

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

Wednesday, October 1, 2008

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.

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

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 3, 2008, are presented for approval. Approval receives and files the minutes of September 3rd Board of Directors meeting.
- B. Approval of Warrant Register - Request for Approval of Warrant Register dated October 1, 2008
- C. August 2008 Local Agency Investment Fund Statement
- D. Status Report from Lobbyist, Government Relations Consultants
- E. Memorandum of Agreement Between The Gateway Cities Council of Governments and CALTRANS for Implementing Coordinated Monitoring Plan (TMDLs)
- F. Letter of Support for SCAG’s Application for State Compass Blueprint Funding

CONSENT CALENDAR ACTION:

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

VIII. REPORTS

- A. Foreclosure Outlook for the Gateway Cities COG Region – Presentation by Joe Carreras, Southern California Association of Governments

15 Min

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF AND RECEIVE AND FILE

10 Min

- B. Request of South Bay Cities Council of Governments and Westside Cities Council of Governments for Interim MTA Board Member Support

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION APPROVE REQUEST, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

10 Min

- C. SB-375 – Climate Change Legislation Implementation

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

IX. REPORTS – COMMITTEES/ AGENCIES – ALL COMMITTEE / AGENCY REPORTS ARE LIMITED TO 3 MINUTES UNLESS ADDITIONAL TIME IS GRANTED BY THE BOARD PRESIDENT

A. Matters from Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) – Oral Report

3 Min SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

B. Matters from the League of California Cities – Oral Report

3 Min SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

C. Matters from California Contract Cities Association – Oral Report

3 Min SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

D. Matters from The I-5 Consortium Cities Joint Powers Authority – Oral Report

3 Min SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

E. Matters from the Orangeline Development Authority-Maglev – Oral Report

3 Min SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

F. Matters from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) – Oral Report

3 Min SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

G. Matters from the Metro Gateway Cities Service Sector – Oral Report

3 Min SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF A

X. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

A. Report from the Conservancy Committee

3 Min SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

B. Report from the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee – Oral Report

3 Min

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

C. Report from the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Corridor Cities Committee – Oral Report

3 Min

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

D. Report from the Transportation Committee – Oral Report

3 Min

SUGGESTED ACTION: A MOTION TO HEAR REPORT, POSSIBLE ACTION AND/OR GIVE DIRECTION TO STAFF

XI. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

XII. MATTERS FROM THE PRESIDENT

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

NOTICE: New items will not be considered after 9:00 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 5, 2008, 9:00 a.m.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICAN 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.

VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
Item A
Approval of Minutes

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE JOINT MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
AND THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Gateway Cities Council of Governments
16401 Paramount Boulevard
Paramount, California
September 3, 2008**

President Bayer called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

PRESENT: President Anne M. Bayer, City of Downey
First Vice President Gordon Stefenhagen, City of Norwalk
Second Vice President Diane DuBois, City of Lakewood
Member Larry R. Nelson, City of Artesia
Member George Mirabal, City of Bell
Member Raymond Dunton, City of Bellflower
Member Jim Edwards, City of Cerritos
Member Joe Aguilar, City of Commerce
Member Lillie Dobson, City of Compton
Member Victor Farfan, City of Hawaiian Gardens
Member Stan Carroll, City of La Habra Heights
Member Pete Dames, City of La Mirada
Member Bonnie Lowenthal, City of Long Beach
Member Patrick O'Donnell, City of Long Beach
Member Felipe Aguirre, City of Maywood
Member Kathy Salazar, City of Montebello
Member Gene Daniels, City of Paramount
Member Gracie Gallegos-Smith, City of Pico Rivera
Member Betty Putnam, City of Santa Fe Springs
Member Edward H. J. Wilson, City of Signal Hill
Member Gil Hurtado, City of South Gate
Member William Davis, City of Vernon
Member Greg Nordbak, City of Whittier
Member Connie Sziebl, Office of Supervisor Don Knabe

ABSENT: Immediate Past President Elba Guerrero, City of Huntington Park
Member Bob Kennedy, City of Avalon
Member Mario Beltran, City of Bell Gardens
Member Frank Gurule, City of Cudahy
Member Maria Teresa Santillan, City of Lynwood
Member Erica Jacquez-Santos, Office of Supervisor Gloria Molina
Member Richard Steinke, Ex Officio Member, Port of Long Beach
ALSO PRESENT: Long Beach Councilmember Tonia Reyes Uranga, Board
Member, South Coast Air Quality Management District Signal Hill City Manager Ken

Farfaring, Chair, City Managers Steering Committee; David Tokofsy, City of Bell; Commerce Senior Administrative Analyst Fernando Mendoza; Lakewood Director of Community Development Jack Gonsalves; Long Beach Government Affairs Manager Tom Modica; South Gate City Engineer Mohammad Mostahkami; Ron Fisher, Deputy, Office of Supervisor Yvonne Burke; Mike Hollon, Field Representative, Assemblyman Hector De La Torre; Dave Hershenson, Community Relations Manager, Metro; Michael Sieckert, Planning Manager, Metro Gateway Cities Service Sector; Kristine Guerrero, Public Affairs Manager, League of California Cities; Yvette Kirrin, Executive Director, I-5 Joint Powers Authority; Darin Chidsey, Member Relations Officer, SCAG; Derek Alatorre, Public Information Specialist, SCAQMD; Jesse Glazer, ITS Engineer, FHWA; Robert Pulliam, Tubular Rail Inc.; Melissa Hewitt, Kimley-Horn; Tracy A. Young, Anchor, Local Edition, CNN Headline News; Frank Osgood, Author, Region Aroused; GCCCOG Executive Director Richard Powers; GCCCOG General Counsel Richard D. Jones; GCCCOG Deputy Executive Director Jack Joseph; GCCCOG Transportation Deputy Karen Heit; GCCCOG Director of Regional Planning Nancy Pfeffer; GCCCOG Consultant Engineer Jerry R. Wood.

Roll was taken through self-introductions.

Member Dobson led the Pledge of Allegiance.

There were no amendments to the agenda.

No one wished to speak during public comments.

The Executive Director announced that the COG had been invited to attend a briefing by Senator Barbara Boxer on transportation issues to be held the next day at MTA headquarters. He said he would be talking with Congresswoman Napolitano's office about arranging a meeting with the President of BNSF Railroad.

It was moved by Second Vice President DuBois, seconded by Member Daniels, to approve the consent calendar as presented. The motion was approved unanimously.

Robert Pulliam, Tubular Rail, Inc., presented a report on a proposed Container Port Skid. He explained that the tubular rail concept is not a maglev system. Rails are mounted on the car, which rides on a grade separated system. The system would require only an easement rather than right of way acquisition. Minimum surface area is needed, so there would be minimal disruption. A container port skid would have no moving parts. Its goal would be to work with existing methods, be grade separated, and address air quality.

Mr. Pulliam showed a brief video demonstrating how a passenger system would work.

Member Nelson asked how far away Tubular Rail was from having a working model. Mr. Pulliam responded that, with funding, it could carry its first passenger in three years. The container skid would take less time.

Second Vice President DuBois asked if the skid would be the way to get cargo to an inland port. Mr. Pulliam said that it would take out of the box thinking to get over the Cajon Pass.

It was the consensus of the Board to receive and file the report.

Jerry Wood presented background and an overview on the Gateway Cities Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Integration Plan for Goods Movement. He introduced Melissa Hewitt of Kimley-Horn, the firm that conducted the study under a federal ITS grant achieved by the COG. Ms. Hewitt gave a power point presentation summarizing the Plan. She said recommended projects included completing already programmed critical projects, filling existing major infrastructure gaps, several truck fleet communications and data collection programs, and vehicle enforcement strategies.

Second Vice President DuBois asked if the Plan was something that would still be useful if Caltrans goes ahead and works on the freeways. Mr. Wood responded that it would because of all the different elements included in the Plan.

Member Aguirre asked how it would improve air quality; if a scheduling system would reduce the number of trucks idling, waiting for their loads. Mr. Wood said that was certainly the intention of the Plan. Member Aguirre asked if Caltrans can give figures on the average daily traffic on the freeways. Mr. Wood responded that Caltrans can give total counts, but not counts by lane or types of vehicles broken down on an hour by hour basis.

Member Mirabal asked if the intent was to also look at the I-110 freeway. Mr. Wood said that they would be working with the South Bay COG to look at the whole goods movement system, including I-110.

Mr. Wood said that the recommendation to the Board was to receive and file the ITS Integration Plan Final Report; approve proceeding with preparation of the ITS Implementation Plan; authorize staff to request funding for the Plan and ITS projects; and continue the ITS working group. It was moved by Member Nelson, seconded by First Vice President Stefenhagen, to approve the staff recommendation. The motion was approved unanimously.

Darin Chidsey presented a report from SCAG. He said that SCAG would be presenting a special workshop on AB 32 the next day. He said a conference scheduled for September 10 would focus on the high gasoline prices and how they will affect various transportation systems.

