



MEETING No. 584

REGIONAL COUNCIL

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
T: (213) 236-1800
F: (213) 236-1825
www.scag.ca.gov

***Thursday, November 3, 2016
12:15 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.***

**SCAG Main Office
818 W. 7th Street, 12th Floor
Board Room
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 236-1800**

REGIONAL COUNCIL OFFICERS

President
Michele Martinez, Santa Ana

First Vice President
Margaret E. Finlay, Duarte

Second Vice President
Alan Wapner, Ontario

Immediate Past President
Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Executive/Administration
Michele Martinez, Santa Ana

Community, Economic &
Human Development
Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake

Energy & Environment
Carmen Ramirez, Oxnard

Transportation
Barbara Messina, Alhambra

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Tess Rey-Chaput at (213) 236-1908 or via email at REY@scag.ca.gov. In addition, regular meetings of the Regional Council may be viewed live or on-demand at: <http://www.scag.ca.gov/NewsAndMedia/Pages/SCAGTV.aspx>

Agendas & Minutes for the Regional Council are also available at: <http://www.scag.ca.gov/committees/Pages/default.aspx>

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. SCAG is also committed to helping people with limited proficiency in the English language access the agency's essential public information and services. You can request such assistance by calling (213) 236-1908. We request at least 72 hours (three days) notice to provide reasonable accommodations and will make every effort to arrange for assistance as soon as possible.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank



Regional Council
Members – November 2016

Members

Representing

President	1. Hon. Michele Martinez	<i>Santa Ana</i>	District 16
1st Vice President	2. Hon. Margaret E. Finlay	<i>Duarte</i>	District 35
2nd Vice President	3. Hon. Alan Wapner	<i>Ontario</i>	SANBAG
Imm. Past President	4. Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker	<i>El Centro</i>	District 1
	5. Hon. Jack Terrazas		Imperial County
	6. Hon. Mark Ridley-Thomas		Los Angeles County
	7. Hon. Michael D. Antonovich		Los Angeles County
	8. Hon. Jim Katapodis		OCTA
	9. Hon. Michelle Steel		Orange County
	10. Hon. Curt Hagman		San Bernardino County
	11. Hon. Linda Parks		Ventura County
	12. Hon. Chuck Washington		Riverside County
	13. Hon. Jan Harnik	<i>Palm Desert</i>	RCTC
	14. Hon. Keith Millhouse	<i>Moorpark</i>	VCTC
	15. Hon. Gregory Pettis	<i>Cathedral City</i>	District 2
	16. Hon. Jim Hyatt	<i>Calimesa</i>	District 3
	17. Hon. Clint Lorimore	<i>Eastvale</i>	District 4
	18. Hon. Randon Lane	<i>Murrieta</i>	District 5
	19. Hon. Frank Navarro	<i>Colton</i>	District 6
	20. Hon. Larry McCallon	<i>Highland</i>	District 7
	21. Hon. Deborah Robertson	<i>Rialto</i>	District 8
	22. Hon. L. Dennis Michael	<i>Rancho Cucamonga</i>	District 9
	23. Hon. Ray Marquez	<i>Chino Hills</i>	District 10
	24. Hon. Bill Jahn	<i>Big Bear Lake</i>	District 11
	25. Hon. Fred Minagar	<i>Laguna Niguel</i>	District 12
	26. Hon. Barbara Kogerman	<i>Laguna Hills</i>	District 13
	27. Hon. Steven Choi	<i>Irvine</i>	District 14
	28. Hon. Steve Nagel	<i>Fountain Valley</i>	District 15
	29. Hon. John Nielsen	<i>Tustin</i>	District 17
	30. Hon. Steve Hwangbo	<i>La Palma</i>	District 18
	31. Hon. Kris Murray	<i>Anaheim</i>	District 19



