

# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## Approved MINUTES

Monday, August 9, 2010

UC Farm Advisors' Conference Room  
890 North Bush Street, Ukiah

**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 10:10 a.m. with Directors Sinnott, Stranske, Smith, and Gjerde present; Chair Gjerde presiding. Directors Rodin and Pinches were absent. Rex Jackman (PAC) and Director Ranochak arrived during Reports. Alternate Director Benj Thomas arrived (in place of Director Rodin) during Agenda #10 - Workshop.

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

Consultant present: Sue Haun, Strategies By Design, workshop facilitator

**2. Convene as RTPA**

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

**Public Expression.** None.

**4. Regular Calendar.**

**4. Consideration of Joining Signatories to Memorandum of Agreement for North State Super Region.** Mr. Dow briefly reported on this proposal, recommended approval and answered questions. Discussion followed. It was noted that 16 counties are included in the “super region” and this would provide a stronger voice for rural issues. Directors Stranske and Sinnott commented favorably on the value of joining this partnership. It is anticipated that a kickoff meeting will be scheduled for the fall, as early as September, likely in Redding.

**Upon motion** by Stranske, second by Sinnott, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (*4 Ayes – Sinnott, Stranske, Smith, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 4 Absent – Jackman/PAC, Rodin, Pinches, and Ranochak*): IT IS ORDERED that the following resolution is adopted.

### **Resolution No. M2010-09**

Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute the  
Memorandum of Agreement for Participation in the  
North State Super Region  
(Reso. #M2010-09 is incorporated herein by reference)

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

**5. Approval of June 7, 2010 Minutes – as written**

**6. Acceptance of MCOG Triennial Performance Audit – LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc.** – MCOG received a favorable audit for Fiscal Years 2006/07, 2007/08 and 2008/09 with two recommendations: 1) work closely with MTA staff to develop and fund a Short Range Transit Development Plan update and 2) continue efforts to develop a staffing and/or contractor transition plan for MCOG.

**7. Approval of Mendocino Transit Authority’s Revised Claim for Fiscal Year 2010/11 Funds** – State Transit Assistance was released from suspension by the Legislature, increasing MCOG’s STA fund by \$506,076; MTA claims an additional \$515,612. MTA claims additional Capital Reserve Funds of \$627 from interest earnings. FY 2010/11 revised allocation summary:

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 Operations	350,000	
MTA & Senior Center Capital	295,000	
MTA Capital - Carryover	51,992	
Total STA		696,992
Capital Reserve Program		640,039
<b>Total Transit Allocations</b>		<b>3,650,950</b>

**8. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee - Reconvene as RTPA - Ratify Action of Policy**

**Advisory Committee.** Upon motion by Smith, second by Stranske, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (4 Ayes – Sinnott, Stranske, Smith, and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 3 Absent – Rodin, Pinches, and Ranochak): IT IS ORDERED that the actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committee are ratified by the MCOG Board of Directors.

Directors Jackman (PAC) and Ranochak arrived during Reports.

**9. Reports - Information**

- a. Mendocino Transit Authority. General Manager Bruce Richard had nothing new to report.
- b. North Coast Railroad Authority. Ms. Ellard reported, as she regularly attends NCRA’s meetings. The Environmental Impact Report for improvements to the Russian River segment from Lombard to Willits is expected to be on their September agenda to certify the document, including all comments received. She then answered questions:
 

Is there progress in opening the tracks to Cloverdale? Some repairs have been completed with Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) funds, as far north as Windsor. NCRA has not received any federal stimulus (ARRA) funds.
- c. MCOG Administration & Planning Staff
  1. *Summary of Meetings.* Mr. Dow referred to his written staff report.
  2. *U.S. 101 Bypass of Willits.* Mr. Dow referred to his written staff report and answered questions. The June 30 California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting was

discussed. An important vote on allocation of construction funds was on that agenda. A contingent from MCOG and other agencies attended and spoke in favor of the project. A group from Willits spoke against the project. Labor groups were in attendance with about 200 representatives. The timing of funds was tied to the federal fiscal year end. Environmental permits had not yet been approved by federal resource agencies, so the CTC voted unanimously to approve funding conditional on Caltrans obtaining the permits by the end of August. To date, the “401” permit has been granted. The “404” wetlands permit is still pending from Army Corps of Engineers, the last remaining permit needed. If not obtained, California could forfeit federal funds for lack of ready eligible projects; the bypass project is the best positioned project for currently available federal funds. Mr. Dow reported personnel changes at Corp during this permitting process.

Director Sinnott, who had attended, commented on the emotional and technical presentations of a more exciting CTC meeting than usual. Director Stranske also attended and called it an excellent meeting with a favorable outcome, and that the union workers’ testimonies were very moving.

3. *American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Update.* Mr. Dow said that staff handled necessary administrative matters, collaborating with the Lake County/City Area Planning Council on an exchange to maximize the use of available funds. Ms. Barrett commented that the result was funding of the originally intended projects.
4. *Miscellaneous.* None.

d. MCOG Directors. There were no further reports.

e. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates. There was no news to report.