Kristine Guerrero presented a report from the League of California Cities. She said that there was still no approved State budget and that the impasse had reached day 65. She said Prop 1A borrowing was not on the table, but a five percent take on every redevelopment agency is. She said she is working with the cities on developing a list of projects that would stop if the redevelopment takes move forward. She encouraged the Board members to attend the League's Annual Conference scheduled for the end of

September in Long Beach.

There was no report from the California Contract Cities Association.

Yvette Kirrin, Executive Director of the I-5 Joint Powers Authority reported that she had participated in a field visit of the I-5 project with members of the staff of Congresswoman Lucille Roybal-Allard. She said that contamination issues are becoming very serious for the Carmenita Bridge project

There was no report from the Orangeline Development Authority.

SCAQMD Board Member Tonia Reyes Uranga introduced Derek Alatorre, who is replacing David Madsen as the liaison to the Gateway Cities COG. Mr. Alatorre said that the District has almost completed the MATES III study.

David Hershenson presented a report from the Metro Gateway Cities Service Sector. He said that there would be no new service cuts or changes this year. He said that the quarterly transit providers workshop would be held a week from Thursday.

Member Wilson presented a report from the Conservancy Committee. He said that the Board did not meet in August, but that staff had released its recommendations for Tier 1 projects. These recommendations include full funding for projects in Bellflower and Maywood, and fifty percent funding for a project in Long Beach, and account for 70% of the total recommended amounts.

Jerry Wood presented a report from the I-710 EIR/EIS Project Committee. Member Hurtado, Co-Chair of the I-710 Project Committee, said that the Committee will be meeting more frequently. Mr. Wood said that the project is now moving in "high gear", and that the Project Committee had appointed members of the Community Advisory Committee. He said that Measure R, the proposed half cent MTA sales tax, included \$600 million for congestion hot spots on I-710.

Jerry Wood presented a report from the SR-91/I-605/I-405 Corridor Cities Committee.

Karen Heit presented a report from the Transportation Committee. She said that the Committee had heard the report on the ITS project. She said that the I-110 was the new target for congestion pricing on the HOV lanes. She reported that the Board of Supervisors had voted 3-2 to oppose the MTA one-half cent sales tax measure.

Second Vice President DuBois reported that long-time Lakewood City Attorney John Todd had passed away. She announced that there would be a memorial service at the Lakewood Sycamore Plaza on September 8th at 11:00 a.m.

President Bayer announced that Member Lowenthal had resigned her position as MTA Board Member. President Bayer requested that the meeting be adjourned in memory of John Todd.

Adjournment: It was the consensus of the Board to adjourn at 7:20 p.m. in memory of John S. Todd.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Powers, Secretary

VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM B
Approval of Warrant Register

**VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM C
August 2008 - Local Agency Investment
Fund Statement**

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BILL LOCKYER, *Treasurer*

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER
SACRAMENTO

Local Agency Investment Fund
PO Box 942809
Sacramento, CA 94209-0001
(916) 653-3001
www.treasurer.ca.gov/pmia-laif



August, 2008 Statement

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Attn: TREASURER
16401 PARAMOUNT BOULEVARD
PARAMOUNT CA 90723

Account Number : 40-19-045

Transactions

| <u>Effective Date</u> | <u>Transaction Date</u> | <u>Tran Type</u> | <u>Confirm Number</u> | <u>Authorized Caller</u> | <u>Amount</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| 08-08-2008 | 08-07-2008 | RW | 1183598 | JACK JOSEPH | - 100,000.00 |

Account Summary

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Total Deposit : | 0.00 | Beginning Balance : | 852,070.85 |
| Total Withdrawal : | - 100,000.00 | Ending Balance : | 752,070.85 |

**VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM D**

**Status Report from Lobbyist Government
Relations Consultants**

GOVERNMENT RELATIONS CONSULTANTS

To: Richard Powers
Gateway Cities Council of Governments

From: Allynn Howe
Government Relations Consultants

September 25, 2008

On Thursday of last week, September 18th, MPOs testified before the Highways and Transits Subcommittee of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. At that hearing, both Reps. Napolitano and Richardson talked about the enormous needs for infrastructure to move freight goods out of the Port of Long Beach. The general view of many members of the Subcommittee (and the witnesses) was that the new authorization for transportation would need to be at least double the existing authorization.

WALL STREET BAILOUT SHIFTS CONGRESSIONAL AGENDA

With only two weeks until a target adjournment date, congressional leaders returned from their summer recess two weeks ago with narrow goals of approving a Continuing Resolution (CR) to keep government operations running through the November elections, an energy bill, and perhaps a second economic stimulus package (including \$50 billion in infrastructure projects). However, economic and natural disasters have caused leaders to change course.

Now, representatives from Congress, the White House, and the Federal Reserve are working feverishly on a proposal that would create a federal entity to purchase the most distressed securities from endangered institutions and hold on to them until the financial markets calm down. Most of these risky investments are mortgage backed securities whose value has plummeted along with real estate prices.

Meanwhile, the Wall Street bailout discussions have quieted talk of a large-scale stimulus package prior to the November election. However, some popular elements of the proposed stimulus – such as an extension of unemployment benefits and low-income home energy assistance – may work their way into the CR. Congress will almost certainly approve a CR in some form next week, and it is likely to also include disaster relief for Gulf Coast hurricanes and Midwest flooding. Final numbers on the disaster relief have not been released yet (some estimate it at \$12 billion), but the much of the funds are likely to flow through the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program at HUD.

Finally, the CR may in fact be smaller than originally expected, as appropriators appear to be making progress on a FY 2009 spending package that would include funds for the Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, and the measure for Military Construction. If House and Senate negotiators can come to some agreement on the package in the next few days, there seems to be bipartisan support for allowing these security-related spending bills to become law. What all of this means for congressional adjournment is unclear. House leaders – cognizant that their rank-and-file are eager to return to their districts to campaign full-time – had been maintaining that their work can be completed by the end of the week, but House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid have been less certain in recent days. At the very least, Congress is likely to position itself to be able to return to Washington to quickly approve emergency legislation and enable committees to examine the financial crisis.

TRANSPORTATION

The comprehensive energy bill (HR 6899, approved by the House this week, includes provisions to boost funding over the next two years for transit.

Meanwhile, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee considered a measure (HR 3999) to authorize an additional \$1 billion in FY 2008 for federal bridge programs.

Energy Bill

The transit title of the House energy bill is designed to address higher gasoline prices by supporting greater ridership on public transportation systems. The bill would authorize an additional \$750 million in each of the next two years to the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Grant program. However, use of those funds would be restricted to activities that result in either increased transit service or reduced fares. The funds could also be used to purchase alternative fuel vehicles. In addition, there would be no local match for the funds.

Other provisions include an increase in the federal cost share of clean fuel and alternative fuel transit projects, whether they are bus, ferry or locomotive-related equipment or facilities, from 90 percent to 100 percent over the next two years; transit fringe benefits for all federal employees; and the implementation of a vanpool demonstration pilot project in three urbanized areas and two non-urbanized areas chosen by the Department of Transportation.

Senate Panel Approves Bridge Bill

Meanwhile, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee marked up and approved the National Highway Bridge Reconstruction and Inspection Act of 2008 (HR 3999) to increase the frequency of bridge inspections, implement uniform standards of inspection, develop a system for prioritizing bridge work that is based on risk, and authorize an additional \$1 billion in funding for bridge projects. HR 3999 was introduced in November of 2007 in response to the sudden collapse of the Interstate 35 bridge in Minnesota. It would authorize funding for the repair and reconstruction of about 6,000 bridges on the National Highway System (NHS) that have been rated as structurally deficient. The NHS is composed of only 4.1 percent of total road mileage in the country, but carries 45 percent of total traffic nationwide. The bill was approved by voice vote, although several committee Republicans voiced objections to a provision in the bill that requires states to prove that

they have addressed all the deficient NHS bridges in the states before they could shift the funds to other programs. The White House has also expressed some concerns about the bill's price tag.

The House overwhelmingly approved HR 3999 earlier this year, and should the bill pass the full Senate, the funds would still need to be appropriated by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees through a Continuing Resolution.

House Reauthorization Hearing

With the 2005 SAFETEA-LU law set to expire in 2009, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee held a hearing this week on transportation planning. Members heard testimony from witnesses representing cities, counties, metropolitan planning organizations, and multi-state transportation coalitions. The emergent theme of the hearing was pursuit of a national transportation planning strategy to better prioritize national interests and place a greater premium on intergovernmental and interregional coordination. To facilitate such coordination, the upcoming reauthorization of surface transportation programs should include incentives for States and localities to work together, witnesses urged. Witnesses also told the panel that the current distribution of resources does not place a great enough emphasis on metropolitan areas. Metro areas cover just 12 percent of the nation's land, but generate approximately 75 percent of its gross domestic product. In addition, 15 percent of the nation's interstate system lies in metropolitan areas but so does 50 percent of the total congestion.

