

MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Approved MINUTES
Monday, June 7, 2010
Ukiah City Council Chambers

ADDITIONAL AUDIOCONFERENCE LOCATION:
Caltrans District 1, 1656 Union St., Eureka

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) meets as the Board of Directors of:
Mendocino Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and
Mendocino County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

1. Call to Order / Roll Call . The meeting was called to order at 1:37 p.m. with Directors Robertson (PAC), Sinnott, Stranske, Pinches, and Gjerde present; Chair Gjerde presiding. Director Ranochak was excused. Directors Rodin and Smith arrived soon after. Mr. Rex Jackman, Caltrans, joined subsequently by audioconference.

Staff present: Phil Dow, Executive Director; Janet Orth, Deputy Director for Administration; Loretta Ellard, Assistant Executive Director; and Nephele Barrett, Senior Planner.

2. Convene as RTPA

3. Recess as RTPA - Reconvene as Policy Advisory Committee.

Public Expression. None.

Director Rodin arrived at 1:39 pm.

4 - 6. Consent Calendar. Upon motion by Pinches, second by Stranske, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (*6 Ayes – Robertson/PAC, Sinnott, Rodin, Stranske, Pinches, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 2 Absent – Smith and Ranochak*): IT IS ORDERED that consent items are approved:

4. Approval of May 3, 2010 Minutes – as written

5. Transit Productivity Committee (TPC) Recommendations:

- a. Acceptance of May 4, 2010 TPC Minutes - *as written*
- b. Adoption of Transit Performance Standards for 2010
- c. Acceptance of Report - Annual Review of Mendocino Transit Authority Performance Reports Against MCOG Standards
- d. Fiscal Year 2010/11 Unmet Transit Needs – *Action under Agenda #9a*
- e. Mendocino Transit Authority's Annual Transit Claim for FY 2010/11 - *Action under Agenda #9c*

6. Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation of May 26, 2010:

Approval of Fifth Amendment to Fiscal Year 2009/10 Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) - Adds \$116,000 of awarded grant funds for Phase 3 of the Regional Blueprint project, and \$35,000 of local matching funds (\$7,000 from Local Transportation Fund and \$28,000 from Planning, Programming & Monitoring). Total increase to the OWP is \$151,000, for a total current year OWP of \$1,966,808.

7 - 10. Regular Calendar.

7. Presentation and Acceptance of MCOG Triennial Performance Audit – LSC

Transportation Consultants, Inc. Mr. Dow introduced Mr. Geoff Straw, who made a slide presentation of the performance audit report, which was favorable. He summarized the purpose of the audit, the process of conducting it, and the two findings:

- *The MCOG should work closely with MTA staff to develop and fund a SRTDP [Short Range Transit Development Plan] update for FY 2010-11 and the ensuing four to six years.*
- *The MCOG should continue efforts to develop a staffing and/or contractor transition plan.*

Director Smith arrived at 1:45 p.m.

Mr. Straw also summarized results (6 recommendations) of Mendocino Transit Authority’s (MTA) performance audit that was conducted by LSC concurrently. He then answered questions.

Mr. Dow noted that MTA’s board had not yet discussed its audit report, so only the MCOG audit was agendized for discussion today. A meeting of MCOG’s Executive Committee is planned for August, the next opportunity when these issues can be reviewed further.

Director Sinnott stated pleasure in receiving good reports for both agencies. Chair Gjerde thanked Mr. Straw for the presentation. No action was taken.

8. Board Calendar – Consideration of Rescheduling August Meeting Date. Staff reported a conflict with the Board of Supervisors on August 30, which would result in two MCOG members unable to attend that day. After a brief calendar review, it was agreed to reschedule MCOG’s next board meeting to August 9 at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Jackman joined the meeting by telephone at 2:00 p.m.

9. Fiscal Year 2010/11 RTPA Budget. Ms. Orth reviewed the budget procedure, briefly summarizing sections of the budget and each agenda item for action. She reported the Transit Productivity Committee recommendations of May 4, which were made after her May 3 budget presentation to the Council. [See also Consent Calendar #5.] She then answered questions.

Upon motion by Sinnott, second by Rodin, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (*7 Ayes – Robertson/PAC, Sinnott, Rodin, Stranske, Pinches, Smith, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent - Ranochak*): **IT IS ORDERED** that the following three budget resolutions are adopted.

