neutral infrastructure and construct new recreation features.

**Funding Need:** Total project cost: $8,500,00.00.

**Potential Funding Source:** Statewide Parks Development and Community Revitalization (Statewide Park Program or SPP) Grant (August 5, 2019).

**Readiness to Apply:** Ready. The city started an application for the Statewide Park Program (SPP) grant and completed community outreach. Jeremy Bates, City of Artesia Management Analyst, is working closely with the ILG team to develop, enhance and complete the SPP grant application. This application has been submitted.

**Capacity Building Strategies:** Consider leveraging the language in the drafted grant application and other successful proposals for future grant applications.

Historic District Recreational Trails
The City of Artesia, in partnership with the Los Angeles Conservation Corps and Artesia Historical Society, plans to develop vacant, undeveloped sections of Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority land into recreational bicycle/pedestrian trails anchored by the trailhead at the city’s two historic buildings. The grounds will provide community space for recreation and opportunities to highlight the community’s history and culture. The Historic District Recreational Trails project seeks to expand green space in an urban, critically underserved community.

**Funding Need:** Total Project Cost: $2,010,250.
- Funds Needed: $1,364,600.
- Funds Secured: $1,000,000 bond funds, $300,000 (LACRPOSD grant), $181,000 County Distributed Transportation Funding, $32,000 (Transportation Development Act Article 3 Bike/Pedestrian Funds).

**Potential Funding Source:** Trails and Greenways Grant Program (August 29, 2019).

**Readiness to Apply:** Ready. The city previously applied for a Cultural, Community and Natural Resources Grant which will serve as a source of narrative and language for the Trails and Greenways Grant application.

**Capacity Building Strategies:** Consider building upon completed grant application language for this proposal, incorporating community challenges and need and demonstrating the potential
opportunities for community engagement and environmental and community benefits. Utilize data from CalEnviro Screen and other sources to strengthen the narrative.

**Tree Planting Program**
The City of Artesia seeks to develop a Tree Planting Program to create a healthy, sustainable urban forest in the city. Elements of the program will include an updated tree inventory and Urban Forest Master Plan.

**Funding Need:** Received $878,336.56 in funding.

**Potential Funding Source:** Urban & Community Forestry Grant Program.

**Readiness to Apply:** Grant awarded!

**Capacity Building Strategies:** Consider becoming a Tree City USA through the Arbor Day Foundation.

**Fleet Electrification**
The City of Artesia seeks to convert its current fleet to electric vehicles. The city applied for and received funding for an electric bus, which will arrive in August. The city is working on installing the charging station for this bus and seeks to include additional charging stations for light duty trucks and other city vehicles.

**Funding Need:** TBD depending on size and scope of the project.

**Potential Funding Sources:** Clean Vehicle Rebate Project, Low Carbon Transportation Investments and Air Quality Improvement Program, California Energy Commission, Southern California Edison, South Coast Air Quality Management District.

**Readiness to Apply:** Developing readiness. The city needs to identify scope and size of the project.

**Capacity Building Strategies:** Contact your SCE Account Manager or call 1-800-990-7788 to discuss electrification opportunities.

**North Artesia Green Streets**
The City of Artesia seeks to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by improving walkability and traffic circulation on two major streets in the north end of the city. The city seeks to repave the associated alleyways with permeable concrete.

**Funding Need:** TBD.

**Potential Funding Source:** Green Infrastructure Grant Program, Urban and Community Forestry Grant Program, Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program, Urban Greening Grant Program, Active Transportation Grant Program.

**Readiness to Apply:** Developing Readiness. The city has a priority list of alleys that need repaving and vegetation management. ILG discussed narrowing the priority list to alleys that could be a good fit for plantings, partial decommissioning and walkability improvements. ILG
recommends pursuing the Urban Greening Grant (if budgeted in 2020) as it provides the most project flexibility.

**Capacity Building Strategies:** ILG suggests working with the community and local partners to discuss potential features for the revamped alleys including lighting, safety, arts and more. To be competitive for the Urban Greening grant, ILG suggests that the city considers connecting the alleys through a community art trail or pathway and incorporate drought tolerant plantings, bioswales, permeable and/or light colored pavement and other green infrastructure multiple benefits. The Trust for Public Land completed a green alley project in Avalon, and in other cities nationwide. See case studies of completed alley revitalization projects here: [https://www.tpl.org/sites/default/files/files_upload/ca-green-alley-avalon-green-alleys-demo-project.pdf](https://www.tpl.org/sites/default/files/files_upload/ca-green-alley-avalon-green-alleys-demo-project.pdf)

**Digitize Records and Permitting Systems**
The city is looking to expand its Transit Oriented Development (TOD) zone around the West Santa Ana Station to create additional housing opportunities throughout the city of approximately 17,000 residents. The goal is to maintain retail areas, but the city also wants to facilitate housing production and streamline permitting for development. The city also seeks to digitize its records and create an ADU housing ordinance.

**Funding Need:** $160,000.


**Readiness to Apply:** Ready. The city is working with a planning consultant to identify opportunities for housing around the West Santa Ana station. Per our conversation during the SB2 technical assistance workshop, the city will send its current RFP to PlaceWorks to help project cost for additional work needed to expand the TOD zone.

**Capacity Building Strategies:** Keep businesses and residents informed as the project moves forward. Explore partnerships that help expand and improve local housing opportunities while supporting workforce education and training for the construction trades.
What is the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program?
AHSC is a competitive program that provides grants and affordable housing loans for capital projects and community programs that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Projects can include:

- Compact, transit-oriented affordable housing developments (new construction or renovation)
- Housing-Related Infrastructure;
- Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure;
- Transportation-Related Amenities; and/or
- Community Benefits Programs.

Who is Eligible to Apply?
Local governments, transportation and transit agencies, housing developers, joint powers authorities, schools, college and university districts, nonprofits, federally recognized Native American tribes.

What is an Eligible AHSC Project?
To be eligible, all projects must be within one mile of a transit stop (or a half-mile for projects with affordable housing components) and generally must demonstrate a reduction in vehicle miles traveled and include components that significantly reduce GHG emissions. Eligible projects must also include at least two of the following:

1. Affordable housing development and/or housing related infrastructure
   Housing projects must meet minimum density requirements, include at least 20% of total rental or owner-occupied residential units as affordable units and be located within 0.5 miles of a rail station or bus stop that serves a transit line with two or more departures during peak hours.

2. Sustainable transportation infrastructure and/or transportation-related amenities
   Transportation infrastructure projects must have a “qualifying transit” stop or station with at least two departures during peak hours. Eligible transportation infrastructure projects include bike lanes, pedestrian crossings, improved walkways to transit stations, upgraded stations and technology and other improvements that encourage residents to walk, bike and/or use public transportation.

3. Community benefits programs
   Besides transportation and housing, eligible projects can also incorporate programs that provide community benefits by promoting safety, increasing ridership, decreasing air pollution and developing the workforce.

What Does a Successful AHSC Project Look Like?
PATH Metro Villas Phase 2, City of Los Angeles
($13.7 million)
This 100% affordable housing project will provide 122 residential units. Sustainable transportation infrastructure,
services and amenities include metro, bus rapid transit, sidewalk improvements and a bike-enhanced network that includes sidewalk repair, curb ramps, tree replacement, pedestrian signals and bike-sharing. The project will also provide significant case management and supportive services for residents transitioning out of homelessness.

San Diego Downtown Mobility Plan and 14/Commercial TOD Apartments ($19,999,999)
This project will implement a phase of the Downtown San Diego Mobility Plan that will provide bicycle connectivity throughout downtown San Diego by installing over two miles of Class IV Cycletrack, over a half mile of walkway upgrades and a road diet treatment (roads designed to accommodate all potential users including bicyclists, drivers, transit riders and pedestrians of every age and ability). The project will provide 407 units, 270 of which will be permanent supportive housing units, next to a transit station. Circulate San Diego will provide workshops on bicycle and pedestrian safety, as well as transit access programming for residents.

What is the Anticipated Application Timeline?
Round 5 of AHSC funding is expected to begin soon. Interested applicants should start planning now to meet the following key milestones:
- Revised program guidelines: Summer 2019
- Notice of funding availability (NOFA): Fall 2019
- NOFA workshops: Fall 2019
- Application due: late 2019/early 2020
- Award: Summer 2020

How Much Funding is Available?
In 2018, the program awarded $255 million to 19 projects. The maximum award amount cannot exceed $20 million. Projects that are located in and benefit the top 25% disadvantaged communities per CalEnviroScreen3.0 and AB 1550 low-income communities will receive priority funding. At least 50% of the AHSC program funds will be awarded to projects with an affordable housing component. During the first four cycles, funds were awarded to projects with an affordable housing component.

How can Applicants Maximize Their Score?
Go Green. Reducing GHGs in a cost-efficient manner compared to other applicants could boost the application score.

Coordinate Housing and Transportation. A significant portion of points will be awarded based on meaningful housing and transportation collaboration.

Engage your community and address climate resiliency. Applicants should engage community stakeholders early to identify community needs and the project components that can potentially address them.

After Selecting an Eligible Project — What’s Next?
Start Early
- Read the program guidelines to identify application requirements and scoring criteria.
- Review past successful applications to understand the scope and complexity of previously awarded projects.
- Identify potential community partners and leveraged funding.
- Check out the AHSC Benefits Calculator Tool (available on CARB website) that you will need to estimate your project’s GHG and VMT reductions.

Stay Informed
- Sign up for the Strategic Growth Council e-Lists to receive timely information about technical assistance workshops, webinars, deadlines, updated program guidelines, etc. http://sgc.ca.gov/

Make Sure Your Project is “Shovel Ready”
- Demonstrate site control, including environmental and land use compliance.
- Adopt resolutions and sign partnership agreements.

Set Aside Time to Prepare Budgets and Complete the Application
- You will need to submit separate budgets for each component of the project.
- The AHSC application may require up to 40 hours to complete.