Highway Trust Fund

Finally, early this week, the President signed into law HR 6532, a bill that transfers \$8.017 billion from the general treasury into the Highway Trust Fund. Both the House and Senate approved the bill last week. The \$8 billion transfer allows the trust fund to remain solvent temporarily, though most transportation officials and industry professionals agree that the primary revenue source of trust fund dollars, the federal excise tax on gasoline sales, is inadequate for the needs of the Nation's transportation infrastructure and must be addressed in the next authorization of federal surface transportation policies.

HOUSING & CD

HUD poised to release foreclosure assistance formula; will host summit on emergency housing bill programs. On September 29, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will publish the formula and the program notice for the \$3.9 billion Emergency Assistance for the Redevelopment of Abandoned and Foreclosed Homes Program. Early reports indicate that HUD will directly allocate funds to "large" cities and counties and that the funding will be targeted only to those communities with the greatest need. A week later, on October 7 and 8, HUD and the Department of the Treasury will host a stakeholder and practitioner summit on the Housing and Economic Recovery Act (PL 110-140) and their plans to address the housing and foreclosure crisis. Dubbed "Summit on Housing: Partnering for Responsible Policy," the meeting is designed to bring together representatives from government agencies at the federal, state and local level, non-profit organizations, foundations and the banking and housing industries to share and learn best practices for addressing both urgent and long term housing issues. As outlined in a letter to stakeholders, HUD's goals for the summit are to:

- Present HUD's current and developing policies and programs, including new programs introduced by PL 1101-40;
- Share state and local policies and programs that are succeeding in foreclosure prevention and public private partnerships, and
- Offer an open forum for discussion of these issues.

The summit agenda, registration information, and hotel information are at http://www.hdci.com/housing_summit. There is limited capacity, so those interested in attending should register as soon as possible.

GRANT OPPORTUNITIES

The Institute of Museum and Library

Services: IMLS is accepting applications for FY2009 Museums for America (MFA) grants.

The funding is designed to help with projects such as ongoing museum work, research and other behind-the-scenes activities, planning, new programs, purchase of equipment or services, and activities that will support the efforts of museums to upgrade and integrate new technologies.

The deadline for all applications is ***November 1, 2008***.

Applicants can apply for funding in one of three categories: Engaging communities (education, exhibitions, and interpretation), Building Institutional Capacity (management, policy, and training), and Collections Stewardship (management of collections). IMLS has \$17 million to award and estimates it will make 150 grants ranging from \$5,000 to \$150,000. There is a 100 percent match requirement. For more information, see: http://www.ims.gov/applicants/grants/pdf/MFA_2009.pdf.

**VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM E**

**Memorandum of Agreement Between the
Gateway Cities Council of Governments
and Caltrans for Implementing
Coordinated Monitoring Plan (TMDLs)**

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Agreement Between the Gateway Cities Council of Governments and Caltrans for Implementing Coordinated Monitoring Plan (TMDLs)

Background

The Board has previously approved a Memorandum of Agreement that provides that the COG, City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, and 40 cities in the Los Angeles River watershed will cooperate in the collection and analysis of water quality samples along the river to determine the actual levels of metal concentrations. This targeted monitoring will allow for more accurate determination of what the Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for the Los Angeles River and its tributaries.

To accomplish this task, monitoring stations will need to be accessed on property owned by Caltrans. The attached agreement adds Caltrans to the number of agencies participating in the study and is tailored to include Caltrans' particular requirements relating to accessing its property. The agreement has been reviewed and approved as to form by the General Counsel's office.

Recommendation

Approve the attached Memorandum of Agreement with Caltrans for the Los Angeles River Coordinated Monitoring Plan.

LOS ANGELES RIVER METALS
TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOADS
IMPLEMENTING COORDINATED MONITORING PLAN
CALTRANS AGREEMENT NO. 07-4847
EA 910204

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
AND
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

REGARDING THE ADMINISTRATION AND COST SHARING OF IMPLEMENTING THE
COORDINATED MONITORING PLAN FOR THE LOS ANGELES RIVER AND
TRIBUTARIES METALS TMDL

This Memorandum of Agreement (“Agreement”) is made and entered into as of the date of the last signature set forth below by and between the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, a California joint powers authority (“GCCOG”), and the State of California, through its Department of Transportation (hereafter referred to as CALTRANS); (hereinafter "Party" or "Parties") with respect to the following:

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the mission of the GCCOG includes environmental planning and providing technically sound science and analyses to its member cities and agencies; and

WHEREAS, fifteen of the GCCOG’s member cities are located within the Los Angeles River watershed and the GCCOG has established effective working relationships with the adjacent Councils of Governments; and

WHEREAS, the GCCOG has previously entered into interagency agreements, successfully partnering with various cities, SCAG, CALTRANS and the County of Los Angeles to undertake projects and studies of regional significance; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (“Regional Board”) adopted the Los Angeles River and Tributaries Metals Total Maximum Daily Load (“TMDL” or “Los Angeles River Metals TMDL”) in September of 2005, with the intent of improving water quality in the Los Angeles River and its tributaries; and

WHEREAS, the Parties recognize that the TMDL is not self-enforcing and has not been incorporated into the 2001 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for

Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Dischargers within the County of Los Angeles, and the unincorporated cities therein except the City of Long Beach, Avalon, Palmdale and Lancaster dated December 13, 2001 and the 1999 Caltrans Statewide Storm Water NPDES Permit for the LA River Metals TMDL to be legally enforceable; and

WHEREAS, this TMDL regulates the discharge of runoff from 40 cities, the County of Los Angeles, and CALTRANS, herein referred to as collectively the “Regulated Entities” or singularly a “Regulated Entity”, requiring a high degree of organization and cooperation from the local watershed agencies; and

WHEREAS, this TMDL requires the preparation and implementation of a Coordinated Monitoring Plan (“CMP”) by the Regulated Entities that is designed to monitor water quality at key locations along the Los Angeles River and its tributaries, in addition to proving compliance with the TMDL waste load allocations; and

WHEREAS, a Los Angeles River Metals TMDL Technical Committee, consisting of representatives from the Regulated Entities, has been established with the purpose of preparing and submitting the CMP to the Regional Board; and

WHEREAS, a Los Angeles River Metals TMDL Steering Committee, consisting of representatives from the Regulated Entities, has been established for the purpose of providing general oversight of the implementation of the Los Angeles River Metals TMDL which includes the CMP and technical Special Studies; and

WHEREAS, a Los Angeles River Watershed Management Committee, required by the Municipal Storm Water NPDES Permit, meets on a regular basis and is attended by all the Regulated Entities in the watershed; and

WHEREAS, the draft and final CMP titled “Los Angeles River Metals TMDL Coordinated Monitoring Plan,” was prepared by the Technical Committee, reviewed by the Los Angeles River Watershed Management Committee and Steering Committee, and submitted to the Regional Board on April 11, 2007 and March 26, 2008, respectively; and

WHEREAS, the Regulated Entities agree to implement the monitoring program within six months of the approval date of the CMP by the Regional Board and upon the adoption and initial funding of this Agreement by the Regulated Entities; and

WHEREAS, the CMP requires administrative services that the Regulated Entities desire the GCCOG to coordinate, including contracting for the purchase and installation of automated water sampling devices, collection of dry and wet weather water quality samples, laboratory analysis and reporting services, and other CMP related activities; and

WHEREAS, the GCCOG has agreed to provide administrative services to the Regulated Entities to facilitate the successful implementation of the CMP; and

WHEREAS, the Regulated Entities have agreed to share in fully funding the costs of the CMP, including those costs incurred by the GCCOG in administering this Agreement, based on the cost allocation formula contained in Exhibit A and the estimated monitoring plan costs shown in Exhibit B of this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the City of Los Angeles has the expertise and equipment to perform sampling services, laboratory analysis, and reporting services (“Monitoring Services”) consistent with the CMP; and

WHEREAS, the GCCOG and the Regulated Entities agree to employ the City of Los Angeles to perform the Monitoring Services on their behalf at locations identified in the CMP, and the Regulated Entities are willing to pay the City of Los Angeles for its Monitoring Services through the GCCOG, and City of Los Angeles is willing to perform the Monitoring Services and be reimbursed for such services as indicated in Exhibit B; and

WHEREAS, the County of Los Angeles has the expertise and equipment to perform the installation, or the ability to contract the installation to an outside entity, of the automated water sampling devices consistent with the CMP; and

WHEREAS, the GCCOG and the Regulated Entities agree to employ the County of Los Angeles to perform the installation of the automated water sampling devices on their behalf at locations identified in the CMP, and the Regulated Entities are willing to pay the County of Los Angeles for its installation services through the GCCOG, and County of Los Angeles is willing to provide, perform and be reimbursed for such installation services as indicated in Exhibit B; and

WHEREAS, GCCOG will execute similar cost-sharing agreements with all other Regulated Entities before this agreement becomes enforceable, unless stated otherwise elsewhere in this Agreement.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and conditions set forth herein, the Parties do hereby agree as follows:

Section 1. Recitals. The recitals set forth above are fully incorporated as part of this Agreement.