- a. Adoption of Resolution Finding That There Are Unmet Transit Needs That Are Reasonable To Meet for Fiscal Year 2010/11.

Resolution No. M2010-05

Finding That There Are Unmet Transit Needs
That Are Reasonable To Meet for Fiscal Year 2010/11
(Reso. #M2010-05 is incorporated herein by reference)

MCOG finds that there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet through revenue-neutral service adjustments contingent on feasibility, as identified on the FY 2010/11 list:	
# S-5	Service to new Family Services/County Health & Human Services center in Point Arena
#M-12	Bus service to the Ukiah Valley Medical Center and the medical clinic across the street
#M-13	More week-day bus service to Raley’s in Ukiah
#M-10	Connection with Horizon service at Sonoma County Airport

- b. Adoption of Resolution Allocating Fiscal Year 2010/11 Funds and 2009/10 Carryover Funds for Administration and Planning.

Resolution No. M2010-06
Allocating Fiscal Year 2010/11 Funds
and 2009/10 Carryover Funds for
Administration and Planning
(Reso. #M2010-06 is incorporated herein by reference)

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)		
MCOG Administration	323,725	
2% Bicycle & Pedestrian	0	
Planning Program – new funds	0	
LTF carryover – Planning program	33,275	
Other funding sources - Planning	1,361,316	
Total Allocations		1,718,316

- c. Adoption of Resolution Allocating Fiscal Year 2010/11 Local Transportation Funds, State Transit Assistance, and Capital Reserve Funds and FY 2009/10 Carryover Funds to Mendocino Transit Authority.

Resolution No. M2010-07
Allocating Fiscal Year 2010/11 Local Transportation Funds,
State Transit Assistance, and Capital Reserve Funds and
FY 2009/10 Carryover Funds to Mendocino Transit Authority
(Reso. #M2010-07 is incorporated herein by reference)

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)		
MTA Operations	1,946,007	
Unmet Transit Needs	0	
Senior Center Operations	367,912	
Total LTF		2,313,919
State Transit Assistance (STA)		
MTA & Senior Center Capital	129,388	
Capital Reserve Fund	0	
Total STA		129,388
Capital Reserve Program		567,383
Total Transit Allocations		3,010,690

Director Pinches asked about the budget of Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE), which funds the motorist aid call box program. Ms. Orth replied that it was adopted as part of a Five-Year Strategic & Financial Plan, which is entering its final year. As this was not agendized for discussion, Chair Gjerde directed the matter to the next Executive Committee meeting in August.

10. Technical Advisory Committee Recommendations of May 26, 2010:

- a. Adoption of Final Fiscal Year 2010/11 Planning Overall Work Program (OWP). Ms. Ellard reviewed status of the annual process and today's requested action. She noted one change to her staff report, that Work Element 16, County Road System Right-of-Way Database, will be completed this fiscal year and not carried over. She then invited questions.

Director Pinches objected to Work Element 24, Pavement Management Program Update, stating his reluctance to support the OWP with this work element included, because it does not address unpaved roads, and that numerous unpaved roads in his district are more heavily used than some paved ones and so deserve a share of pavement funds. Ms. Barrett explained the purpose of this program is to maintain already paved roads, analyzing their condition for best use of limited maintenance funds; as distinct from capital improvement of roads that have yet to be paved. Chair Gjerde and Director Sinnott concurred.

A motion was made by Director Rodin, seconded by Director Stranske, to adopt the OWP. **Discussion on the motion:**

- Suggestion that County Board of Supervisors discuss identifying and prioritizing funds for paving of unpaved roads. (Smith)
- Suggestion that MCOG transfer responsibility for the Pavement Management Program to the County and allocate that portion of funds to other MCOG purposes. This program is meant to preserve the existing capital investment in pavement. (Dow)
- Suggestion to update and revise the Pavement Management Program to include well-used unpaved roads. (Pinches)

Howard Dashiell, Director, Mendocino County Department of Transportation, was invited to the podium. The program's Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is a tool used to apply the right maintenance treatments to the system. A statewide inventory showed \$570 million of unmet road needs in Mendocino County. There are 350 miles of unpaved roads in the County, some of which have seen increased volumes. His budget has a modest amount for paving those roads incrementally over time. The PCI report card does not dictate where to spend the funds, as the County retains that internal decision. He strongly recommends the County spend a significant amount on preventive maintenance of pavement, to avoid higher costs of replacement later on, while continuing to invest as they are able in the unpaved surfaces.