Contact Coral Abbott at the Strategic Growth Council with questions regarding your potential project (916) 322-6072 Coral.Abbott@SGC.CA.GOV

For more detailed information regarding project eligibility, scoring criteria and related requirements refer to the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program guidelines: http://sgc.ca.gov/programs/ahsc/resources/
What is the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program?
The Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) Program provides grants for projects that contribute to mitigation of the environmental effects of transportation facilities, including:

- Urban forestry projects designed to offset carbon dioxide emissions from vehicles.
- Resource land acquisition or enhancement projects within or near the right-of-way of transportation improvements.
- Mitigation projects beyond the scope of the lead agency that is responsible for assessing the environmental impacts of a proposed transportation improvement.

Who is Eligible to Apply?
Local, state and federal agencies and 503(c)(3) nonprofits are eligible to apply for grant funding under this program. Each agency can submit one Related Transportation Facility (RTF) per application.

What is an Eligible EEM Project?
Eligible projects must mitigate the environmental impacts of either an existing RTF built after January 1, 2019 or the construction of a new RTF facility with dedicated funding.

What is an RTF? An RTF is a public street, highway, or mass transit guideway such as trains, ports, light rail lines, airports, or other additions such as park and ride facilities, transit stations or HOV lanes, among others.

An RTF mitigation project cannot be a maintenance project such as painting or resurfacing streets or a standalone mitigation project such as the construction of a sound wall.

Eligible R as Councils of Governments, Municipal Transportation Agencies, or Caltrans. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) must be completed at time of project submission.

Tip: Contact the relevant lead agency for the RTF early in the application process to understand eligible RTFs in your area and to request a letter to submit with your project proposal.

The proposed mitigation project must include implementation activities and cannot be a planning project. However, planning can be part of an implementation project.

For acquisition projects, the property must be acquired at or below fair market value. Tip: The acquisition does not have to be in place by the application submission date but the proposal must discuss the status. Acquisition can be for conserving, protecting, or restoring property. The proposed project does not have to develop the property.

The application must include how the RTF has had a negative impact on the environment and how the project directly or indirectly mitigates the impact.

Eligible projects must be within one of the following categories:

1. Urban forestry
   - Example: Permeable walking paths, planting drought-tolerant trees

2. Resource lands
   - Example: Dam removal, creek restoration

3. Mitigation project beyond the scope of the lead agency
   - Example: Mitigation is beyond the jurisdiction’s authority
   - Projects in this category must cover urban forestry or resource lands
   Tip: Contact EEM program staff early in the process to see if your proposed project is eligible.
What Does a Successful Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Project Look Like?

Stanfield Marsh Outdoor Recreation and Education Project, City of Big Bear ($331,388). This project contains trails with native trees, natural landscaping, bioswales, and a stormwater-clarifying system. The project will extend the current wooden trail system with an ADA-compliant pedestrian trail.

What is the Anticipated Application Timeline?
The next round of the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation funding is expected to be available in spring 2020. Interested applicants should start planning no later than January 2020 to meet the following anticipated milestones based on previous years’ schedules:

- Concept proposal: June 2020
- Site visits: late summer 2020 (exact date set by the California Natural Resource Agency for qualifying projects only)
- Submission of supporting documentation: Fall 2020 (qualifying projects only)
- Projects awarded: Spring 2021

How Much Funding is Available?

- $6.7 million is allocated annually by the legislature Tax Account.
- Grants are available for $500,000, with up to $1,000,000 for acquisition projects.
- Matching funds are not required, however project proposals that include other funding or in-kind sources may be more competitive.

How Can Applicants Maximize Their Score?

Demonstrate Potential Impact. Make a clear connection between how the problem caused by the RTF will be mitigated by the proposed project and how the project will achieve carbon sequestration or offset greenhouse gas emissions.

Provide Multiple Benefits. will net your project application a higher score. Multiple savings, increased habitat, access to outdoor recreation, opportunities for community stewardship, and economic, social and health benefits. Tip: Be sure to answer the "Other Benefits" question on the application.

Plant Native and Drought-Tolerant Species. Incorporate native and appropriate low water plants into the project plan, which require less water and provide vital habitat for birds and other wildlife. If the project does not include low water plants, explain why.

Engage Stakeholders and the Community. Summarize discussions with key stakeholders, property owners, and relevant agencies. For example, if rail crosses the proposed project property, show you have spoken with the railroad agency. Detail community engagement plans as appropriate and discuss plans for donated labor or volunteer engagement to reduce costs.

Be ‘Shovel Ready’. Site control can stop a project in its tracks. Demonstrate site control, provide preliminary designs, environmental compliance documentation and/or seller letters (for acquisition projects).

Demonstrate Capacity. Provide information about your organization’ with similar projects; disclose additional previous state agency grants awarded, signed MOUs, etc.

I Think I Have an Eligible Project – What’s Next?

Start Early

- Read the program guidelines to identify application requirements and scoring criteria.
- Review past successful applications to understand the project scope and complexity that may be required.
- Identify potential community partners.

Receive Timely Information

- Sign up for the California Natural Resources Agency listserv to receive timely information about technical assistance workshops, webinars or updated program deadlines http://resources.ca.gov/grants/environmental-enhancement-and-mitigation-eem/.

Leverage Existing Funds (or In-kind Contributions)

- Leveraged funds (or in-kind contributions) will make a project application more competitive. If you are not leveraging funds, explain why in the application.

Contact Larelle Burkham-Greydanus, grant administrator at the California Natural Resources Agency with any questions regarding your potential project (916) 651-7590 Larelle.Burkham-Greydanus@resources.ca.gov

For more detailed information regarding project eligibility, scoring criteria and related requirements refer to the EEM program guidelines: http://resources.ca.gov/grants/environmental-enhancement-and-mitigation-eem/
What are the Transformative Climate Communities Implementation Grants?

Transformative Climate Communities (TCC) Implementation Grants fund community-led, neighborhood-level development and infrastructure projects that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and achieve major environmental, health and economic benefits in California’s most disadvantaged communities. A collection of individual but interconnected climate projects are woven together in a robust community program. The projects are developed in collaboration with the community to address local housing, transit, urban greening, energy/water efficiency, land conservation and other local needs.

Who is eligible to apply?

Any collaborative of community residents, businesses, nonprofits, regional agencies, academics, and faith-based organizations that form a collaborative stakeholder structure may apply. A local or regional public agency must act as the lead applicant or co-applicant and the stakeholder collaborative must have a minimum of two partners.

What is an Eligible TCC Project?

An eligible TCC project must include a minimum of three integrated projects with quantifiable GHG reductions addressing at least three of the following TCC Program strategies:

- Equitable housing and neighborhood development.
- Transit access and mobility.
- Decarbonized energy and energy efficiency.
- Water efficiency.
- Material management.
- Urban greening and infrastructure.

Projects must also meet all of the following requirements:

- Reduce GHG emissions and provide community benefits.
- Implement policies to avoid displacement of existing households and other small businesses.
- Ensure community engagement.
- Increase resiliency of the project area to the anticipated impacts from climate change.
- Increase workforce and economic development.
- Have matching funds of at least 50% from local and/or private sectors.

Examples of Individual TCC Projects:

- Affordable housing
- Transit stations and facilities
- Bicycle and car share programs
- Residential weatherization and solar projects
- Drought tolerant landscaping
- Irrigation system retrofits
- Residential weatherization and solar projects
- Building retrofits
- Smart grid technology
- Urban greening and green infrastructure projects
- Food waste recycling and composting
- Waste-to-energy projects
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Low-carbon transit vehicles and clean vehicle rebates
- Sustainable soils and irrigation practices
- Restoration of urban streams
- Community gardens
- Small recreational facilities
What Does a Successful TCC Project Look Like?

Green Together: Pacoima-Sun Valley, Los Angeles ($23 million)
This project creates a unique plan for a green, socially inclusive and climate-resilient neighborhood by integrating urban greening, clean transportation and energy projects, job training and displacement strategies to protect the community from heat, improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote equity. The stakeholder collaborative includes the City of Los Angeles, the Trust for Public Land, Pacoima Beautiful, GRID Alternatives LA, the Los Angeles Business Council, the Los Angeles Conservation Corps and the Los Angeles Clean Tech Incubator.

What is the Anticipated Application Timeline?
Round 3 of TCC funding is expected to begin soon. Interested applicants should start planning now to meet the following key milestones:
• Revised program guidelines: Summer 2019
• Application release and notice of funding availability: Fall 2019
• Applications due: late 2019/early 2020
• Award: Winter 2020

How Much Funding is Available?
In the previous two funding cycles, five projects received an average of $29 million (with the exception of the Transform Fresno that received $70 million).

How Can Applicants Maximize Their Score?
Go Green. Significantly reducing quantifiable GHG emissions compared to the other project applicants will increase your project application points.
Build a strong collaborative structure. Having a well-coordinated collaborative structure with a clear vision, objectives and strategies will net your project application a higher score.
Create a neighborhood transformation. Transformative strategies such as displacement avoidance, community engagement, workforce and economic development, climate adaptation and resiliency analysis are worth one-third of the total maximum score.

Demonstrate Capacity to Implement ‘Shovel Ready’ Projects. Have a strong budget and work plan and long-term operational and maintenance plans. Make it evident that all members of the collaborative stakeholder structure have sound financial, management and organizational capacity to implement the ‘shovel ready’ projects.

I Think I Have an Eligible Project — What’s Next?
Start Early
• Read the program guidelines to identify application requirements and scoring criteria.
• Review past successful applications to understand the scope that may be required.

Stay Informed
Sign up for the Strategic Growth Council E-Lists to receive timely information about technical assistance workshops, webinars, deadlines, updated program guidelines, etc. http://sgc.ca.gov/.

Coordinate, Integrate and Transform
• Review each of the collaborative partners’ policy priorities and community needs to develop a shared vision.
• Ensure that the mix of projects is not at odds with future projects planned by local agencies.
• Identify leveraged funding opportunities. Make a clear distinction between projects funded by the TCC Program and projects funded by other sources.
• Prioritize strong engagement of disadvantaged community members and stakeholders to identify the community needs and project components that address them.

Contact Saharnaz Mirzazad at the Strategic Growth Council with questions regarding your potential project Saharnaz.Mirzazad@sgc.ca.gov

For more detailed information about project eligibility, scoring criteria and related requirements, refer to the Transformative Climate Communities Program guidelines: http://sgc.ca.gov/programs/tcc/
What is the Urban Greening Grant Program?
The Urban Greening Grant Program is a competitive program that supports projects that reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by:

- Establishing, enhancing and expanding neighborhood parks and community space.
- Greening public lands, streets, alleyways and rooftops using natural solutions to improve air and water quality, and/or reduce energy consumption.
- Creating walkable and bikeable trails that enable residents to safely access work, schools and commercial centers without having to drive automobiles.
- Mitigating heat islands.