Regional Council
Members – November 2016

Members

Representing

32. Hon. Tri Ta	<i>Westminster</i>	District 20
33. Hon. Art Brown	<i>Buena Park</i>	District 21
34. Hon. Marty Simonoff	<i>Brea</i>	District 22
35. Hon. Victor Manalo	<i>Artesia</i>	District 23
36. Hon. Gene Daniels	<i>Paramount</i>	District 24
37. Hon. Sean Ashton	<i>Downey</i>	District 25
38. Hon. José Luis Solache	<i>Lynwood</i>	District 26
39. Hon. Ali Saleh	<i>Bell</i>	District 27
40. Hon. Dan Medina	<i>Gardena</i>	District 28
41. Hon. Rex Richardson	<i>Long Beach</i>	District 29
42. Hon. Lena Gonzalez	<i>Long Beach</i>	District 30
43. Hon. Andrew Sarega	<i>La Mirada</i>	District 31
44. Hon. Margaret Clark	<i>Rosemead</i>	District 32
45. Hon. Gene Murabito	<i>Glendora</i>	District 33
46. Hon. Barbara Messina	<i>Alhambra</i>	District 34
47. Hon. Jonathan Curtis	<i>La Cañada/Flintridge</i>	District 36
48. Hon. Carol Herrera	<i>Diamond Bar</i>	District 37
49. Hon. Sam Pedroza	<i>Claremont</i>	District 38
50. Hon. James Gazeley	<i>Lomita</i>	District 39
51. Hon. Judy Mitchell	<i>Rolling Hills Estates</i>	District 40
52. Hon. Pam O'Connor	<i>Santa Monica</i>	District 41
53. Hon. Vartan Gharpetian	<i>Glendale</i>	District 42
54. Hon. Steven Hofbauer	<i>Palmdale</i>	District 43
55. Hon. John Sibert	<i>Malibu</i>	District 44
56. Hon. Carmen Ramirez	<i>Oxnard</i>	District 45
57. Hon. Glen Becerra	<i>Simi Valley</i>	District 46
58. Hon. Carl E. Morehouse	<i>San Buenaventura</i>	District 47
59. Hon. Gilbert Cedillo	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 48
60. Hon. Paul Krekorian	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 49 / Public Transit Rep.
61. Hon. Bob Blumenfield	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 50
62. Hon. David Ryu	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 51



Regional Council
Members – November 2016

Members

Representing

63. Hon. Paul Koretz	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 52
64. Hon. Nury Martinez	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 53
65. VACANT	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 54
66. Hon. Marqueece Harris-Dawson	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 55
67. Hon. Curren D. Price, Jr.	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 56
68. Hon. Herb J. Wesson, Jr.	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 57
69. Hon. Mike Bonin	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 58
70. Hon. Mitchell Englander	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 59
71. Hon. Mitch O’Farrell	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 60
72. Hon. José Huizar	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 61
73. Hon. Joe Buscaino	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 62
74. Hon. Karen Spiegel	<i>Corona</i>	District 63
75. Hon. Erik Peterson	<i>Huntington Beach</i>	District 64
76. Hon. Ryan McEachron	<i>Victorville</i>	District 65
77. Hon. Michael Wilson	<i>Indio</i>	District 66
78. Hon. Antonio Lopez	<i>San Fernando</i>	District 67
79. Hon. Rusty Bailey	<i>Riverside</i>	District 68
80. Hon. Jeffrey Giba	<i>Moreno Valley</i>	District 69
81. Hon. Ross Chun	<i>Aliso Viejo</i>	TCA
82. Hon. Mary “Maxine” Resvaloso	<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians</i>	Tribal Government Representative
83. Mr. Randall Lewis	<i>Lewis Group of Companies</i>	Business Representative
84. Hon. Eric Garcetti	<i>Los Angeles</i>	(Member at Large)

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

REGIONAL COUNCIL AGENDA NOVEMBER 3, 2016

The Regional Council may consider and act upon any of the items listed on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as Information or Action Items.

CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(Hon. Michele Martinez, President)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – Members of the public desiring to speak on items on the agenda, or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Council, must fill out and present a Public Comment Card to the Assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes per speaker. The President has the discretion to reduce the time limit based upon the number of speakers. The President may limit the total time for all public comments to twenty (20) minutes.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

RECOGNITION OF OUTGOING REGIONAL COUNCIL AND POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

PRESENTATION ITEM

Page No.