Section 2. Purpose. The purpose of this Agreement is to cooperatively fund the implementation of the CMP

Section 3. Cooperation. The Parties shall fully cooperate with one another to attain the purposes of this Agreement.

Section 4. Voluntary Nature. This Agreement is voluntarily entered into for the implementation of the CMP.

Section 5. Term. The term of this Agreement shall remain and continue in effect until completion of the ambient monitoring period of the CMP or June 30, 2012, whichever occurs first.

Section 6. Coordinated Monitoring Plan. The Los Angeles River Metals TMDL CMP consists of the regulatory background, ambient and effectiveness monitoring, monitoring sites, sampling parameters, analytical methods, schedule, reporting, and other regulatory requirements. Digital versions of the Regional Board approved CMP have been provided to all of the Regulated Entities. The final CMP was approved by the Regional Board on April 11, 2008, and is incorporated into this Agreement by this reference.

Section 7. Assessment for Proportional Costs of the CMP.

- a) CALTRANS' funding encumbered under this Agreement is evidenced by the signature of its District Budget Manager certifying as to funds in the maximum sum of Twenty Two Thousand Nine Hundred Fifty Nine and 22/100 Dollars (\$22,959.22) having been allocated and represents CALTRANS' share of the work costs as shown in Exhibit C. Any cost to be invoiced above this sum will require an amendment to this Agreement.
- b) The GCCOG will annually invoice CALTRANS upon the execution of this Agreement, based on allocated CMP costs, which includes all administrative costs incurred by the GCCOG in the performance of its duties under this Agreement. The GCCOG administrative costs include compensation for staff time, audit expenses, and costs incurred in administrating agreements. Any overpayment or underpayment of the CMP costs shall be credited or billed to CALTRANS in the next year's invoice or if it occurs in the last year of the Agreement it shall be reimbursed at its termination.

Section 8. Role of the GCCOG. The GCCOG shall enter into agreements with each of the Regulated Entities to effectuate the CMP, invoice and collect from the Regulated Entities the estimated amounts identified in Exhibit C, which are based on the cost allocation formula in Exhibit A and estimated annual monitoring costs in Exhibit B, and reimburse the City of Los Angeles and the County of Los Angeles for their respective services as described in this Agreement.

Section 9. Role of the City of Los Angeles.

- a) Monitoring – The City of Los Angeles will perform the Monitoring Services at locations indicated in the CMP on behalf of the Regulated Entities. Performance of the Monitoring Services by the City of Los Angeles is expressly conditioned upon all Regulated Entities listed in Exhibit A executing a similar agreement with the GCCOG for cost sharing of the CMP.

- b) Early Start of Monitoring – The TMDL requires monitoring to begin within six months of the Regional Board approval of the Final CMP; therefore, all Regulated Entities agree that the City of Los Angeles will start the Monitoring Services, if necessary, even before this agreement has been signed by all the Regulated Entities to ensure compliance with the TMDL. The Regulated Entities thereby authorize that all costs incurred by the City of Los Angeles for any early monitoring required by the CMP be included in the initial GCCOG invoice to the Regulated Entities.
- c) Reporting – The City of Los Angeles will submit final summary monitoring reports to the Regional Board annually as described in the CMP and distribute copies of the annual reports to the Regulated Entities prior to submittal to the Regional Board for review and approval. Regulated entities will have the right to request monitoring reports at any time.

Section 10. Role of the County of Los Angeles. The County of Los Angeles will perform the installation of the automated water sampling devices at the locations identified in the CMP. Installation of the automated water sampling devices by the County of Los Angeles is expressly conditioned upon all Regulated Entities listed in Exhibit A executing a similar agreement with the GCCOG for cost sharing of the CMP. The TMDL requires monitoring to begin within six months of the Regional Board approval of the Final CMP; therefore, all Regulated Entities agree that the County of Los Angeles will start the installation of the auto samplers, if necessary, even before this agreement has been signed by all the Regulated Entities to ensure compliance with the TMDL. The Regulated Entities thereby authorize that all capital costs incurred by the County of Los Angeles for any early installations be included in the initial GCCOG invoice to the Regulated Entities.

Section 11. Invoice and Payment.

- a) Annual Monitoring Payment – The GCCOG shall reimburse the City of Los Angeles for the Monitoring Services in accordance with Exhibits B and C within ninety (90) days of receipt of the invoice from City of Los Angeles, minus the cost share of the City of Los Angeles' portion of the GCCOG annual administration services cost. The GCCOG shall not be obligated to remit to the City of Los Angeles more than the amount it has actually collected from Regulated Entities pursuant to this Agreement less its estimated administrative costs. In the event that funds received by the GCCOG are not sufficient to cover the full GCCOG administrative costs and City of Los Angeles invoice within 90 days of invoice, but are subsequently received, those subsequent amounts shall be paid within to the City of Los Angeles within 30 days of receipt by the GCCOG. The annual payment shall be increased by the State of California Consumer Price Index (CPI) annually¹. The total annual monitoring costs shown in Exhibit B are estimates that have been agreed upon amongst the City of Los Angeles and the Regulated Entities. The cost estimates of Monitoring Services presented in Exhibit B and C and costs of any monitoring activities, are subject to changes in the CMP pursuant to a Regional Board

¹ The State of California CPI is referenced at <http://www.dir.ca.gov/DLSR> for Los Angeles-Riverside-Orange County Region for the month of June.

- requirement or unforeseen challenges in the field. The GCCOG shall be notified by the City of Los Angeles of any decreases or increases in sampling frequency; the actual cost of any decreases or increases in sampling frequency will be reconciled with the next annual payment.
- b) Auto Sampler Payment – The GCCOG shall reimburse the County of Los Angeles for the auto sampler infrastructure and installation capital costs as shown in Exhibit B and C within ninety (90) days of receipt of any invoices from County of Los Angeles. The GCCOG shall not be obligated to remit to the County of Los Angeles more than the amount it has actually collected from Regulated Entities pursuant to this agreement less its estimated administrative costs. In the event that funds received by the GCCOG are not sufficient to cover the full GCCOG administrative costs and County of Los Angeles invoice within 90 days of invoice, but are subsequently received, those subsequent amounts shall be paid within to the County of Los Angeles within 30 days of receipt by the GCCOG.
- c) Invoice – The GCCOG shall invoice the Regulated Entities annually in January except for the first invoice, which will take place immediately following the execution of this Agreement. The first invoice will consist of the allocated CMP costs for the first and second fiscal years, which include the costs of the auto sampler infrastructure and installation capital costs, and from thereon invoicing will be done in January of each year and will be based on the estimated costs of the following fiscal year as indicated in Exhibits B and C. The Regulated Entities shall pay the GCCOG invoices within sixty (60) days of receipt of the invoices. The City of Los Angeles will invoice the GCCOG immediately upon execution of this Agreement and from thereon on annual basis starting July 2009 and the GCCOG shall pay the City of Los Angeles invoices within ninety (90) days of receipt. Since the City of Los Angeles is providing the Monitoring Services, the City of Los Angeles will not be invoiced by the GCCOG for any monitoring related costs for the City's costs share; similarly, the County will not be invoiced for any auto sampler costs. Therefore, the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles invoices will be adjusted to exclude the City and County's cost shares, respectively.
- d) Late Payment Penalty – Any payment that is late shall be subject to interest on the original amount due from the date that the payment first became due. The interest rate shall be equal to the Prime Rate in effect when the payment first became due plus one percent for any payment that is made from 1 to 30 days after the due date. The Prime Rate in effect when the payment first became due plus five (5) percent shall apply for any payment that is made from 31 to 60 days after the due date. The Prime Rate in effect when the payment first became due plus ten (10) percent shall apply for any payment that is made more than 60 days after the due date. The rates shall, nevertheless, not exceed the maximum allowed by law.
- e) Delinquent Payments – A Regulated Entity's payment is considered to be delinquent 180 days after being invoiced by the GCCOG. The following procedure may be

implemented to attain payments from the delinquent Regulated Entity or Entities per instructions from the Steering Committee: 1) verbally contact/meet with the manager from the delinquent Regulated Entity or Entities, 2) submit a formal letter to the delinquent Regulated Entity or Entities from the GCCOG attorney, and 3) notify the Regional Board that the delinquent Regulated Entity or Entities are no longer a participating member of the CMP. If a Regulated Entity or Entities remain delinquent after the above procedures, then any delinquent amount(s) will be distributed in the following year's invoice amongst all remaining Regulated Entities proportionate to each Entity's area as it relates to the overall remaining total Regulated Entities area, excluding the delinquent Regulated Entity or Entities. The Steering Committee will revise Exhibits A and C to show the recalculated costs for each participating Regulated Entity; these revised exhibits will be sent to the GCCOG and included with the annual invoices to the Regulated Entities.