Who Is Eligible to Apply? Cities, counties, non-profit organizations, joint powers authorities and special districts are eligible to apply.

What is an Eligible Urban Greening Project?
Eligible projects must do at least one of the following:

1. Acquire, create, or enhance community parks and green spaces; and/or
2. Use natural systems or systems that mimic natural systems to achieve multiple benefits.

Eligible projects must have at least one GHG reduction activity including:

1. Sequester or store carbon by planting trees;
2. Reduce building energy use by strategically planting trees that shade buildings; and/or
3. Reduce community Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by constructing bicycle paths and lanes, and/or pedestrian facilities that provide safe routes for travel between residences, workplaces, commercial centers and schools.

What Does a Successful Urban Greening Project Look Like?
Lynwood Urban Bicycle Trail, City of Lynwood ($2,853,000) This project will improve the city’s cycling connections and provide safe routes for cyclists. The trail will feature sustainable green elements, lighting, permeable pavers and bioswales designed to remove silt and pollution from surface runoff water.

What is the Anticipated Application Timeline?
Round 3 of Urban Greening funding is expected to begin soon. Interested applicants should start planning no later than Fall 2019 to meet the following key milestones:

- Revised program guidelines: Winter 2019
- NOFA release: January 2020

The application process includes three phases:

» Concept proposal: January 2020
» Site visits: April - June (qualifying projects only)
Submission of supporting documentation (if selected): July - September

Grant awards announced: November 2020

How Much Funding is Available?

$19 million was awarded through the Urban Greening Program in 2019. A minimum of 75% of the Urban Greening Program funds will be awarded each funding cycle to projects located within the top 25% disadvantaged communities per CalEnviroScreen3.0 and AB 1550 low-income communities. More than 90% of funds have been awarded to disadvantaged communities during the first two funding cycles.

How can Applicants Maximize Their Score?

Go Green. Significantly reducing GHGs compared to the other project applicants in each cycle will greatly increase your project application score.

Benefit Disadvantaged / Low Income Communities. Additional points will be awarded to projects located within, and benefiting, disadvantaged and low-income communities.

Provide Multiple Benefits. Providing multiple benefits will net your project application a higher score. Multiple benefits include, but are not limited to, economic, social and health benefits.

Develop Partnerships. Applicants should identify relevant partners early and engage community stakeholders to identify needs, project components and additional benefits. Potential partners may include other agencies, non-profits, schools, local businesses or community based organizations.

Demonstrate Capacity. Provide information about your organization’s previous experience with similar projects; disclose additional fiscal sponsors, list previous state agency grants, signed MOUs, etc.

Be ‘Shovel Ready’. Provide preliminary project designs, permits, environmental compliance documentation, and/or seller letters (for land acquisition projects). Review your city’s Capital Improvement Program to ensure the proposed project would be included in the long-term operational plan.

After Selecting an Eligible Project — What’s Next?

Start Early

- Read the program guidelines to identify application requirements and scoring criteria.
- Review past successful applications to understand the project scope and complexity that may be required.
- Identify potential community partners.

Receive Timely Information

- Sign up for the California Natural Resources Agency listserv to receive timely information about technical assistance workshops, webinars, deadlines, updated program guidelines, etc. http://resources.ca.gov/grants/urban-greening/

Leverage Existing Funds (or In-kind Contributions)

- Leveraged funds (and in-kind contributions) will make a project application more competitive. If you are not leveraging funds, explain why in the application.

Tell the Story about How Your Project Creates Multiple Benefits

- Describe more than just the obvious project benefits, such as planting trees or creating a bike path. Explain how your project will also contribute to benefits like:
  - Reducing air and water pollution or energy consumption;
  - Increasing safety and physical activity; or
  - Improving mental health and local job opportunities.

Plant Native Species

- Native species require less water and provide vital habitat for birds and other wildlife.

Contact Melissa Jones, grant administrator at the California Natural Resources Agency, with any questions regarding your potential project (916) 651-7583, Melissa.Jones@resources.ca.gov

For more detailed information regarding project eligibility, scoring criteria and related requirements refer to the Urban Greening Program guidelines: http://resources.ca.gov/grants/urban-greening/
Announcement of Availability of Senate Bill 2 Funds

Senate Bill 2, adopted in 2017, establishes a permanent source of funding to increase affordable housing stock. The funding for this year includes approximately $125 million for financial and technical assistance to local governments to update planning documents to streamline housing production.

The funds will be distributed on an “over the counter”, non-competitive basis to eligible jurisdictions. To be eligible, jurisdictions must have a Certified Housing Element, 2017 or 2018 Annual Progress Report submitted to HCD, and a few other requirements.

The application form will be released March 29, 2019.

Applications can be submitted April 1 to November 30, 2019. (may be extended)

Eligible Activities

Jurisdictions selecting priority policy areas will receive a smoother, faster, and easier process.

Priority Policy Areas:

» Rezone to permit by-right
» Objective design and development standards
» Specific plans or form based codes coupled with CEQA streamlining
» Accessory dwelling units or other innovative building strategies
» Expedited processing
» Innovative housing finance, fees or infrastructure strategies

Eligible projects include but are not limited to:

» Targeted general plan updates
» Community plans and specific plans
» Zoning updates
» Environmental analyses that eliminate the need for project-specific review

Technical Assistance

Along with HCD, a consultant team led by PlaceWorks has been contracted to assist with:

» SB 2 planning grant application assistance
  › Grant writing (limited)
  › Review of ideas and draft applications
  › Identification of eligible activities
» Housing element compliance
» Annual progress reports

Los Angeles County Regional Liaisons

Jonathan Nettler
JNettler@PlaceWorks.com
(213) 623-1443

Colin Drukker
CDrukker@PlaceWorks.com
(714) 966-9220

For more information, email SB2PlanningGrant@HCD.CA.gov
Funding Sources by Project Type

**ADA Improvements**
AHSC will fund housing developments that are looking to do substantial rehabilitation (including things like ADA improvements or energy upgrades), but only in the case that there has been a full transfer of ownership from one entity to another entity with no overlap in ownership structure. However, if a developer or housing authority seeks to make ADA improvements to a development in their existing housing stock, that cannot be funded under the AHSC program.

**Bike Lanes**
Urban Greening grants do cover bike paths, bike lanes and pedestrian facilities that provide safe routes for travel between residences, workplaces, commercial centers and schools.

**Climate Action Planning**
There are currently no state funding programs to support Climate Action Planning. However, the Gateway Cities Regional Climate Action Planning Framework provides many elements a city would need to get started including a GHG inventory, locally-based GHG reduction strategies and even a model Climate Action Plan. If your city does not have the internal capacity for this project, you may choose to get additional support from ICLEI USA, a CivicSpark fellow or a private consultant to assist with public engagement efforts, writing the document and/or the CEQA elements needed to complete a climate action plan.

For information on how ICLEI can assist, contact Hoi-Fei Mok at 510-596-4331, hoi-fei.mok@iclei.org. For information about CivicSpark, contact Kif Scheuer at 916-448-1198 x312, kscheuer@lgc.org. For information about the toolkit/private consulting, contact Jeff Caton at 510-463-6743, jCaton@esaassoc.com.

**Electric Vehicle Infrastructure**
There are several programs offered by Southern California Edison (SCE) and the California Energy Commission that can help cities develop electric vehicle infrastructure. SCE’s Charge Ready Program supports the deployment of a minimum of 10 charging stations per site (five in disadvantaged communities). The applicant must own, lease or operate a site that provides long term parking. The program provides all electric infrastructure costs related to the new circuit and rebates to offset some or all of the costs for the charging stations and their installation. Find more information here. SCE also has a program that can help cities convert their fleet. The California Energy Commission and the California Air Resources Board are two state agencies that often provide grant funding to support electric vehicle programs. Funding and timelines for these programs vary based on budget allocations. For additional details about how cities have been deploying EV infrastructure, see ILG’s article in the February 2018 issue of Western City Magazine.

**Energy Efficiency Projects**
Southern California Regional Energy Network (SoCal REN) provides public agencies with services to support energy efficiency projects, including audits, technical services, financing support, simplified procurement and incentive application support. SoCal REN’s Pathway to Zero Program provides a comprehensive view of energy opportunities for facilities in disadvantaged communities including energy efficiency and distributed energy resources. Click here for more information. For cities involved in Southern California Energy Leaders Program, please contact your local representative.

**General Plan Updates**
SB 2 Planning dollars can be used to support several elements of a General Plan update including the land use, housing and community design elements if there is a clear nexus as to how the activities
proposed in the grant will lead to the increase of housing production. The grant dollars can also support public engagement efforts and consultants that can assist in the project. The deadline for this grant is November 30, 2019 and all deliverables (ex: an adopted General Plan) must be complete by June 30, 2022. PlaceWorks is offering technical assistance for this program. Please contact Jonathan Nettler at JNettler@PlaceWorks.com.

**Housing - Homelessness**

**SB2** created a new reliable source of funding for affordable homes through a $75 fee on the recording of certain types of real estate documents. It is estimated that the bill will generate roughly $250 million each year. Of the revenue generated between Jan 2018-Dec 2018, half will go toward reducing homelessness and half will go directly to local governments to update community plans in order to improve neighborhood quality and spur housing growth where it makes most sense. [Additional information about SB2 can be found here](#). Additional funding has been allocated to the continuums of care throughout the state. [Find out more about the Los Angeles Continuum of Care here](#).

**Housing - Seniors**

The AHSC program funds senior housing. However, because the Quantification Methodology calculates reductions in GHG from reductions in driving, and seniors drive less to begin with, senior projects tend to score lower in the GHG category. Refer to the AHSC Round 3 awarded project “3268 San Pablo,” for an example of a successful application that involves senior housing.

**Irrigation**

The Urban Greening Grant Program does include funding for irrigation as part of a larger project. For projects with additional irrigation, applicants will need to provide a Water Budget Workbook for new and rehabilitated landscapes.