The Chair called a recess at 10:28 a.m. and reconvened the meeting at 10:35 a.m.

Director Ranochak left the meeting at 10:28 a.m.

**10. Strategic Planning Workshop.** (Refer to Supplemental Agenda.) This item was continued from June 7, 2010. The Chair introduced Sue Haun, Strategies By Design, engaged by MCOG to facilitate today’s workshop, who led the following session.

- I. **Introduction to the Strategic Planning Workshop.** A set of meeting guidelines were agreed to by all of the participants. The goal was to reach some conceptual agreements by end of day, with clear direction for staff to pursue and bring back more specifics later.
- II. **Mission & Vision.** Purpose and definitions were reviewed. Ms. Haun handed out a draft MCOG mission statement for discussion. The word “community” was added (see attached revised draft mission statement). She then led a brainstorming exercise for creating a vision for MCOG (see attached draft vision with themes and raw data). These were intended for further consideration over time.

Director Thomas (Alt.) arrived during #II.

- III. **Aim, Impacts, Outcome - Your Vision for MCOG.** The facilitator posed the question: “As MCOG, what do you want to create, experience or impact in the community?” This was part of the above discussion.

BREAK for Lunch at 11:40 a.m., reconvened at 12:15 p.m.

- IV. **Future Role of MCOG.** Ms. Haun introduced the issues for discussion.

1. Types of Regional Projects Funded/Not Funded by MCOG. Mr. Dow described five transportation project types as identified in the meeting materials he provided (“Supplemental Agenda Packet”), reviewing examples of each.

*Funded by MCOG:*

- State Highway Improvement Projects
- Local Streets & Roads Projects
- Regional Circulation Projects
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects
- Public Transit Projects

*Funded by MCOG in past:*

- Streets & Roads Rehabilitation Projects
- Rail Grade Crossing Improvements

2. Historic Role of MCOG and Other Possible Roles. A timeline from the 1970s to 2000s was provided in the meeting packet, including both discretionary and mandated functions. Examples of active, semi-active, and passive MCOG roles were identified and discussed.

3. What future role do you want MCOG to play with respect to each of the 5 project types? After brainstorming the topic, several key issues were identified and Ms. Haun conducted a straw poll to gauge agreement. From “Should MCOG play an active role in all five project types?” more specific questions were raised and consensus reached as follows.

*Applies to All Projects – Application Process for Funding:*

- Applicants are to provide total budget and a plan for project completion
- Level of information required is to be consistent with project size
- Documentation of entity’s commitment to project is to be provided (staff followup: draft policy for periodic reviews and recommitment).

*All Five Project Types:*

Staff is to bring back options, new and current, for MCOG’s role. Staff is to bring existing funding criteria back to Board for review. Changes are to be reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee for concurrence and identification of any problems, starting with the LTF 2% Bicycle & Pedestrian Program.

*Local Streets & Roads:*

During discussion, Mr. Howard Dashiell, Director, Mendocino County Department of Transportation, commented on the North State Street improvement project.

(5-minute break)

**V. Project Facilitation & Leveraging Funds.**

1. Definition of “Strategic” Project Choices. Mr. Dow reviewed his written staff analysis (see meeting materials).
2. Possible Additions to Criterion for “Strategic” Project Choices. Ideas included consistency with the Regional Blueprint and local Specific Plans, linkage to Housing & Jobs Balance, Mixed-Use Development, Complete Streets and Green Streets. Staff is to bring back a more detailed proposal.
3. Project Facilitation & Leveraging Funds: Issues for Consideration and Discussion. Four issues were addressed:
  - Issue 1 - Should MCOG be responsible for project development for priority projects to ensure project readiness?
  - Issue 2 - Should the Partnership Funding Program that was initiated several years ago with RSTP funding be continued through the life of the next federal transportation bill?
  - Issue 3 - Should MCOG pursue expansion of the level of local assistance for its member agencies?
  - Issue 4 - Should MCOG expand project selection criteria to increase the relative importance of leveraging and to reflect outcomes of this workshop?All four were agreed to in concept.
4. Which types of project facilitation/project development would you support and under what conditions? How does this impact the application process? This was included in the above discussion.

Director Smith left the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

- VI. Wrap-Up.** Ms. Haun asked for a brief evaluation of the workshop and noted comments. The floor was opened to a thoughtful closing discussion by all. Next steps will involve work by staff that will be brought to the Board for review and revisions over several regular meetings.

**11. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Submitted: PHILLIP J. DOW, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

By Janet Orth, Deputy Director for Administration

Attachments:

- Revised draft MCOG Mission Statement
- Draft Vision with themes and raw data

---

*Draft Presented at the August 9, 2010 Strategic Planning Meeting Plus Changes Made During the Meeting*

The purpose of the Mendocino Council of Governments  
is to assist local governments in planning for common needs,  
cooperating for mutual benefit,  
and coordinating for sound regional **and community**<sup>1</sup> development.  
MCOGs mission is to provide regional **and community** transportation planning,  
to administer transportation funding and financing,  
to develop transportation projects for future funding,  
to provide technical assistance for transportation project delivery,  
to support rural/public transportation services, and  
to administer grants for transportation/community enhancement projects.