- f) Interest Accrual – Any interest accrued on the funds collected per this Agreement during the term of this Agreement shall be redeposited into the appropriate account and used for implementation of the CMP. The GCCOG shall report on an annual basis to the Steering Committee the amount of interest accrued by the CMP account(s).

Section 12. Independent Contractor.

- a) The GCCOG is and shall at all times remain a wholly independent contractor for performance of the obligations described in this Agreement. The GCCOG officers, employees and agents performing such obligations shall at all times be under the GCCOG's exclusive control. The Regulated Entities shall not have control over the conduct of the GCCOG or any of its officers, employees or agents, except as set forth in this Agreement. The GCCOG, and its officers, employees, or agents are not and shall not be deemed to be employees of the Regulated Entities.
- b) No employee benefits shall be available to the GCCOG in connection with the performance of its obligations under this Agreement. The GCCOG is solely responsible for the payment of salaries, wages, other compensation, employment taxes, worker's compensation, or similar taxes for its employees for performing obligations hereunder.

Section 13. Indemnification. To the fullest extent permitted by law, CALTRANS and the GCCOG agree to save, indemnify, defend, and hold harmless each other from any and all liability, claims, suits, actions, arbitration proceedings, administrative proceedings, and regulatory proceedings, losses, expenses, or any injury or damage of any kind whatsoever, whether actual, alleged or threatened, actual attorney fees, court costs, and any other costs of any nature without restriction incurred in relation to, as a consequence of, or arising out of, the performance of this Agreement, and attributable to the fault of the other. Following a determination of the percentage of fault and or liability by agreement between the Parties or a court of competent jurisdiction, the Party responsible for liability to the other will indemnify the other Party to this Agreement for the percentage of liability determined.

- constitute a waiver of any other provision, nor a waiver of any subsequent breach or violation of any provision of this Agreement.
- f) Law to Govern; Venue. This Agreement shall be interpreted, construed, and governed according to the laws of the State of California. In the event of litigation between the Parties, venue in the state trial courts shall lie exclusively in the County of Los Angeles.
 - g) No Presumption in Drafting. The Parties to this Agreement agree that the general rule that an Agreement is to be interpreted against the Party drafting it, or causing it to be prepared shall not apply.
 - h) Entire Agreement. This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement of the Parties with respect to the subject matter hereof and supersedes all prior or contemporaneous agreements, whether written or oral, with respect thereto.
 - i) Severability. If any term, provision, condition or covenant of this Agreement is declared or determined by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of this Agreement shall not be affected thereby and this Agreement shall be read and constructed without the invalid, void, or unenforceable provision(s).
 - j) Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be an original, but all of which taken together shall constitute but one and the same instrument, provided, however, that such counterparts shall have been delivered to both Parties to this Agreement.
 - k) All Parties have been represented by counsel in the preparation and negotiation of this Agreement. Accordingly, this Agreement shall be construed according to its fair language.
 - l) Each of the persons signing below on behalf of a Party represents and warrants that he or she is authorized to sign this Agreement on behalf of such Party.
 - m) All obligations of CALTRANS under the terms of this Agreement are subject to the appropriation of the resources by the Legislature and the allocation of resources by the California Transportation Commission. This Agreement has been written before ascertaining the availability of federal or state legislative appropriation of funds, for the mutual benefit of the Parties in order to avoid program and fiscal delays that would occur if the Agreement were executed after that determination was made. This Agreement is valid and enforceable as to CALTRANS as if sufficient funds have been made available to CALTRANS by the United States Government or California State Legislature for the purposes set forth in this Agreement. If the United States Government or the California State Legislature does not appropriate sufficient funds for CALTRANS to participate in this Agreement, this Agreement may be amended in writing by the PARTIES to reflect

- any agreed upon reduction in the percentage of funds contributed by CALTRANS to continue its participation in this Agreement. CALTRANS, however, has the option to withdraw from this Agreement in the event sufficient funds are not appropriated for CALTRANS. Should CALTRANS exercise its option to withdraw from this Agreement, CALTRANS shall remain responsible for its share of liability, if any, incurred while participating in this Agreement.
- n) Any Party intending to enter onto a CALTRANS right of way shall first make a written request to CALTRANS, identifying the site location, extent of access by persons (and equipment if any), dates and times of entry, as well as an explanation of the purpose of that entry. CALTRANS shall thereafter determine, within ten (10) working days, if that entry will be allowed without a formal encroachment permit issued by the District Permit Engineer as an authorized presence of non-CALTRANS Parties not interfering with or threatening the safety of the traveling public or the integrity of the CALTRANS infrastructure. In such case, CALTRANS will condition that right of entry on the accompaniment of a CALTRANS representative who shall be empowered to restrict or limit the access of those permittees, as deemed necessary, at the sole discretion of CALTRANS. Where adverse impacts to traffic or the traveled way can be anticipated by CALTRANS, CALTRANS may require that requesting Party submit a formal encroachment permit application to be filed and completed together with Traffic Control Plans when necessary (which must be prepared by or under the supervision of a traffic engineer licensed in the State of California) with the District Permit Engineer. An encroachment permit may require as much as six (6) weeks to be issued depending upon the extent of coordination and development of traffic controls required for that access.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed on their behalf, respectively, as follows:

DATE: _____

GATEWAY CITIES COUNCIL OF
GOVERNMENTS

Anne M Bayer, President

ATTEST:

Richard Powers, Secretary

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Department of Transportation

Will Kempton
Director of Transportation

By: _____
Douglas R. Failing
District Director

Date: _____

APPROVED AS TO FORM & PROCEDURE:

Attorney

CERTIFIED AS TO FUNDS:

District Budget Manager

CERTIFIED AS TO FINANCIAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS:

Accounting Administrator

EXHIBIT A

LOS ANGELES RIVER METALS TMDL COORDINATED MONITORING PLAN COST ALLOCATION FORMULA

(showing cost allocation for every \$100,000 in costs)

| Name | Area in sq miles | Distribution | Base Rate (\$) | Allocation on Sq Miles (\$) | Total Rate (\$) |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Alhambra | 7.6 | 0.012258262 | 500 | 968.40 | 1,468.40 |
| Arcadia | 10.93 | 0.017629317 | 500 | 1,392.72 | 1,892.72 |
| Bell | 2.74 | 0.004419426 | 500 | 349.13 | 849.13 |
| Bell Gardens | 2.48 | 0.004000065 | 500 | 316.01 | 816.01 |
| Bradbury | 1.4 | 0.002258101 | 500 | 178.39 | 678.39 |
| Burbank | 17.35 | 0.027984322 | 500 | 2,210.76 | 2,710.76 |
| Caltrans | 11.24 | 0.018129325 | 500 | 1,432.22 | 1,932.22 |
| Calabasas | 5.58 | 0.009000145 | 500 | 711.01 | 1,211.01 |
| Carson | 0.88 | 0.001419378 | 500 | 112.13 | 612.13 |
| Commerce | 6.56 | 0.010580816 | 500 | 835.88 | 1,335.88 |
| Compton | 8.6 | 0.013871191 | 500 | 1,095.82 | 1,595.82 |
| Cudahy | 1.12 | 0.001806481 | 500 | 142.71 | 642.71 |
| Downey | 5.66 | 0.00912918 | 500 | 721.21 | 1,221.21 |
| Duarte | 2.3 | 0.003709737 | 500 | 293.07 | 793.07 |
| El Monte | 6.97 | 0.011242117 | 500 | 888.13 | 1,388.13 |
| Glendale | 30.62 | 0.049387893 | 500 | 3,901.64 | 4,401.64 |
| Hidden Hills | 1.57 | 0.002532299 | 500 | 200.05 | 700.05 |
| Huntington Park | 3.03 | 0.004887176 | 500 | 386.09 | 886.09 |
| Irwindale | 1.89 | 0.003048436 | 500 | 240.83 | 740.83 |
| La Canada Flintridge | 8.57 | 0.013822804 | 500 | 1,092.00 | 1,592.00 |
| Long Beach | 16.66 | 0.026871401 | 500 | 2,122.84 | 2,622.84 |
| City of Los Angeles | 281.44 | 0.453942806 | 500 | 35,861.48 | 36,361.48 |
| Lynwood | 4.85 | 0.007822707 | 500 | 617.99 | 1,117.99 |
| Maywood | 1.18 | 0.001903257 | 500 | 150.36 | 650.36 |
| Monrovia | 10.34 | 0.016677688 | 500 | 1,317.54 | 1,817.54 |
| Montebello | 8.36 | 0.013484088 | 500 | 1,065.24 | 1,565.24 |
| Monterey Park | 7.66 | 0.012355038 | 500 | 976.05 | 1,476.05 |
| Paramount | 4.34 | 0.007000113 | 500 | 553.01 | 1,053.01 |
| Pasadena | 22.7 | 0.036613494 | 500 | 2,892.47 | 3,392.47 |
| Pico Rivera | 3.12 | 0.005032339 | 500 | 397.55 | 897.55 |
| Rosemead | 5.14 | 0.008290456 | 500 | 654.95 | 1,154.95 |
| San Fernando | 2.41 | 0.003887159 | 500 | 307.09 | 807.09 |
| San Gabriel | 4.12 | 0.006645268 | 500 | 524.98 | 1,024.98 |
| San Marino | 3.76 | 0.006064614 | 500 | 479.10 | 979.10 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|-------------|--------|-----------|-----------|
| Sierra Madre | 2.99 | 0.004822658 | 500 | 380.99 | 880.99 |
| Signal Hill | 1.13 | 0.00182261 | 500 | 143.99 | 643.99 |
| South El Monte | 2.09 | 0.003371022 | 500 | 266.31 | 766.31 |
| South Gate | 7.48 | 0.012064711 | 500 | 953.11 | 1,453.11 |
| South Pasadena | 3.43 | 0.005532347 | 500 | 437.06 | 937.06 |
| Temple City | 4.01 | 0.006467846 | 500 | 510.96 | 1,010.96 |
| Vernon | 5.08 | 0.008193681 | 500 | 647.30 | 1,147.30 |
| Unincorporated LA County Areas | 80.61 | 0.130018226 | 500 | 10,271.44 | 10,771.44 |
| | 619.99 | 1 | 21,000 | 79,000 | 100,000 |