**Land Clean Up**

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency offers various types of [brownfield grant programs](#). The agency is hosting the 2019 National Brownfields in Los Angeles on December 11-13, 2019. For more information on this federal resource [can be found here](#). The California EPA recently launched its Environmental Justice Small Grants Program, which provides $50,000 in funding for a 12-month period to non-profit organizations to address environmental justice issues in areas disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and hazards. [Click here for more information](#).

**Purchase/ Property Acquisition**

Urban Greening Grants can be used to acquire property to create, enhance or expand community parks and green space.
Additional Resources

Gateway Cities COG CAP Framework
The Gateway Cities Regional Climate Action Planning Framework was designed to help cities in the region develop a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It includes almost everything a city would need to put together its own climate action plan, such as a customized GHG inventory, regionally focused GHG reduction strategies and a model climate action plan. The framework even includes a toolkit for helping cities incorporate public engagement and climate adaptation strategies. www.gatewaycog.org/initiatives-and-projects/climate-action-planning-framework

ILG’s Beacon Program
The Institute for Local Government’s Beacon Program provides a framework for cities and counties to share best practices and get recognition for their sustainability achievements. The program honors voluntary efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, save energy and adopt policies that promote sustainability. To join, a city must fill out an online application and pass a council resolution. In addition to award recognition, the Beacon Program participants receive monthly emails notifying them of education and grant opportunities, along with year-round support from a friendly team of sustainability professionals. www.ca-ilg.org/BeaconProgram

ICLEI
SEEC ClearPath California is an all-in-one suite of online tools to help local agencies complete government operations and community-wide greenhouse gas inventories, forecasts and climate action plans. The tool was created by ICLEI and is now being offered at no cost to California local governments through the SEEC partnership. www.iclei.org/

Civic Spark
CivicSpark is a Governor’s Initiative AmeriCorps program dedicated to building capacity for local public agencies to address community resilience issues such as climate change, water resource management, housing and mobility. CivicSpark fellows can provide 11 months of quality capacity building support at a low cost to local governments. Appointments happen on an annual basis with service agreements usually running October through August. http://civicspark.lgc.org/join-civicspark/project/.
Gateway Cities Council of Governments

About the COG
The Gateway Cities Council of Governments’ mission is to improve the quality of life for the two million residents of Southeast Los Angeles County. Targeted initiatives include transportation planning, affordable housing, improving air quality, economic development and other community-enhancing activities. www.gatewaycog.org/
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Institute for Local Government

About ILG
The Institute for Local Government (ILG) is the nonprofit education and training affiliate of the League of California Cities, the California State Association of Counties and the California Special Districts Association. Its mission is to promote good government at the local level with practical, impartial and easy-to-use resources for California communities. www.ca-ilg.org
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VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM G
Report from the Gateway Water Management Authority
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Grace J. Kast, Executive Officer, Gateway Water Management Authority (GWMA)

SUBJECT: GWMA Activities

The Gateway Water Management Authority (GWMA) is the sister JPA agency to the Gateway Cities COG in charge of water and watershed-related coordination and activities. It is made up of 30 member cities, water agencies, and a port within the Gateway Region and is governed by a 30-member Board of Directors. This number increased by one since the last report due to Compton joining GWMA recently. The GWMA Board meets monthly on the 2nd Thursday at noon in Paramount at Progress Park.

Members are: Artesia, Avalon, Bell, Bell Gardens, Bellflower, Central Basin MWD, Cerritos, Commerce, Compton, Cudahy, Downey, Hawaiian Gardens, Huntington Park, La Mirada, Lakewood, Long Beach, Long Beach Water Dept., Port of Long Beach, Lynwood, Maywood, Montebello, Norwalk, Paramount, Pico Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, Signal Hill, South Gate, Vernon, Whittier, and Water Replenishment District of Southern California.

Currently, GWMA is going through a board member appointment process. This requires that governing boards from each of our members appoint a board member and up to 3 alternates for the next 2-year term. One of the recent changes to GWMA’s bylaws states that board members and alternates may continue in subsequent terms without being re-appointed by each member agency’s legislative body unless the member agency’s legislative body wishes to change the appointment at any time.

GWMA is also working with the COG to host a joint informational workshop tentatively scheduled on Thursday, November 7th from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. in the Clearwater Building Upstairs Board Room. This workshop will focus on recent headlines regarding groundwater contamination and is expected to include presentations from local and state experts.

As reported previously, GWMA continues to work on a grant application under the Integrated Regional Water Management Proposition 1 Grant Program administered by the State Dept. of Water Resources “DWR”. GWMA submitted two of its Gateway regional projects under this program which are: 1) Central Basin Municipal Water District’s Recycled Water Conversion for 10 Disadvantaged Community Connections; and 2) Catalina’s Desalination Storage and Distribution Project benefitting Disadvantaged Communities on the island. The process to finalize the application with DWR is expected to take several more months with awards from DWR being announced by the end of the calendar year 2019 or early 2020.
GWMA submitted a joint grant application for the Rivers and Mountains Conservancy Proposition 68 Regionwide Planning Grant through a 3-agency partnership between the Gateway Cities COG, GWMA, and the Watershed Conservation Authority. The project partners intend to develop a regional plan to identify projects that emphasize critical benefits to improve livability, and meet best management practices associated with urban greening and open space, watershed management, transportation, economy, public health and environment. The application seeks $500k. Awards are expected later this year.

**Recommended Action**

Receive and File.
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
 ITEM H
 Report from the I-710 Corridor Project
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Yvette Kirrin, COG Consulting Engineer

SUBJECT: I-710 Project Update

Environmental Review Process – Update

The 710 Technical Advisory Committee met during the month of September 2019. This was the second meeting of the year, which was last held in March 2019 and prior to that in September 2018. Updates on the 710 EIR/EIS status were presented, as well as the various freeway and non-freeway early action projects that are currently being delivered via Measure R funds by Metro and our local jurisdictions.

Environmental Review Process – Update

Regarding the 710 EIR/EIS, the project team is still working with EPA on an MOU for a Clean Truck Program as well as finalizing and getting approval for air quality conformity. The MOU partners include GCCOG, Metro, Caltrans and SCAG. While both the MOU and the Air Quality Conformity issues were expected to be resolved near year end of 2019, which would allow for the FEIR/FEIS to be released, the recent federal EPA mandate that voids the California special waiver that required higher emissions standards will likely delay our project and require a new air quality/emissions model run based on the new federal standards in order to get EPA approval. This could delay the project and additional year.

Local Early Action Funds – Update

Regarding local early action funds, there are still approximately $68 million available in the total Measure R allocation for 710 early action non-freeway program. The cities of Carson, Cudahy, Signal Hill and Compton have still to receive 710 early action Measure R funds to deliver an operational improvement within their jurisdiction. Metro has offered to deliver projects for jurisdictions that do not have the resources available to do so, and the GCCOG advocates the jurisdictions taking a vantage of this opportunity.

Recommended Action

Receive and file
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR

ITEM M

Matters from the League of California Cities
TO: Gateway Cities Council of Governments Board of Directors
FROM: Kristine Guerrero, Regional Public Affairs Manager, League of California Cities
kguerrero@cacities.org
SUBJECT: League of California Cities and Los Angeles County Division October Legislative and Advocacy Report

Events and Programs

LA County Division Annual Conference Lunch: Wednesday, October 16, noon-1:15pm, Hyatt Regency, Long Beach. Register at www.lacities.org.

Homelessness Policy Workshop: November 4, 2019, Sacramento. Hosted by the League of California Cities and the California State Association of Counties. Save the date-details to follow at www.cacities.org/events

Leadership Opportunity
Interested in being a part of the leadership in the League’s Los Angeles County Division? The League’s Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities is pleased to announce an opening on the Board of Directors: Due to an Unexpected Vacancy, the Nominating Committee is accepting letters of interest for the position of the State League Director. This individual will serve as the Division’s liaison to the State League and serves as a member of the Board of Directors’ Executive Committee. The State League Director position is for a two-year term. There are additional details in the attachment. City officials from any member city is eligible to submit a letter of interest. To be considered for the position, please send a letter indicating your interest along with a resume no later than Friday, October 4, 2019 to: Nominating Committee Chair c/o League of California Cities, Los Angeles County Division Email: jquan@cacities.org

Legislation and Advocacy
The legislature wrapped up its 2019 session on Friday, September 13 and sent a number of bills to Governor Newsom. The League of California Cities has identified the priority bills, and asks that cities not delay in sending signature and veto request letters. Please find brief descriptions and links to sample letters for each bill below.

Signature Requests
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 5 sample signature request letter
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 329 sample signature request letter

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 344 sample signature request letter

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. SB 531 sample signature request letter

Veto Requests

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. AB 931 sample veto request letter

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 1184 sample veto request letter

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. AB 1763 sample veto request letter

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 13 sample veto request letter

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 330 sample veto request letter

For additional information or resources on these items, contact Kristine Guerrero at kguerrero@cacities.org.
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM O
Matters from Eco-Rapid Transit (WSAB)
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Mike Kodama, Executive Director – Eco-Rapid Transit JPA

SUBJECT: Eco-Rapid Transit/West Santa Ana Branch (Eco-Rapid) Update – October - 2019

Background

Environmental Review Process
Corridor cities continue to work with the MTA on defining and addressing potential environmental impacts from the construction and operation of the WSAB/Eco-Rapid Light Rail.

In September, MTA staff issued a report to the Planning and programming Committee (Attachment “A”) as a milestone update. The update covered three areas:

A. Initial Operating Segments (IOS) Analysis
B. Planning process and delivery; and
C. Public/private partnership (P3) delivery procurement

This project is part of the Metro 28X28 Initiative and is designated as a “Pillar” project. Groundbreaking for the Project is anticipated to start as early as the beginning of 2022, with a revenue service date of 2028. Key environmental clearance process milestone dates include:

- Draft EIS/EIR Release December 2020
- Board Selects Locally Preferred Alternative April 2021

The project has different Measure M/LRTP opening dates that are dependent upon available funding; there is $1 billion (Measure M and other funds) for an FY 2028 opening and $3 billion (Measure M and other funds) for an FY 2041 opening. It is important to note that the estimated project costs exceed the $4 billion available. The current end-to-end project capital cost is estimated at $6.5-$6.6B (in 2018$).