The motion carried unanimously on roll call vote (*7 Ayes – Robertson/PAC, Sinnott, Rodin, Stranske, Pinches, Smith, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent - Ranochak*): IT IS ORDERED that the 2010/11 Final Overall Work Program is adopted as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee, and the Executive Director is authorized to sign appropriate certifications and the OWP Agreement and to forward to Caltrans as required.

- b. Adoption of Resolution #M2010-08 Redirecting American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Cost Savings. Ms. Barrett explained the issue. There are cost savings as a result of low bids on projects approved by MCOG for award of the first round of federal stimulus funds. A decision needed to be made on how to use the savings. In 2009, the Council had directed that savings would go toward the second phase of City of Ukiah's Dora Street project on the TAC's recommended list for the second round of federal stimulus, Jobs for Main Street Act. The project was later cut from the list as not able to meet the required timeline, and Jobs for Main Street has not yet passed into law. An estimated \$270,000 is available in cost savings. Therefore, the TAC has recommended redirection of cost savings to the County's Comptche-Ukiah/Orr Springs Road overlay project now in progress. It would be too late to start a new project because of federal requirements. Mr. Dow and Ms. Barrett answered questions.

A motion was made by Director Rodin, seconded by Director Stranske, to adopt proposed resolution. **Discussion on the motion:**

Mr. Bob Parker, Assistant Director, Mendocino County Department of Transportation, made comments in support of the TAC recommendation and clarified that the \$270,000 will not fully fund the entire project, only an additive bid item of the project, by augmenting other available funding from Proposition 1B and the County's road fund. Any future funding would allow continued overlay to cover the full length of this road eastward to Ukiah.

Ms. Barrett reported a correction to be made to the draft resolution, that the project location of Comptche-Ukiah/Low Gap Road will be correctly identified as Comptche-Ukiah/Orr Springs Road.

The motion carried unanimously on roll call vote (7 Ayes – Robertson/PAC, Sinnott, Rodin, Stranske, Pinches, Smith, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent - Ranochak): IT IS ORDERED that the following resolution is adopted, redirecting \$270,000 of ARRA cost savings to County of Mendocino's previously approved Comptche-Ukiah/Orr Springs Road Overlay Project.

Resolution No. M2010-08
Redirecting Cost Savings from
American Recovery & Reinvestment Act Projects
(Reso. #M2010-08 is incorporated herein by reference)

11. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee - Reconvene as RTPA - Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee. Upon motion by Sinnott, second by Rodin, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (6 Ayes – Sinnott, Rodin, Stranske, Pinches, Smith, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 1 Absent - Ranochak): IT IS ORDERED that the actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committee are ratified by the MCOG Board of Directors.

12. Reports - Information

- a. Mendocino Transit Authority. No one was present from MTA.
- b. North Coast Railroad Authority. There was no report.
- c. MCOG Administration & Planning Staff.
 1. *Summary of Meetings*. Dow referred to his written staff report.
 2. *Results of Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Workshops and Survey*. Ms. Barrett summarized the results of six workshops held at various locations countwide. 35 people attended in person and over 150 responses were received from the online survey. Discussion followed. Comments received were of interest and reflected participation, while not "statistically significant" for accuracy of the general population. The comment period for this outreach phase is now closed. The next opportunity for comment will be upon release of the Draft RTP.
 3. *2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)*. Mr. Dow answered questions about his staff report. When actual revenues do not meet the official STIP estimate made for programming of projects, as is the case for FY 2009/10, the California Transportation Commission enacts an Allocation Plan of their own. For FY 2010/11, CTC staff does not anticipate an Allocation Plan. Therefore, MCOG staff expects to receive funding for local road projects as programmed in the STIP in the coming year. Transit funds remain uncertain.
 4. *Senate Bill 83 (Hancock) Traffic Congestion: Motor Vehicle Registration Fees*. Mr. Dow reported it has been learned that this bill made its own definition of RTPAs, as only those

nine entities that are members of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission in the Bay Area, not the 30 or so statewide. Santa Cruz staff discovered this, among a number of disappointed agencies. The author of SB 83 has been contacted, understands the problem, and is willing to amend the bill at the next opportunity.

5. *Miscellaneous*. None.

- d. MCOG Directors. Director Sinnott expressed interest in a future agenda item to discuss a proposal reported in the Information Packet, to form a North State Planning Partnership.
- e. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates. None.