Notes: The calculation of square miles in the watershed is based on GIS information supplied by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The distribution column indicates the square miles located within the jurisdiction of each Regulated Entity as a fraction of the total watershed. The base rate is \$500 per Regulated Entity per \$100,000 in monitoring costs. This base rate ensures a minimum contribution from each Regulated Entity, resulting in a total base of \$21,000. The allocation based on square miles is \$100,000 minus the base of \$21,000 (\$79,000) multiplied by the figure in the distribution column for each Regulated Entity. Each Regulated Entity's total cost for every \$100,000 in costs is the sum of the base (\$500 per \$100,000), plus the Regulated Entity's allocation based on square miles.

EXHIBIT B - Los Angeles River Metals TMDL Coordinated Monitoring Plan Estimated Costs

| MONITORING COSTS - Work Performed by City of Los Angeles | LABOR Cost/Site | LAB ANALYSIS Cost/Site | No. of Sites | Cost per Sample Event | No. Sample Events | Annual Cost |
|---|------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| DRY-Weather Monitoring | \$116 | \$365 | 12 | \$5,772 | 12 | \$69,264 |
| WET-Weather Monitoring | \$440 | \$365 | 5 | \$4,025 | 6 | \$24,150 |
| | | | | | Sub-total | \$93,414 |
| Special Dissolved Field Sampling (2 yrs) | \$67 | 0 | 12 | \$804 | 12 | \$9,648 |
| Special Dissolved Lab Analysis QA (2 yrs) | | \$730 | | | 18 | \$13,140 |
| | | | | | Sub-total | \$22,788 |
| Other Monitoring Related Costs (estimates from Steering Committee via LACoDPW) | Cost/Site | | No. of Sites | | | |
| Data Analysis | -- | | -- | -- | -- | \$50,000 |
| Reporting & Program Management | -- | | -- | -- | -- | \$30,000 |
| Stream Gage Service/data collection | \$700 | | 5 | -- | -- | \$3,500 |
| Auto Sampler Maintenance | \$1,000 | | 5 | -- | -- | \$5,000 |
| | | | | | Sub-total | \$88,500 |
| CITY Annual Costs for Years 1 & 2 | | | | | | \$204,702 |
| CITY Annual Costs for Years 3 & 4 | | | | | | \$181,914 |

| ONE-TIME CAPITAL COSTS - Work Performed by County of Los Angeles | Unit Cost | No. Units | Total Cost |
|---|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Auto Sampler Infrastructure & Installation | \$75,000 | 5 | \$375,000 |
| Total COUNTY Costs | | | \$375,000 |

| ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS - Work Performed by Gateway Cities Council of Governments | |
|---|-----------------|
| GCCOG Annual Costs | \$10,000 |

Notes:

This cost analysis **does not** include the cost of Tier II or III sampling.

This cost analysis is based on the number of sampling sites and frequency being proposed in the Revised CMP in response to the RWQCB comments.

The laboratory costs are based on EPA Analytical Method 200.8 (ICP-MS); Hardness is measured using SM 2340C.

The wet-weather labor costs are based on 2 trips to the auto-sampler per storm event.

The special dissolved field sampling and lab analysis QA are for the first two years of monitoring only; the QA is analysis for a field blank and field duplicate.

| TOTAL COST SUMMARY | YEAR 1 | YEAR 2 | YEAR 3 | YEAR 4 | TOTAL |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| City of Los Angeles Monitoring Costs | \$204,702 | \$204,702 | \$181,914 | \$181,914 | \$773,232 |
| County of Los Angeles Auto Sampler Capital Costs | \$375,000 | | | | \$375,000 |
| Gateway Cities COG Administrative Costs | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$40,000 |
| TOTAL COSTS | \$589,702 | \$214,702 | \$191,914 | \$191,914 | \$1,188,232 |

EXHIBIT C - Estimated Monitoring Cost Allocations for 40 TMDL Identified Cities, LA County & Caltrans