In order to accelerate the project Metro is considering engaging a 3P partner and breaking down the project into two possible Initial Operating Segments (IOS). There is intent to build the entire project (from Artesia to Downtown LA) but 3P proposers will be offered IOS 1; from Artesia to the Metro Green Line. and IOS 2; from Artesia to the Metro Blue Line Slauson Station.

The EIS/EIR will study the entire project and the two IOS options. Metro Staff is optimistic that IOS 2 is feasible to fund and deliver by 2028 based on P3 market soundings and preliminary work on funding strategy options. Consideration of an IOS is a different strategy from previous plans where 3P financing was assumed to deliver the entire project from Artesia to DTLA. Funding strategy options for the end-to-end project and IOS will be
provided to the Board as part of the report back on the Pillar Projects later this year and at its February 2020 meeting.

**Recommended Action**

Receive and file
VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM Q
Request to from Metro Gateway Service Council
TO: Board of Directors, GCCOG Board of Directors

FROM: Julia Brown, Manager, Community Relations, Gateway Cities Area

SUBJECT: Matters from the Metro Gateway Cities Service Council

October 2019 Gateway COG Update on Metro Gateway Cities Service Council
The Metro Gateway Cities Service Council will meet on Thursday, October 10, 2019 at 2:00 p.m. at Salt Lake Park Community Center (Lounge) located at 3401 E. Florence Ave., Huntington Park, CA 90255. The Council is scheduled to receive an update on the following Metro items: Transit Security; Customer Complaint Handling Process; FY 20 Q1 Station Evaluation Program Report; and the Regional Service Performance Report. The Council will also receive a Mobility 21 Overview from Vice Chair Al Rios and Councilmember Danny Hom, and a Line Ride Report from Councilmember Lori Woods.

For more information, please visit https://www.metro.net/about/local-service-councils/gwc/.

Recommended Action

Receive and file report.
VIII. REPORTS
ITEM C
Request to Fund Multi-year Sub-regional Program (MSP) for Active Transportation (AT)
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Nancy Pfeffer, Executive Director

BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Analyst

SUBJECT: Request to Fund Multi-year Sub-regional Program for Active Transportation

**Background**

During the development of the Measure M Expenditure Plan, the Gateway Cities Council of Governments chose to allocate available funding to major infrastructure projects that were not fully funded under Measure R. These major projects are the West Santa Ana Branch/Eco-Rapid Transit Light Rail Corridor, the I-710 Corridor, Metro Gold Line Eastern Extension Phase 2, I-5 Corridor (I-605 to I-710), and the I-605 “Hot Spots” project.

The I-605 “Hot Spots” project was reclassified as a Multiyear Sub-regional Program (MSP) instead of an Expenditure Plan Major Project. This move allowed the project to receive $1.2 billion. The I-605 “Hot Spots” program has retained its Measure R description, but is subject to the Measure M MSP Guidelines.

Gateway Cities has two other MSP programs: Active Transportation (AT) with a “TBD” fund allocation, and the as yet-to-be-allocated Sub-regional Equity Fund (SEF), explained in Attachment “A”, leaving the I-605 “Hot Spots” as the only funded MSP program for the COG.

**Issue**

MTA allocated $65 million from Measure M for the first five-years of the “Hot Spots” program. The GCCOG submitted the first five-year allocation of the I-605 “Hot Spots” MSP program as part of the Measure M expenditure plan. The SR-91/I-605/I-405 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) advocated for the distribution of 100% of the first five-year allocation, up to $65 million, for local hot spot early action improvement projects at the local level with our member jurisdictions.

The first step of this process included the GCCOG obtaining the jurisdictional priorities from each of the member cities.

The second step included the GCCOG staff working with the jurisdictions to maximize the eligible components of each project while coordinating with Metro, who has the final determination of eligibility based on the MSP Guideline criteria approved by the Metro Board in June of 2017.

As a result of the eligibility screening, several priority projects have been either denied in total, or have had elements denied by Metro based on eligibility requirements. The ineligible projects include standalone Active Transportation (AT) projects and ineligible components that are not
directly tied to, or impacted by the construction of the operational improvement. These ineligible projects or project elements are still a high priority for their project sponsors.

COG staff and the SR-91/I-605/I-405 TAC discussed various options for funding these ineligible projects including:

1. **Utilize Measure M or Measure R local return** for these projects. This isn’t ideal for the local jurisdictions because it reduces the jurisdictions, remaining local return funds, which may already be prioritized for other uses.

2. **Loan I-605 Hotspots MSP funds to the Active Transportation program** to fund the projects. This may not be possible as the AT line item has zero dollars allocated and therefore has no ability to pay back the I-605 “Hot Spots” funds. This method would also reduce funding available for “Hot Spots” projects. Requesting that “Hot Spots” funds be spread out to fund AT projects for the entire GC subregion exacerbates this problem.

3. **Request an advance of funding from the sub-regional equity fund, SEF,** which is currently unfunded, but has a future availability earmark of $244 million. The COG can request Metro “figure out” a way to fund the SEF MSP, including a fair share 5-year allocation portion for the GCCOG Active Transportation projects, based on the precedent set with the San Gabriel Valley COG and the advance of SEF in support of the Foothill Extension contract. (see attachment)

Metro could use Measure R/M Highway funds to advance the SEF and repay when the SEF is funded. MTA set a precedent with this sort of “cash-on-hand” borrowing a few years ago.

**SR-91/I-605/I-405 TAC Recommended Action**

1. The TAC supported a staff recommendation to pursue an allocation of SEF funding, or other types of GCCOG sub-regional funds that are financially neutral and will not impact our current priority Measure R and Measure M programs and projects.

2. The TAC directed staff to implement a two-phase approach which first allows for the AT projects or elements that are most shovel ready to be funded via a 5-year allocation of SEF funds, that are not discounted for advancing from a future unfunded year to present. Phase 1 would include the first five-year allocation, which is an amount that needs to be quantified and finalized and brought back to the TAC.

3. The TAC directed staff to work with the GCCOG subregion to develop an inventory of “Shovel Ready” projects that could be delivered in an additional five-year MSP funding allocation, which would be facilitated through the STP TAC since all jurisdictions are represented as part of that body.

4. The TAC requested Metro to split the project out by Highways and Active Transportation projects on the I-605 Hotspots Measure M MSP Evaluation Matrix (dated 09-24-19).
**Recommended Action**

It is recommended that the COG Board support the SR-91/I-605 TAC recommendations and move forward to implement Items 1-4 above.

**Attachment**

Background for the Development of Sub-regional Equity Funds
ATTACHMENT “A”

Background for the Development of Subregional Equity Funds
During the June, 2016 adoption of the Measure M Ordinance and placement on the November – 2016 ballot, the following Motion to give the San Fernando Valley subregion an additional $180 million was approved

49.2 APPROVED Motion by Directors Garcetti, Kuehl, Antonovich, Krekorian and Antonovich AS AMENDED that the Board direct the CEO to add a new "Multi-Year Subregional Program" in the Los Angeles County Transportation Expenditure Plan named “North San Fernando Valley Bus Rapid Transit Improvements” and provide the following:

A. Designate the "North San Fernando Valley Bus Rapid Transit Improvements" as a System Connectivity ("sc") sub-regional category;

B. Funds for the North San Fernando Valley Bus Rapid Transit Improvements will be programmed from the System Connectivity portion of the Transit Construction subfund at $180 million under the "Measure__Funding 20155" for this program;

C. A "Schedule of Funds Available" in Fiscal Year 2019 and an "Expected Opening Date" of Fiscal Year 2023;

D. Designate the modal code for this program as a transit category, or "T"

E. Add a footnote to state the following:

1. This project will increase system connectivity in the North San Fernando Valley and the Metro transit system. Environmental planning work shall begin no later than six months after passage of Measure __.

F. Remove the North San Fernando Valley BRT project from footnote 11m” (Line 39) as an eligible expenditure.

In order to achieve equity for the other subregions, Director John Fasana amended the Motion to provide equivalent funding to the other subregions. The Amendment read:

**FASANA AMENDMENT:** To provide equivalent funding based on the original allocation of funding (i.e. $180 million is 13% of such funding based on the San Fernando Valley’s share) to each of the other subregions to assure and maintain equitable funding.
This funding had not been previously requested nor was it part of any financial analysis developed for the tax measure. Director John Fasana amended the Motion with the bolded language to provide equivalent funding to all other subregions based upon the subregional formula for funding. This created the Subregion Equity Fund which appears in the Expenditure Plan as a footnote.

These Subregional Equity Fund allocations are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subregion</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Cities</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central City Area</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North County</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Virgenes/Malibu</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gateway Cities</strong></td>
<td><strong>$244,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay Cities</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$997,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total with SFV</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,177,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The footnote further states:

"Environmental plan work (on the SFV transit Project) shall begin no later than six months after passage of Measure M. To provide equivalent funding to each subregion other than the San Fernando Valley, the subregional equity program will be provided as early as possible to the following subregions in the amounts (in thousands) specified here:"

The adopted Measure M Guidelines has an Allocation Methodology for these funds:

**ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY**

Funding for this program will be identified as part of the Cashflow Management evaluation. The funds identified may be any combination of federal, state, or Metro controlled funds including, but not limited to, Measure M. Prior to each five-year review Countywide Planning will provide a forecast of the amount of funding, if any, that is forecasted to be available for this program over the subsequent five-years. Once funding is identified, each subregion will be afforded an opportunity to submit their project to Metro staff for evaluation based on project readiness provisions outlined in these Guidelines.

At the July 2019 Board meeting, the Metro Board recommended the allocation of $126 million of the $199 million in San Gabriel Valley’s SEF. The $126 million fills a funding gap in the contract bid for the Gold Line Foothill Extension Phase 2B to Pomona. The San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments approved the allocation of the SEF for this purpose.
VIII. REPORTS
ITEM D
Proposed Memorandum of Understanding Regarding I-710 Clean Truck Program
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Nancy Pfeffer, Executive Director, COG
Karen Heit, Transportation Analyst, COG

SUBJECT: Proposed Memorandum of Understanding Regarding I-710 Clean Truck Program

Background

In March 2018, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 5C as the Locally Preferred Alternative for the I-710 Corridor Project. Alternative 5C includes the I-710 Zero Emission/Near Zero Emission (ZE/NZE) Truck Technology Deployment Program (also known as the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program, or I-710 Clean Truck Program). Caltrans has endorsed Metro’s recommendation to advance Alternative 5C as the Preferred Alternative through the I-710 EIS/EIR.