---

<sup>1</sup> "and community" was added during the August 9, 2010 Strategic Planning Workshop.

---

*Drafts Developed After Discussion at MCOG's August 9, 2010 Strategic Planning Meeting*

**DRAFT 1**

Regional and county government working together to connect communities, create thriving city centers, and develop healthy, livable communities for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians.

**DRAFT 2**

Regional and county government working together  
to connect communities and people through a variety of transportation modes;  
to create thriving city centers with safe streets and lush tree canopies, and  
to create healthy, livable communities for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians alike.

## MCOG VISION

### THEMES IDENTIFIED FROM THE RAW DATA FROM THE AUGUST 9, 2010 STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP

*See the Next Page for Raw Data*

#### THEMES:

##### 1. Connected Communities

###### Transportation Connecting Communities & People

- Strategies, partnerships with local entities **strategy, vision?**
- Efficient flow of traffic for all modes **vision**
- Partnerships across jurisdictional boundaries **vision?**
- Educate public for informed community **strategy, vision**
- Interregional connection to other areas
- Connectivity – regional, community **vision (duplicate)**
- Transportation connecting communities **vision**
- Educational role for informed decision-making **strategy, vision**

##### 2. Thriving City Centers

- Streets as exceptional public spaces for walking, biking, driving and the environment **vision**
- Efficient flow of traffic for all modes **vision**
- Infill development for walkability, cycling **strategy, vision**
- Complete our streets for all users with emphasis on infill communities **vision, strategy**
- “Green Streets” – beyond canopy **vision**
- Vibrant small towns **vision**
- Retain rural character, beauty of region without pollution **vision**
- Reduce oil dependency **objective**
- Reduce green house gases **objective**
- Business friendly **vision**
- Economic vitality **vision**
- Allow open space by balancing with density, cluster development **vision, strategy**

##### 3. Healthy, Livable Communities

- Actualize community visions for enhanced quality of life **objective strategy, vision**
- Walking, cycling, encourage for community health **vision**
- Walkable community with free-flowing traffic **vision, vision**
- Neighborhood connectivity **vision**
- Safe streets for drivers, pedestrians, cyclists **vision**
- Tree canopy in streets **vision**
- Livable communities – trees, biking, walking, etc. **vision**
- “Livable communities” **vision**

## MCOG VISION

### RAW DATA FROM THE AUGUST 9, 2010 STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOP - BRAINSTORMING

#### *Initial Analysis*

- Walking, cycling, encourage for community health **vision**
- Reduce oil dependency **objective**
- Reduce green house gases **objective**
- Planning with longer horizons **strategy**
- Integrate city-county planning principles, design standards, service delivery **strategy**
- Strategies, partnerships with local entities **strategy, vision?**
- Allow open space by balancing with density, cluster development **vision, strategy**
- Infill development for walkability, cycling **strategy, vision**
- Walkable community with free-flowing traffic **vision, vision**
- Complete our streets for all users with emphasis on infill communities **vision, strategy**
- Neighborhood connectivity **vision**
- Educational role for informed decision-making **strategy, vision**
- Efficient flow of traffic for all modes **vision**
- Application of transportation planning principles on land-use development, integrate transportations and land use decisions **strategy**
- Partnerships across jurisdictional boundaries **vision?**
- Safe streets for drivers, pedestrians, cyclists **vision**
- Educate public for informed community **strategy, vision**
- Tree canopy in streets **vision**
- Economic vitality **vision**
- Efficient, high quality project delivery **objective**
- Appropriate mitigation for transportation impacts **strategy**
- Business friendly **vision**
- Ease of transportation for business products and services **strategy**
- Local contractors and workers working on transportation projects **strategy**
- Balance of transportation modes **objective?**
- Well-maintained roads, streets **objective?**
- Actualize community visions for enhanced quality of life **objective strategy, vision**
- “Green Streets” – beyond canopy **vision**
- Retain rural character, beauty of region without pollution **vision**
- Vibrant small towns **vision**
- “Livable communities” **vision?**

#### Vision Themes (identified in real time during the meeting)

- Transportation connecting communities **vision**
- Interregional connection to other areas **vision (duplicate)**
- Streets as exceptional public spaces for walking, biking, driving and the environment **vision**
- Good road maintenance plans **strategy**
- Applying good planning, economically that doesn't cost extra **strategy**
- Excellence in design **strategy**
- Project investment in infrastructure **strategy**
- Ensure Economic viability **vision**
- Provide new transportation infrastructure support **strategy**
- Connectivity – regional, community **vision (duplicate)**
- Livable communities – trees, biking, walking, etc. **vision**