| City | Watershed Area | | Base Rate | Area | Year 1** Invoice Amount**** | Base Rate | Area | Year 2 Invoice Amount**** | Base Rate | Area | Year 3 & 4 Invoice Amount**** | Total Estimated Costs per Agreement Term |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| | sq miles | Percentage | Apportionment*** | | | Apportionment*** | | | Apportionment*** | | | |
| Alhambra | 7.6 | 1.22583% | \$2,949 | \$5,711 | \$8,659 | \$1,074 | \$2,079 | \$3,153 | \$960 | \$1,859 | \$2,818 | \$17,448.03 |
| Arcadia | 10.93 | 1.76293% | \$2,949 | \$8,213 | \$11,161 | \$1,074 | \$2,990 | \$4,064 | \$960 | \$2,673 | \$3,632 | \$22,489.86 |
| Bell | 2.74 | 0.44194% | \$2,949 | \$2,059 | \$5,007 | \$1,074 | \$750 | \$1,823 | \$960 | \$670 | \$1,630 | \$10,089.69 |
| Bell Gardens | 2.48 | 0.40001% | \$2,949 | \$1,863 | \$4,812 | \$1,074 | \$678 | \$1,752 | \$960 | \$606 | \$1,566 | \$9,696.03 |
| Bradbury | 1.4 | 0.22581% | \$2,949 | \$1,052 | \$4,000 | \$1,074 | \$383 | \$1,457 | \$960 | \$342 | \$1,302 | \$8,060.85 |
| Burbank | 17.35 | 2.79843% | \$2,949 | \$13,037 | \$15,985 | \$1,074 | \$4,747 | \$5,820 | \$960 | \$4,243 | \$5,202 | \$32,210.14 |
| Caltrans | 11.24 | 1.81293% | \$2,949 | \$8,446 | \$11,394 | \$1,074 | \$3,075 | \$4,149 | \$960 | \$2,749 | \$3,708 | \$22,959.22 |
| Calabasas | 5.58 | 0.90001% | \$2,949 | \$4,193 | \$7,141 | \$1,074 | \$1,527 | \$2,600 | \$960 | \$1,365 | \$2,324 | \$14,389.63 |
| Carson | 0.88 | 0.14194% | \$2,949 | \$661 | \$3,610 | \$1,074 | \$241 | \$1,314 | \$960 | \$215 | \$1,175 | \$7,273.53 |
| Commerce | 6.56 | 1.05808% | \$2,949 | \$4,929 | \$7,878 | \$1,074 | \$1,795 | \$2,868 | \$960 | \$1,604 | \$2,564 | \$15,873.41 |
| Compton | 8.6 | 1.38712% | \$2,949 | \$6,462 | \$9,411 | \$1,074 | \$2,353 | \$3,426 | \$960 | \$2,103 | \$3,063 | \$18,962.09 |
| Cudahy | 1.12 | 0.18065% | \$2,949 | \$842 | \$3,790 | \$1,074 | \$306 | \$1,380 | \$960 | \$274 | \$1,233 | \$7,636.91 |
| Downey | 5.66 | 0.91292% | \$2,949 | \$4,253 | \$7,201 | \$1,074 | \$1,548 | \$2,622 | \$960 | \$1,384 | \$2,344 | \$14,510.75 |
| Duarte | 2.3 | 0.37097% | \$2,949 | \$1,728 | \$4,677 | \$1,074 | \$629 | \$1,703 | \$960 | \$562 | \$1,522 | \$9,423.50 |
| El Monte | 6.97 | 1.12421% | \$2,949 | \$5,237 | \$8,186 | \$1,074 | \$1,907 | \$2,980 | \$960 | \$1,704 | \$2,664 | \$16,494.17 |
| Glendale | 30.62 | 4.93879% | \$2,949 | \$23,008 | \$25,957 | \$1,074 | \$8,377 | \$9,450 | \$960 | \$7,488 | \$8,447 | \$52,301.74 |
| Hidden Hills | 1.57 | 0.25323% | \$2,949 | \$1,180 | \$4,128 | \$1,074 | \$430 | \$1,503 | \$960 | \$384 | \$1,343 | \$8,318.24 |
| Huntington Park | 3.03 | 0.48872% | \$2,949 | \$2,277 | \$5,225 | \$1,074 | \$829 | \$1,902 | \$960 | \$741 | \$1,701 | \$10,528.77 |
| Irwindale | 1.89 | 0.30484% | \$2,949 | \$1,420 | \$4,369 | \$1,074 | \$517 | \$1,591 | \$960 | \$462 | \$1,422 | \$8,802.74 |
| La Canada Flintridge | 8.57 | 1.38228% | \$2,949 | \$6,440 | \$9,388 | \$1,074 | \$2,345 | \$3,418 | \$960 | \$2,096 | \$3,055 | \$18,916.67 |
| Long Beach | 16.66 | 2.68714% | \$2,949 | \$12,518 | \$15,467 | \$1,074 | \$4,558 | \$5,631 | \$960 | \$4,074 | \$5,034 | \$31,165.43 |
| Los Angeles | 281.44 | 45.39428% | \$2,949 | \$211,476 | \$214,424 | \$1,074 | \$76,995 | \$78,069 | \$960 | \$68,823 | \$69,783 | \$432,058.76 |
| Lynwood | 4.85 | 0.78227% | \$2,949 | \$3,644 | \$6,593 | \$1,074 | \$1,327 | \$2,400 | \$960 | \$1,186 | \$2,146 | \$13,284.36 |
| Maywood | 1.18 | 0.19033% | \$2,949 | \$887 | \$3,835 | \$1,074 | \$323 | \$1,396 | \$960 | \$289 | \$1,248 | \$7,727.75 |
| Monrovia | 10.34 | 1.66777% | \$2,949 | \$7,770 | \$10,718 | \$1,074 | \$2,829 | \$3,902 | \$960 | \$2,529 | \$3,488 | \$21,596.56 |
| Montebello | 8.36 | 1.34841% | \$2,949 | \$6,282 | \$9,230 | \$1,074 | \$2,287 | \$3,361 | \$960 | \$2,044 | \$3,004 | \$18,598.72 |
| Monterey Park | 7.66 | 1.23550% | \$2,949 | \$5,756 | \$8,704 | \$1,074 | \$2,096 | \$3,169 | \$960 | \$1,873 | \$2,833 | \$17,538.87 |
| Paramount | 4.34 | 0.70001% | \$2,949 | \$3,261 | \$6,210 | \$1,074 | \$1,187 | \$2,261 | \$960 | \$1,061 | \$2,021 | \$12,512.19 |
| Pasadena | 22.7 | 3.66135% | \$2,949 | \$17,057 | \$20,005 | \$1,074 | \$6,210 | \$7,284 | \$960 | \$5,551 | \$6,511 | \$40,310.37 |
| Pico Rivera | 3.12 | 0.50323% | \$2,949 | \$2,344 | \$5,293 | \$1,074 | \$854 | \$1,927 | \$960 | \$763 | \$1,723 | \$10,665.03 |
| Rosemead | 5.14 | 0.82905% | \$2,949 | \$3,862 | \$6,811 | \$1,074 | \$1,406 | \$2,480 | \$960 | \$1,257 | \$2,217 | \$13,723.44 |
| San Fernando | 2.41 | 0.38872% | \$2,949 | \$1,811 | \$4,759 | \$1,074 | \$659 | \$1,733 | \$960 | \$589 | \$1,549 | \$9,590.05 |
| San Gabriel | 4.12 | 0.66453% | \$2,949 | \$3,096 | \$6,044 | \$1,074 | \$1,127 | \$2,201 | \$960 | \$1,008 | \$1,967 | \$12,179.10 |
| San Marino | 3.76 | 0.60646% | \$2,949 | \$2,825 | \$5,774 | \$1,074 | \$1,029 | \$2,102 | \$960 | \$919 | \$1,879 | \$11,634.03 |
| Sierra Madre | 2.99 | 0.48227% | \$2,949 | \$2,247 | \$5,195 | \$1,074 | \$818 | \$1,892 | \$960 | \$731 | \$1,691 | \$10,468.21 |
| Signal Hill | 1.13 | 0.18226% | \$2,949 | \$849 | \$3,798 | \$1,074 | \$309 | \$1,383 | \$960 | \$276 | \$1,236 | \$7,652.05 |
| South El Monte | 2.09 | 0.33710% | \$2,949 | \$1,570 | \$4,519 | \$1,074 | \$572 | \$1,645 | \$960 | \$511 | \$1,471 | \$9,105.55 |
| South Gate | 7.48 | 1.20647% | \$2,949 | \$5,621 | \$8,569 | \$1,074 | \$2,046 | \$3,120 | \$960 | \$1,829 | \$2,789 | \$17,266.34 |
| South Pasadena | 3.43 | 0.55323% | \$2,949 | \$2,577 | \$5,526 | \$1,074 | \$938 | \$2,012 | \$960 | \$839 | \$1,798 | \$11,134.39 |
| Temple City | 4.01 | 0.64678% | \$2,949 | \$3,013 | \$5,962 | \$1,074 | \$1,097 | \$2,171 | \$960 | \$981 | \$1,940 | \$12,012.55 |
| Vernon | 5.08 | 0.81937% | \$2,949 | \$3,817 | \$6,766 | \$1,074 | \$1,390 | \$2,463 | \$960 | \$1,242 | \$2,202 | \$13,632.59 |
| LA County Unincorp. | 80.61 | 13.00182% | \$2,949 | \$60,571 | \$63,519 | \$1,074 | \$22,053 | \$23,126 | \$960 | \$19,712 | \$20,672 | \$127,989.70 |
| Total | 619.99 | 100.00000% | \$123,837 | \$465,865 | \$589,702 | \$45,087 | \$169,615 | \$214,702 | \$40,302 | \$151,612 | \$191,914 | \$1,188,232.00 |

**Includes \$375,000 capital costs for sampler equipment and installation.

***21% and 79% of allocation from base and area apportionments respectively

**** Includes \$10,000 GCCOG administrative costs per year, but does not include CPI adjustments.

**VII. CONSENT CALENDAR
ITEM F**

**Letter of Support for SCAG's Application
for State Compass Blueprint Funding**

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Letter of Support for SCAG's Application for State Compass Blueprint Funding

Background

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the federally designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for Southern California. Since 2001 SCAG has been working to respond to the challenges of population growth, worsening air quality, and reduced transportation funding by developing alternative plans for regional growth patterns. These plans and visions have collectively been called the Compass Blueprint for regional growth.

Following are the Compass Blueprint principles adopted by SCAG:

- Mobility - Getting where we want to go
- Livability - Creating positive communities
- Prosperity - Long-term health for the region
- Sustainability - Promoting efficient use of natural resources

Issue

SCAG has offered a suite of services to member cities to assist them in efforts to conduct planning that aligns with these Compass Blueprint principles. SCAG has funded these services in part with state Blueprint planning grant funds made available periodically to MPOs through a competitive process.

SCAG is now seeking the Gateway Cities COG's support in its application for a new round of available state grant funding. This funding, if received by SCAG, would in turn be offered to cities, including the Gateway Cities, via a competitive grant process.

In the past, projects in Compton, Long Beach, and the unincorporated Florence-Firestone area have been approved to receive SCAG Compass Blueprint funding. The Compton project was completed in 2007 with a budget of \$93,000; the Long Beach project is anticipated to be completed at the end of this year and has a budget of \$107,000. The Florence-Firestone project has an estimated budget of \$80,000 and would be completed during 2009.

Our support of SCAG's application could help provide a continuing opportunity for Gateway cities to receive future funds.

Attachments

Draft support letter to SCAG.

Recommended Action

Approve support letter.

DRAFT

October 1, 2008

Hasan Ikhata
Executive Director
Southern California Association of Governments
818 W. Seventh Street, 12th Floor (Main Office)
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Mr. Ikhata:

The Gateway Cities Council of Governments is pleased to support the Southern California Association of Governments in its application for a California Regional Blueprint Planning Grant.

Local governments are facing unprecedented challenges in planning for the future: fiscal constraints, greenhouse gases, and population growth. We appreciate SCAG's efforts to secure additional State resources to allow local governments to plan effectively for the future. The help that SCAG provides through its Compass Blueprint funded suite of services, assistance and research enables local jurisdictions to voluntarily update and implement local plans and strategies which support shared sustainable development principles. These resources also help communities address federal and state planning mandates associated with new development, energy emission reduction, and air quality conformity.

Since 2001, the Southern California Association of Governments has worked with communities to establish the Compass Blueprint vision and implementation strategy to promote sustainable and balanced development. We support the continued funding of this effort and endorse its incentive based approach of serving the region by helping local governments plan for the future.

We look forward to working in continued partnership with SCAG to create a more sustainable Southern California.