Issue

The I-710 Corridor Project proposed a ZE/NZE Truck Deployment Program (Clean Truck Program). This program would reduce the cost to turn over the fleet of diesel trucks in the corridor and reduce the total amount of Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) by 2035.

Metro and Caltrans have proposed that because of this reduction in DPM, the I-710 Project is not a “project of air quality concern” and should therefore not be required to demonstrate project-level conformity. This demonstration is a critical step in completing the Final EIR/EIS for the Project. Without a conformity finding, Caltrans and Metro cannot finalize the environmental document for the Project.

EPA has stated in writing that for them to consider the I-710 Corridor Project not a “project of air quality concern”, they would want to see a written commitment for the Clean Truck Program from Metro/Caltrans that is also enforceable under regulations and state plans.

The most critical element of this funding commitment is a demonstration of implementation, which would include identification of funding sources and “back-stop” measures to guarantee the program is viable.

Metro and Caltrans are seeking to fulfill the commitment to the Clean Truck Program through the creation of a partnership of local and State air and transportation agencies, recognizing that improving air quality along I-710 is a shared responsibility.

The commitment to pursue and program funds for the Clean Truck Program is proposed to be memorialized in a multi-agency MOU. The proposed MOU would involve funding partners Metro, Caltrans, SCAG and the Gateway Cities COG.

By signing on, the COG would be agreeing to participate as a member in a new I-710 Corridor
Air Quality Steering Committee which would develop implementation and funding details for the I-710 Clean Truck Program.

The I-710 Technical Advisory Committee at its September 18th, 2019, meeting recommended that the COG Board agree to sign the MOU.

**Recommended Action**

Approve signing on to the MOU by the Gateway Cities COG.

**Attachments**

- I-710 South Corridor Project – Air Quality Conformity Approach Briefing Sheet
- Proposed Memorandum of Understanding Creating the I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee to Implement the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program
I-710 South Corridor Project – Air Quality Conformity Approach

Background

- The I-710 Corridor Project (the Project) proposed a ZE/NZE Truck Deployment Program (the Clean Truck Program) that would partially subsidize the turnover of diesel trucks in the corridor and reduce the total amount of Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) by 2035. This is a programmatic feature of the Project, not a mitigation measure.
- Metro and Caltrans propose that because of this reduction in DPM, the Project is not a “project of air quality concern” and should therefore not be subject to quantitative analysis requirements to demonstrate project-level conformity – a critical step in completing the Final EIR/EIS for the Project. Without this conformity determination, Caltrans and Metro cannot finalize the environmental document for the Project.
- The Transportation Conformity Working Group (TCWG), a multi-agency group that helps FHWA fulfill interagency consultation requirements of the Federal Transportation Conformity Rule, will need to confirm that the Project is not a “project of air quality concern”.
- The TCWG comprises SCAG, SCAQMD, FHWA, CARB and EPA. FHWA is responsible for determining that the requirements of the transportation conformity rule are met. EPA, who is responsible for promulgating transportation conformity regulations, is normally the lead in the TCWG’s discussions regarding air quality conformity determinations.

Issue

- EPA has stated in writing that for them to consider the I-710 Corridor Project not a “project of air quality concern”, they would want to see a written commitment for the Clean Truck Program from Metro/Caltrans that is also enforceable as an obligation per the conformity regulation and per the State Implementation Plan.
- The most critical element of this funding commitment is a demonstration of implementation, which would include identification of funding sources and “back-stop” measures to guarantee the program is viable.
- In their role as transportation agencies, Metro and Caltrans will fund the improvements to the freeway. Metro and Caltrans have no jurisdiction over diesel emissions.
- Furthermore, funding for the Clean Truck Program is expected to come from discretionary state and federal sources/grants.
- Therefore, Metro and Caltrans alone cannot commit to the implementation of the Clean Truck Program.

Recommendation

- I-710 Project Funding Partners are seeking to fulfill the commitment to the Clean Truck Program through the creation of a partnership of local and State air and transportation agencies, recognizing that improving air quality along I-710 is a shared responsibility.
- The commitment to pursue and program funds for the Clean Truck Program can be memorialized in a multi-agency MOU. Ideally, this MOU would be signed by AQMD, CARB, FHWA, and the I-710 Funding Partners: Metro, Caltrans, Gateway Cities COG, Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, SCAG and I-5 JPA.
Memorandum of Understanding
Creating the I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee to Implement the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program

This Memorandum of Understanding Creating the I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee to Implement the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program ("MOU") is entered into between the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Metro"), the California Department of Transportation ("Caltrans"), the Southern California Association of Governments ("SCAG"), and the Gateway Cities Council of Governments ("Gateway Cities COG"), collectively the "Parties". In order to implement the program contemplated herein, the Parties have voluntarily arrived at the following mutual understandings and agreements.

WHEREAS, the I-710 Freeway is a major transportation corridor (I-710 Corridor) accommodating both daily commutes and significant freight movement to and from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

WHEREAS, Caltrans and Metro have partnered with the Gateway Cities COG, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, the Cities along the I-710 Corridor, and community groups and worked with the California Air Resources Board (CARB), SCAG and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) to identify features for the I-710 Corridor Project that improve mobility, support commerce, and address air quality and public health concerns in the corridor.

WHEREAS, Caltrans and Metro have prepared a draft Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report ("EIS/EIR") for the I-710 Corridor Project. On March 1, 2018, the Metro Board of Directors identified Alternative 5C as the Locally Preferred Alternative ("LPA") for the I-710 Corridor Project. Caltrans has endorsed Metro’s recommendation to advance Alternative 5C as the Preferred Alternative through the I-710 EIS/EIR. Alternative 5C includes the I-710 Zero Emission/Near Zero Emission Truck Technology Deployment Program (also known as the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program or "Program" herein) as a focused I-710 incentive program for heavy-duty trucks that meet or exceed CARB’s 0.02 g/bhp-hr NOx standard (i.e., Zero Emission ("ZE")/Near Zero Emission ("NZE") trucks).

WHEREAS, within the greater project area, several agencies have published commitments to development of ZE/NZE trucks and understand that deployment will take a collaborative approach. The Parties will form a Steering Committee (and invite other agencies to join the Steering Committee) to implement the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program (which qualifies for and contributes to each agency’s plans and goals as identified and summarized below and more comprehensively described in Appendix A) in the I-710 Corridor to improve air quality for communities along the corridor.

a. SCAQMD: 2016 Air Quality Management Plan ("AQMP") seeks to leverage strong federal, state, and local partnerships to secure incentive funding and supporting infrastructure for early deployment of zero and near-zero technologies, inclusive of the mobile source sector, specifically heavy-duty trucks.

b. SCAG: 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy and 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy include a commitment to reduce emissions from transportation sources
to comply with SB 375 by pledging to a broad deployment of zero and near zero emission transportation technologies especially in the goods movement system.

c. Port of Long Beach: The 2017 San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan ("CAAP") Update set the Port of LB on the path to zero emission goods movement, with the goal of transitioning terminal equipment to zero emissions by 2030 and on-road trucks by 2035.

d. Port of Los Angeles: The Zero Emission Technologies effort, including the San Pedro Bay Ports CAAP, Zero Emissions Roadmap commits to finding new ways to reduce emissions from ships, trains, trucks, harbor craft, and cargo handling equipment with the goal of eliminating all pollution from port-related operations. The Port Zero-Emissions White Paper outlines a specific plan of action including expanded development and testing of zero emission technologies, identification of new strategic funding opportunities, and new planning for long-term infrastructure development.

e. California Air Resources Board: The CARB Mobile Source Strategy: Further Deployment of Cleaner Technologies: On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicles control measure in the 2016 AQMP and CARB’s related State Implementation Plan (“SIP”) submittal to USEPA commits to expanding and enhancing existing incentive funding and innovative funding programs for heavy-duty vehicles to increase the emphasis on and support for purchase of near-zero and zero emission equipment. Furthermore, full implementation of this CARB measure would require funding approximately 15,000 to 20,000 trucks per year over a seven year period, depending upon the availability of vehicles and engines certified to the ZE and/or NZE standards.

f. USEPA: The National ZEV Investment Plan commits to $1.2 billion (outside California) and $800 million (within California) for a total of $2 billion in funding over 10 years for zero emission vehicle (“ZEV”) infrastructure, education, and access. The funding supports the increased adoption of ZEV technology by installing ZEV fueling infrastructure (for both electric- and hydrogen-powered cars), funding brand-neutral consumer awareness campaigns that will help grow the ZEV vehicle market, and investing in projects such as car-sharing programs that will increase access to ZEVs for all consumers in California, including those in lower-income and disadvantaged communities.

The Clean Diesel Program provides support for projects that protect human health and improve air quality by reducing harmful emissions from diesel engines. This program includes grants and rebates funded under the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (“DERA”). The program solicited proposals nationwide for projects that achieve significant reductions in diesel emissions in terms of tons of pollution produced and exposure, particularly from fleets operating in areas designated by the Administrator as poor air quality areas. Eligible diesel vehicles, engines and equipment include school buses, class 5 – class 8 heavy-duty highway vehicles, locomotive engines, marine engines, nonroad engines, and equipment or vehicles used in construction, handling of cargo (including at ports or airports), agriculture, mining or energy production (including stationary generators and pumps).
The Cleaner Trucks Initiative ("CTI") is a future planned rulemaking to update standards for nitrogen oxide ("NOx") emissions from highway heavy-duty trucks and engines. USEPA expects that heavy-duty trucks will be responsible for one-third of NOx emissions from transportation in 2025. Updating these standards will result in NOx reductions from mobile sources and could be one important way that allows areas across the U.S. to meet National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and particulate matter.

WHEREAS, The Parties to this MOU wish to implement the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program (which qualifies for and contributes to each agency’s plans and goals discussed above) in the I-710 Corridor to improve air quality for communities along the corridor. The purpose of this MOU is to clarify the Parties’ interests, commitments, roles and responsibilities in the implementation of the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program.