Mr. Jackman signed off the audioconference link.

The Chair called a recess at 2:52 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 3:04 p.m.

13. Strategic Planning Workshop. Chair Gjerde convened the workshop and asked Executive Director Dow to summarize the staff report. Mr. Dow gave an overview of roles and responsibilities of Council of Governments (COGs) and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) in California. He noted that these regional agencies are being asked, as a result of State legislation, to consider sustainable communities planning in addition to their customary duties, and that this is an indication of how attitudes have changed toward regional government over the past three decades. Questions are arising on best use of limited resources and whether there are more strategic ways of looking at the issues. Chair Gjerde referred to the recent East Bay Tour of transportation “best practices” organized and attended by board and staff members of MCOG and its member agencies.

I. History of RTPAs and Councils of Government

Director Sinnott, as MCOG’s Alternate Delegate to CALCOG, presented a statewide history of the RTPAs and COGs, formed in the 1960s to 1970s, legislation affecting them, and scope of decision making as a result. *“In California COGs are among the lead agencies in regional planning for two basic reasons: 1) They are **extensions of local government**, the most basic unit of governance in the American system; and 2) they are **multipurpose associations** which can integrate all essential elements of growth management and comprehensive planning.”*

Mr. Dow and Chair Gjerde contributed comments to the presentation.

II. “Color of Money” Issues and Exercise

Mr. Dow reviewed the various funding sources available to MCOG, describing their uses and limitations and answering questions. Director Sinnott then conducted a group exercise as a mock regional economy, illustrating choices to be made in funding household and societal necessities such as taxes, housing, food, and capital improvements.

III. Vision for Communities

A. *Categories of Focus*. Mr. Dow reviewed MCOG’s transportation functions and the linkage to community development. He explained why MCOG has responsibility for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process, which is an unfunded State mandate. To date, transportation decisions have tended to react to development after the fact. MCOG has no land use authority. Chair Gjerde described how regions such as the Bay Area are beginning to devise incentives to co-locate development of housing, jobs and transportation as opposed to more sprawl development. Mr. Dow then described the correlation to community health, in terms of bicycle and pedestrian access. Board and staff discussion included:

- Tendency of private investment to follow public funding
- Siting of schools and the popular Safe Routes to Schools grant program
- Potential of MCOG recommendations for the County General Plan
- Dedication of MCOG funds to match bicycle and pedestrian grants
- Constraints on funds for certain purposes can be beneficial
- Existence of specific plans by the local member jurisdictions for various community development
- Air quality impacts of vehicle use and value of reducing unnecessary trips by increasing bicycle and pedestrian access
- Evidence that attractive pedestrian areas can result in economic benefits.

B. *Mendocino County Blueprint Process.* Mr. Dow introduced Nephele Barrett, Senior Planner in charge of MCOG's Blueprint planning project. He noted that in California the regional "blueprint" plans are mandated in urban areas and voluntary in rural ones. Ms. Barrett described the three grant-funded phases and status of each phase. In Phase 1, base data is being compiled into GIS (Geographic Information Systems) format, building mapping layers for all areas of the countywide region for a variety of factors. Phase 2 will involve stakeholders in a public outreach process. Phase 3 will identify various alternative scenarios for consideration in selecting preferred development scenarios in each local area, along with implementation strategies and performance measures for sustainable community outcomes. Extensive discussion followed, including the following questions and issues:

- Timeline of Blueprint process (2009 to 2013)
- Value of the Blueprint process or lack thereof
- Comparisons to the Ukiah Valley Area Plan (UVAP) process
- Relationships to existing general and specific plans of the County and Cities
- Role of Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
- Potential overlap and conflicts between Blueprint planning and other planning efforts
- Benefits and opportunities in Blueprint planning, such as illuminating gaps and redundancies across jurisdictional boundaries and identifying unique local community character and values within the larger region to guide compatible development
- MCOG's advisory role in relation to local government decision making powers.

The remainder of the workshop agenda was continued to the August 9 meeting, as follows:

C. *Visioning of Project Lists*

IV. MCOG's Role in Vision Implementation

V. Project Facilitation & Leveraging Funds to Implement Visions

It was agreed to seek a facilitator for the next workshop session.

14. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Submitted: PHILLIP J. DOW, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

By Janet Orth, Deputy Director for Administration