Sincerely,

Anne M. Bayer
President
Councilmember, City of Downey

VIII. REPORTS

ITEM A

**Foreclosure Outlook for the Gateway
Cities COG Region – Presentation By
Joe Carreras, Southern California
Association of Governments**

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Foreclosure Outlook for the Gateway Cities COG Region – Presentation by Joe Carreras, Southern California Association of Governments

Background

Of all the United States, California has the highest concentrations of subprime mortgage loans, and Southern California has the highest concentration in the state. While concentrations are worst in the Inland Empire, data from the Federal Reserve indicate that in Los Angeles County, the Gateway Cities are among the most affected areas.

Issue

Mr. Joe Carreras, Program Manager for Housing and Community Planning for the Southern California Association of Governments, will present data on the outlook for home mortgage foreclosures based on subprime lending patterns in the Gateway Cities subregion. He will describe resources and tools available to local governments through SCAG to respond to these trends.

Recommended Action

Receive and file this report.

VIII. REPORTS

ITEM B

Request of South Bay Cities Council of Governments and Westside Cities Council of Governments for Interim MTA Board Member Support

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Request of South Bay Cities Council of Governments and Westside Cities Council of Governments for Interim MTA Board Member Support

Background

Attached please find a request from South Bay and Westside Cities COGs to assist their MTA Board Member Pam O'Connor for an interim period of time because their Board Deputy has resigned leaving them without support for the MTA Board activities.

Issue

Karen Heit would be providing support to MTA Board Member O'Connor in addition to her duties for Gateway Cities. COG Staff is of the opinion that to provide assistance to both COGs would foster a more common understanding of the transportation issues facing the three sub-regions and create a closer working environment for the future.

The assistance requested would be for only 2 or 3 Board meetings until a replacement Deputy is retained.

In as much as the Gateway Cities Board Deputy is compensated in part by local City assessments, it is recommended that the South Bay and Westside Cities reimburse to the Gateway Cities COG the time spent on their behalf at the rate of \$44.00 per hour (our city assessment portion reimbursement).

Recommended Action

Approve the request of the South Bay Council of Governments and the Westside Cities Council of Governments for interim MTA Board Member support and authorize the Executive Director to sign a letter agreement with the South Bay COG providing for reimbursement to the Gateway Cities COG at the hourly rate of \$44.00 on an actual time spent basis.

VIII. REPORTS
ITEM C
SB-375 – Climate Change Legislation
Implementation

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Richard Powers, Executive Director

BY: Karen Heit, Transportation Deputy

SUBJECT: SB-375 – Climate Change Legislation Implementation

Background

In 2006, the legislature and Governor approved AB 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act, landmark legislation that gives the California Air Resources Board (CARB) authority to issue regulations to achieve major reductions in Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, including the regulation of emissions from cars and light trucks, a major contributor.

SB 375 is the vehicle by which CARB will endeavor to reduce transportation-related GHG emissions to 1990 levels. This bill will allow CARB to reduce GHG through the nexus between land use and transportation. Under SB 375 CARB is charged with determining the amount of GHG reduction each metropolitan region must achieve through transportation friendly land use and zoning. Each region will participate in the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that will reduce GHG via the region's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) In the case of Los Angeles County, SCAG creates the RTP and will affirm conformity and consistency between the SCS and the RTP.

Issue

In making the connection between land use and transportation, SB 375 assumes that an increase in density around transit nodes decreases auto and light truck usage.

The SCS will contain smart growth policies that will include concentrating housing, alternative development patterns or additional transportation infrastructure measures or policies that have the cumulative effect of reducing GHG emissions.

The strategies within the SCS include changing the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) cycle from five years to eight years to align the transportation and planning cycles. The SCS will fully mirror RHNA and the allocations per City. The RHNA requirements become a mandatory piece of local Housing Elements in that the Housing Elements need to be consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy may impact the priority of funding for transportation projects as they appear in the Transportation improvement Program (TIP) although how this may occur is not specified. The requirement to have the Housing Elements consistent with the SCS effectively gives SCAG some oversight authority over local zoning.

The Legislation requires that:

- Housing planning be coordinated with the SCAG Regional Transportation Plan. (RTP)
- Housing units be allocated within the region (SCAG region) consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy.
- Each jurisdiction must rezone (if necessary) to accommodate the allocation.

Cities that cannot rezone or otherwise meet their RHNA allocations may be subject to court action brought on by “interested parties.” This issue is of concern to built-out Gateway Cities that cannot identify sufficient sites for RHNA allocations.

SB 375 assumes that the “Compass Blueprint” land use assumptions and growth projects are achievable and that the transportation infrastructure exist or will exist to accommodate the “smart growth” designated for the communities. Again, the process of developing of the Compass Blueprint recommendations is of concern to Gateway Cities

SB 375 does provide a streamlining of the California Environmental Act (CEQA) for projects deemed Transit Priority Projects (TPP). TPP are projects that meet specific criteria that require the project (among other things) to be within ½ mile from an existing or planned transit stop, or high quality transit corridor, and have a minimum residential density of at least 20 dwelling units per acre. These projects require no additional review under the CEQA process, enabling cities to facilitate the construction of transit oriented development.

Recommended Action

SB 375 was awaiting the Governor’s signature at the end of September. COG staff believes the Bill will be signed and that follow-up legislation will need to occur to resolve some of the concerns expressed by cities. There are parts of the Bill where there are references to subregional standards being created and subregional involvement. In some places the legislation there is reference to Councils of Government.

Staff recommends that GCCOG staff follow the progress of the SB 375 and participate in the process of follow-on legislation and the creation of any implementation process that will occur at the CARB or SCAG levels.

IX. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES
ITEM A
Conservancy Committee

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Councilmember Patrick O'Donnell
Councilmember Edward Wilson

SUBJECT: San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy Update

Background

The San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy (RMC) was established by State Legislation in which the COG was an active participant. The Gateway Cities are represented on the RMC Board by two members listed above.

Issue

The Board of Directors of the RMC met on September 22, 2008.

The Board approved the RMC staff's funding recommendations for Tier 1 projects in the current round of project grant funding. Tier 1 projects are those that are ready for immediate implementation. Projects were categorized as either Tier 1 or Tier 2 earlier this year.

Of four Tier 1 projects in the Gateway Cities COG area, two were approved for full funding and one for partial funding, pending the identification of matching funds. One was not recommended for funding since no Step 2 application was submitted following the project's categorization as Tier 1.

A total of \$3,533,807 in funding was approved for the Gateway Cities COG, out of a total of \$5,015,878 that was requested (just over 70% of the requested amount).

Tier 2 funding recommendations are expected in October of this year.

Attachment

Table summarizing grant applications received within the Gateway Cities COG area.

Recommended Action

Receive and file this report.

| Tier 1 Applications: Sorted by COG Area, then by Applicant | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------|----------|---|--------------------|---|----------------------------|-------------|
| Program Manager | Project Name | Applicant | COG Area | Current description | Application Amount | Recommendation | Recommended Funding Amount | Total Score |
| Jane Beesley | Development of Palm Street Linear Park | Bellflower, City of | Gateway | The project will provide a park in an urban area that is park poor, dense and lower income. The City is deficient approximately 160 acres of park land and has little funds and open space to create parks. Creatively re-using underutilized parcels the City will create new park space. This project is an extension of a new Pocket Park in the City. Project will include river bed bank and basin, pedestrian path, picnic areas, permeable pavement in the parking lot and signage. | \$1,840,446.00 | Full Funding | \$1,840,446.00 | 75 |
| Tim Worley | West San Gabriel River Walk | Long Beach, City of | Gateway | The San Gabriel River Walk would develop unused open space next to the western levee of the San Gabriel River into a passive park with pathways and native landscaping. | \$2,288,143.00 | Partial funding recommended; \$1,144,072 from RMC once applicant has matching funds from other sources - federal or state grant programs &/or county (Proposition A) funds. | \$1,144,072.00 | 62 |
| Alina Bokde | 114th Street Park-South LA | Trust for Public Land | Gateway | The project involves the acquisition and development of a pocket park in South Central Los Angeles. This is a joint effort between the Trust for Public Land, Heal the Bay and Grant Housing and Economic Development Corporation. The project will transform a blighted vacant lot into a place for rest, relaxation, recreation and a gathering spot for local community groups. The park will be located in the heart of one of Los Angeles's densest and poorest neighborhoods; in a community where significant percentage of residents struggle with obesity and high blood pressure. The park will provide a safe place for families living in overcrowded circumstances to exercise, participate in community and cultural events and enjoy a natural native landscape. | \$338,000.00 | Incomplete: No Step 2 application submitted+L9 | \$0.00 | 0 |
| Jane Beesley | Pine Avenue Park Acquisition and Development | Trust for Public Land | Gateway | The Trust for Public Land is working with the City of Maywood and its communities to develop a pocket park. This area is a park poor community near the Los Angeles River. This project includes acquisition and development of the park. | \$549,289.00 | Full Funding | \$549,289.00 | 70 |