THEREFORE, in furtherance of this MOU the Parties agree as follows:

1.0 I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program

The I-710 Phased-In Zero Emission Truck Technology Development Program (also known as the I-710 Clean Truck Emissions Program) is a component of Alternative 5C, also known as the Preferred Alternative ("PA"), for the I-710 Corridor Improvement Project. The Clean Truck Emissions Program would seek funding to assist individual owner-operators and privately owned truck fleets to subsidize the purchase of heavy duty zero or near zero emission trucks for use within the I-710 Corridor as well as seed money for electric charging stations and hydrogen refueling stations within the I-710 Corridor. The recharging/refueling stations would be constructed near locations served by heavy-duty vehicles such as intermodal terminals at the ports, rail yards, warehouses, and distribution centers. The Clean Truck Emissions Program is consistent with goals and strategies of the SCAQMD 2016 AQMP and the 2016 AQMP Funding Plan, as well as other similar clean technology incentive programs administered by the SCAQMD. The Clean Truck Emissions Program is also consistent with the plans, goals and strategies of the other Parties to this MOU as described above.

2.0 I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee

The Clean Truck Emissions Program addresses one element of the overall air quality/environmental improvement needs of the corridor. It will take a collaborative effort of all the Parties and Steering Committee members to be able to bring the Parties’ plans and goals to fruition. Therefore, the Parties agree to form the I-710 Corridor Air Quality Steering Committee ("Committee"), that will consist of the Parties to this MOU and subsequent invited agencies, funding partners and industry engine/truck providers and users. The formation of the Committee will allow for a more comprehensive approach and faster implementation of the improvements/incentives, goals, plans and the Clean Truck Emissions Program. The Parties to this MOU agree to have a representative actively serve on the Committee.

3.0 Responsibilities of the Committee

The Committee will:
a. Further develop implementation details, including eligibility requirements, institutional arrangements, management, and administration for the Clean Truck Emissions Program.

b. Explore and identify funding opportunities, financial impact, and other implementation factors along with the development of a phasing plan for the achievement of the funding target developed by Caltrans and Metro for the Clean Truck Emissions Program, and the more comprehensive goals, based on existing and new potential funding, including local, state, federal and private resources. This includes collaborating with the Port of Long Beach, the Port of Los Angeles and the South Coast Air Quality Management District in identifying funding and project/program opportunities to implement.

c. Develop a strategy that outlines progressive transition to ZEVs in the corridor starting with the latest feasible and sustainable technologies.

d. Identify and evaluate other potential strategies to address the air quality concerns in the corridor.

e. Obtain or assist with obtaining funding to implement the Clean Truck Emissions Program and more comprehensive programs.

f. Meet monthly and report quarterly to the SCAQMD’s Mobile Source Committee on the development and progress toward the established and agreed upon goals.

4.0 TERM

4.1. The term of this MOU will begin on the Effective Date and shall continue until the Program is fully implemented or until terminated in writing by two thirds (2/3) of the signatories with thirty (30) days’ notice.

5.0 AMENDMENT

5.1. Amendment of any provision of this MOU shall be effective only if in writing and signed by authorized representatives of the Parties.

6.0 MISCELLANEOUS

6.1 Effective Date. The date the last signatory executes the MOU.

6.2 Assignment. The Parties shall not assign rights or responsibilities under this MOU without written permission from the remaining Parties.

6.3. Governing Law; Venue. This MOU, and any claims relating to or arising out of this MOU, whether arising in contract, tort, or otherwise, shall be governed and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of California, without giving effect to conflicts of laws and principles. Any action or proceeding between the Parties relating to this MOU shall take place in the State of California in the County of Los Angeles.
6.4. Notices. Any notice required or permitted hereunder shall be in writing and shall be given to each Party's Designated Representative at the address below, or at such other address as the Party may hereafter specify in writing. Such notice shall be deemed given: upon personal delivery to the appropriate address; or three (3) business days after the date of mailing if sent by certified or registered mail; or one (1) business day after the date of deposit with a commercial courier service offering next business day service with confirmation of delivery. Each Party may change the Designated Representative as needed and shall provide notice to the other Parties by email of the change.

6.5 Dispute Resolution. In the event of any dispute between the Parties arising out of or in connection with this MOU, the Parties shall attempt, promptly and in good faith, to resolve any such dispute. If the Parties are unable to resolve any such dispute within a reasonable time (not to exceed thirty (30) days), then either Party may submit such dispute to non-binding mediation in Los Angeles County, California. Each Party shall bear its own expenses in connection with the mediation and share equally the fees and expenses of the mediator. If the dispute cannot be resolved through mediation within a reasonable time, then the Parties shall be free to pursue any right or remedy available to them under applicable law. The requirements of this section shall not preclude a Party from pursuing equitable relief, if delay in seeking such relief may result in irreparable harm to such Party.

6.6. Force Majeure. Subject to the express provisions of Section 4 (Term) above, no Party will be deemed in default of this MOU to the extent that performance of its obligations or attempts to cure any breach are delayed or prevented by reason of any event beyond the reasonable control of such Party, which event was not caused by such Party's negligence and could not have been avoided by such Party's commercially reasonable efforts (including, but not limited to, any act of God, fire, earthquake, natural disaster, accident, pandemic, labor unrest, civil disobedience, acts of terrorism or act of government); and provided further that such Party gives the other Parties written notice thereof promptly and, in any event, within five (5) business days of discovery thereof, and thereafter uses its best efforts to continue to so perform or cure. In the event of such a force majeure event, the time for performance or cure will be extended for a period equal to the duration of the force majeure event plus reasonable repair timeframes, but in no event more than thirty (30) days unless agreed upon by the Parties.

6.7. No Third Party Beneficiaries. This MOU is executed and entered into by the Parties solely for their benefit, and for no other party (including without limitation any individual employee, officer, director, contractor or agent of a Party).

6.8. Counterparts. This MOU may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original and all of which together shall constitute one instrument.

6.9. Waiver; Modification. No amendment, modification, waiver or supplement shall be made with respect to this MOU or any provision of this MOU by course of performance, or by the failure of a Party to object to a deviation from the terms of this MOU. Any waiver, modification or amendment of any provision of this MOU
shall be effective only if in writing and signed by authorized representatives of the Parties.

6.10. Complete Understanding. This MOU and any attached exhibits, schedules and addenda, all of which are incorporated into this MOU by this reference, constitute the full and complete understanding and agreement of the Parties relating to the subject matter hereof and supersede all prior understandings and agreements relating to such subject matter. The provisions of this MOU shall prevail over any conflicting provisions in any purchase order, acceptance notice or other document generated by the Parties except as expressly provided in the preceding sentence.

7.0 EXECUTION

7.1. By their signatures below, each of the following represents that it has authority to execute this MOU and to bind the Party on whose behalf the execution is made.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this MOU has been executed by each of the Parties as of the date set forth next to such Party’s authorized representative’s signature.

[Signature Page to follow.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority</th>
<th>California Department of Transportation, District 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name of Individual</td>
<td>Printed Name of Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gateway Cities Council of Governments</th>
<th>Southern California Association of Governments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printed Name of Individual</td>
<td>Printed Name of Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A

Examples of Agencies Plans and Goals to Implement Clean Truck Emissions Technology

a. SCAQMD: 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)

Page 5 Executive Summary: Identify and secure significant funding for incentives to implement early deployment and commercialization of zero and near-zero technologies. The 2016 AQMP control strategy strongly relies on a transition to zero and near-zero emission technologies in the mobile source sector, including automobiles, transit buses, medium- and heavy-duty trucks, and off-road applications. The plan focuses on existing commercialized technologies and energy sources including their supporting infrastructure, along with newer technologies that are nearing commercialization based on recent demonstration programs and limited test markets. Prioritizing and expanding funding in Environmental Justice (EJ) areas will be sought.

Page 4-3: The 2016 AQMP relies strongly upon partnerships at federal, state, and local levels, seeking to expand existing collaborations and establish new coalitions. These strategies include aggressive new regulations and development of incentive funding and supporting infrastructure for early deployment of advanced control technologies... The SCAQMD will continue to support technology demonstration projects for both mobile and stationary sources and will work to create new or expanded funding opportunities for earlier deployment of cleaner technologies, thus contributing to a smooth transition to zero and near-zero emission technologies in the mobile and stationary source sectors.

b. SCAG: 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

Page 107: The 2016 RTP/SCS focuses on a two-pronged approach for achieving an efficient freight system that reduces environmental impacts. For the near term, the regional strategy supports the deployment of commercially available low-emission trucks and locomotives while centering on continued investments into improved system efficiencies. For example, the region envisions increased market penetration of technologies already in use, such as heavy-duty hybrid trucks and natural gas trucks. Applying ITS solutions to improve operational efficiency is also recommended. In the longer term, the strategy focuses on advancing technologies – taking critical steps now toward the phased implementation of a zero- and near-zero-emission freight system. SCAG is cognizant of the need to incorporate evolving technologies with plans for new infrastructure. These include technologies to fuel vehicles, as well as to charge batteries and provide power. The plan to develop and deploy advanced technologies includes phased implementation, during which technology needs are defined, prototypes are tested and developed, and efforts are scaled up. The phases are summarized as follows:

- Phase 1: Project Scoping and Evaluation of Existing Work
- Phase 2: Evaluation, Development and Prototype Demonstrations
Phase 3: Initial Deployment and Operational Demonstration
Phase 4: Full-Scale Demonstrations and Commercial Deployment

The 2016 RTP/SCS Goods Movement Appendix further details an updated environmental action plan for the goods movement system that builds on regional progress to date. This includes an Action Plan for Advancement of Zero-Emission Technology. As the four phases of the updated action plan are reviewed, the text also points to progress made related to specific action steps identified in 2012. The technology development and deployment plan is inclusive of all stages of technology development and deployment: beginning from an initial definition of key operational parameters, moving through prototype development, initial demonstration and evaluation, and eventually a staged roll-out. This start-to-finish framework is useful as there are many potential technologies available, each at different stages of readiness.

Significant regional actions will be needed in order to realize this vision of a zero- and near zero-emission freight transportation system that meets regional objectives for long-term sustainability and can also meet the performance objectives required by industry. SCAG may act together with key partner agencies such as the Port of Los Angeles, the Port of Long Beach, the SCAQMD and the region’s county transportation commissions to update and implement this plan as needed. Since SCAG adopted the 2012 RTP/SCS, the region has attracted outside funding and committed its own funding to support research and development efforts. Several studies have been conducted to date that contribute to “project scoping” by providing a greater understanding of the regional truck market and how truck use defines key performance parameters such as range and power needs. To evaluate and develop prototypes, three large-scale research and development efforts are underway to develop and test zero-emission trucks and charging infrastructure. These projects require continuing collaboration between original equipment manufacturers and public sector agencies.

c. Port of Long Beach

The 2017 San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan Update set the Port of Long Beach on the path to zero-emission goods movement, with a goal of transitioning terminal equipment to zero emissions by 2030 and on-road trucks by 2035.

d. Port of Los Angeles: Zero Emission Technologies

Although significant emissions reductions have been achieved under the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP), the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (the San Pedro Bay Ports) continue to place great emphasis on green development, including a particular focus on zero emission technologies. Fostering the development of zero emission technologies is not only a key component of the Ports’ plans to achieve their voluntary air quality goals, but it will also help to greatly reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions. To that effect, the San Pedro Bay Ports prepared a Zero-Emissions Roadmap designed to guide their actions going forward.
e. California Air Resources Board (CARB): 2016 AQMP Appendix IV-B CARB Mobile Source Strategy: "Further Deployment of Cleaner Technologies: On-Road Heavy-Duty Vehicles"

Page IV-B-50: Overview: The goal of this proposed measure is to identify concepts that will further reduce NOx emissions. These concepts will include additional incentive funding and developing technologies to accelerate the penetration of near-zero and zero equipment beyond the rate of natural turnover achieved through implementation of the other proposed measures identified for on-road heavy-duty vehicles. This measure is specifically for the South Coast.

Page IV-B-51: Expand and enhance existing incentive and other innovative funding programs for heavy-duty vehicles to increase the emphasis on and support for purchase of near-zero and zero equipment. Funding mechanisms would target technologies that meet either lower NOx standards or are hybrid/zero-emission technologies. If incentive funding is the primary mechanism to achieve the scope of further technology deployment described above, funding would be required for approximately 15,000 to 20,000 trucks per year over a seven year period, depending upon the availability of zero-emission vehicles and engines certified to [C]ARB’s optional low-NOx standards of 0.05 g/bhp-hr and 0.02 g/bhp-hr or other advanced hybrid/zero-emission technologies. The incentive funding required for this effort would go beyond the amount currently authorized for existing programs through 2023. Continued incentive funding post-2023 to further accelerate the deployment of trucks meeting or exceeding a 0.02 g/bhp-hr standard would provide additional reductions for 2031.

Determination of the needed resources will be based on assessment of the incremental cost of technologies, cost effectiveness, and the type of financing mechanism employed. Funding needs and mechanisms will be identified working in collaboration with the District and other State agencies over the next several months.

f. USEPA: National ZEV Investment Plan

Page 3: As required by Appendix C to the 2.0-Liter Partial Consent Decree entered by the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California on October 25, 2016, Volkswagen Group of America is investing $1.2 billion over the next 10 years in zero emission vehicle (ZEV) infrastructure, education, and access outside California to support the increased adoption of ZEV technology in the United States, representing the largest commitment of its kind to date. Based on figures from the Council of Economic Advisors and U.S. Department of Transportation related to highway and transit investments, the $1.2 billion being spent here is estimated to support up to 15,000 jobs throughout the United States over the 10 year course of the investment [Dep. of Transportation, Council of Economic Advisors]. The first cycle of a separate investment of $800 million in California is the subject of the California ZEV Investment Plan, which was submitted to the California Air Resources Board on March 8.
VIII. REPORTS
ITEM E
Report Regarding EPA Communication to California: Update from COG Staff
TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Nancy Pfeffer, Executive Director

BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Analyst

SUBJECT: Report Regarding EPA Communication to California: Update from COG Staff

Background

Over the past months, COG staff has been providing verbal updates on the conflict between the federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the State of California over the state’s more rigorous vehicle emissions standards, which have been in place through waivers for decades. This conflict will have a direct negative impact on federal highway funding and federal approvals for highway projects in development and environmental review such as the I-710 Corridor, the SR-91/I-605/I-405 “Hot Spots” and the I-5 Corridor.

The State of California has been locked in a battle with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) over California’s strict vehicle pollution standards that conflict with the Trump administration’s planned rollback of the Obama-era federal emissions and fuel economy requirements.

As part of its rollback of the emissions rule, EPA finalized its legal determination to revoke a waiver to the Clean Air Act that has given California the right to set its own vehicle regulations. Under the Clean Air Act, California has for decades, received a waiver allowing the state to impose vehicle emissions standards that are stricter than those of the federal government.

The Trump administration roll-back proposal is contained within the proposed Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule.

Issue

Non-compliance with the SAFE rule puts the California air quality State Implementation Plan (SIP) out of compliance and removes air quality conformity findings for major highway projects. Projects in the environmental phase will be impacted by the conformity issues. For the Gateway COG and LA Metro, the I-710 Corridor Project environmental review will be impacted as well as the I-605/91 and I-605/5, I-605/60 Capital Improvement Program environmental reviews. In addition to Gateway Cities’ projects, SCAG has projected that over 440 transportation projects in the region, along with another 2,000 transportation projects statewide are all at risk.
The COG’s major highway initiatives in the environmental review process will no longer conform with plans to meet National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for six common air pollutants, also known as criteria pollutants. These pollutants are; particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides, and lead. In addition to the NAAQS, there is also the California Ambient Air Quality Standards. The “EMFAC” is the mobile source emission model that ARB developed to assess emissions from on-road vehicles in California. The latest version of this model was approved for use in transportation conformity analyses by the EPA on 12/14/15 using the “California waiver” driven emissions standards.

In order for the highway initiatives to achieve air quality conformity, the EMFAC must be recalibrated to incorporate the new SAFE standards. This exercise may take up to two years and would require re-running the highway models for all projects in the environmental review process.

Further, the attached letter from EPA Administrator Andrew Wheeler to California Air Resources Board Chair, Mary Nichols, accuses the state of having failed for decades to take required steps under the Clean Air Act, specifically allowing a backlog of more than 130 inactive smog-reduction plans to accumulate. “California has the worst air quality in the United States,” says the letter, which states that 82 areas within California aren’t meeting federal air quality standards.

The letter further warns that:

“We recommend that California withdraw its backlogged and un-approvable SIPs and work with the EPA to develop complete, approvable SIPs. In the event California fails to withdraw them, the EPA will begin the disapproval process consistent with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

As you know, if the EPA disapproves a SIP, that triggers statutory clocks for.

- Highway funding sanctions, which could result in a prohibition on federal transportation projects and grants in certain parts of California;
- New Source Review permitting sanctions; and
- A deadline for the issuance of a Federal Implementation Plan.”

California State Attorney General Xavier Becerra responded to the revocation of the waiver that allowed California to set tougher auto emissions standards by suing the administration arguing that the state’s stricter emissions standards are lawful and needed to improve air quality.

COG staff will continue to monitor this complex issue and rapidly changing situation including monitoring an October 10th Joint Meeting of the California Transportation Commission and California Air Resources Board.
**Recommended Action**

It is recommended that the Board of Directors:

1. Discuss information presented and offer action items; and/or
2. Receive and file the item.

**Attachment**

EPA Administrator Letter
Ms. Mary D. Nichols  
Chair  
California Air Resources Board  
1001 I Street, P.O. Box 2815  
Sacramento, California 95812  

Dear Ms. Nichols:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and California Air Resources Board play a critical role in protecting public health through implementing National Ambient Air Quality Standards under the federal Clean Air Act. In particular, the state of California facilitates the submittal of State Implementation Plans from its 35 local air districts with Clean Air Act responsibilities.

A SIP is a collection of regulations and documents used by a state, territory or local air district to reduce air pollution in areas that do not meet NAAQS. Failure to carry out this SIP responsibility correctly, including submitting timely and approvable plans to assure attainment of the NAAQS, can put at risk the health and livelihood of millions of Americans. As part of our fundamental Clean Air Act responsibilities, I have recommitted the EPA to act quickly to approve or disapprove SIPs and to dramatically reduce the backlog of SIPs nationally.

Since the 1970s, California has failed to carry out its most basic tasks under the Clean Air Act. California has the worst air quality in the United States, with 82 nonattainment areas and 34 million people living in areas that do not meet National Ambient Air Quality Standards — more than twice as many people as any other state in the country. As evidenced by the EPA’s recent work on interstate air pollution issues as well as analysis accompanying its rulemakings, California’s chronic air quality problems are not the result of cross-state air pollution or this Administration’s regulatory reform efforts.

In addition, the state of California represents a disproportionate share of the national list of backlogged SIPs, including roughly one-third of the EPA’s overall SIP backlog. California’s total portion of the SIP backlog is more than 130 SIPs, with many dating back decades. Most of these SIPs are inactive and appear to have fundamental issues related to approvability, state-requested holds, missing information or resources. For example, these SIPs include key ozone NAAQS attainment plans for the following areas:

- Coachella Valley for 1997 and 2008 ozone NAAQS
• Sacramento Metro for 2008 ozone NAAQS
• Western Nevada County for 2008 ozone NAAQS
• Ventura County for 1997 and 2008 ozone NAAQS

We recommend that California withdraw its backlogged and unapprovable SIPs and work with the EPA to develop complete, approvable SIPs. In the event California fails to withdraw them, the EPA will begin the disapproval process consistent with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

As you know, if the EPA disapproves a SIP, that triggers statutory clocks for:

• Highway funding sanctions, which could result in a prohibition on federal transportation projects and grants in certain parts of California;
• New Source Review permitting sanctions; and
• A deadline for the issuance of a Federal Implementation Plan.

We certainly want to avoid these statutory triggers, but our foremost concern must be ensuring clean air for all Americans. That is our goal.

To ensure that we are making progress on improving air quality in California, we request a response from CARB by October 10 indicating whether it intends to withdraw these SIPs.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Andrew K. Wheeler