- | | | |
|---|-------------------|----------|
| 1. <u>Go Human Active Transportation Safety and Encouragement Campaign</u>
<i>(Sarah Jepson, SCAG Staff)</i> | Attachment | 1 |
|---|-------------------|----------|

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEM

- | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|
| 2. <u>Amendment 2 to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 Overall Work Program (OWP)</u> | Attachment | 18 |
|--|-------------------|-----------|

Recommended Action: Adopt Resolution No. 16-584-1 approving Amendment 2 to the FY 2016-17 OWP and authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to submit the necessary documentation to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

- | | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------|
| 3. <u>Minutes of the Regional Council Meeting – September 29, 2016</u> | Attachment | 23 |
| 4. <u>CivicSpark – Sponsorship Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding</u> | Attachment | 35 |



REGIONAL COUNCIL AGENDA NOVEMBER 3, 2016

CONSENT CALENDAR - continued

Page No.

- | | | |
|---|-------------------|------------|
| 5. <u>Contracts \$200,000 or Greater: Contract No. 17-012-C1, Videography Services</u> | Attachment | 54 |
| 6. <u>Contracts \$200,000 or Greater: Contract Nos. 17-002-C1 through 17-002-C12, On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services</u> | Attachment | 69 |
| 7. <u>Contract Amendment that exceeds \$75,000: Contract No. 12-019-C1, Monthly Managed Information Technology (IT) Services</u> | Attachment | 125 |
| 8. <u>Approval of Additional Stipend Payments</u> | Attachment | 131 |

Receive & File

- | | | |
|--|---|------------|
| 9. <u>Purchase Orders \$5,000 but less than \$200,000; Contracts \$25,000 but less than \$200,000; and Amendments \$5,000 but less than \$75,000</u> | Attachment | 132 |
| 10. <u>2017 Local Profiles Update</u> | Attachment | 138 |
| 11. <u>California Housing Summit: The Cost of Not Housing – Recap</u> | Attachment | 143 |
| 12. <u>Cap-and-Trade Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program and Award Update</u> | Attachment | 151 |
| 13. <u>SB 375 Target Setting Stress Test Status Report</u> | Attachment | 177 |
| 14. <u>Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget Development Schedule</u> | Attachment | 180 |
| 15. <u>2017 Meeting Schedule of the Regional Council and Policy Committees</u> | Attachment | 182 |
| 16. <u>CFO Monthly Report</u> | Attachment | 183 |
| 17. <u>November State and Federal Legislative Update</u> | To be distributed
at the meeting | |



REGIONAL COUNCIL AGENDA NOVEMBER 3, 2016

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

- Rail~Volution 2016 Conference
- New Members
- Committee Appointments
- Business Update
- Air Resources Board (ARB) – Update

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

(Hasan Ikhata, Executive, Director)

- California Housing Summit – Recap
- SCAG 7th Annual Southern California Economic Summit –
December 1, 2016, The L.A. Hotel Downtown

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive/Administration Committee (EAC) Report

(Hon. Michele Martinez, Chair)

Transportation Committee (TC) Report

(Hon. Barbara Messina, Chair)

Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee Report

(Hon. Bill Jahn, Chair)

Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)

(Hon. Carmen Ramirez, Chair)



REGIONAL COUNCIL AGENDA NOVEMBER 3, 2016

CLOSED SESSION ITEMS

- I. Conference with Real Property Negotiators
Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.8

Property: 900 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90017
Agency Negotiators: Hasan Ikhata, Debbie Dillon
Negotiating Parties: Hanjin International Corporation
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms of Payment

- II. Conference with Legal Counsel Regarding an Existing Litigation
Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.9 (a)

City of El Segundo v SCAG (LASC Case No. BS162452)

- III. Conference with Legal Counsel Regarding an Existing Litigation
Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54956.9 (a)

Zucker v SCAG (LASC Case No. BC 610043)

FUTURE AGENDA ITEM/S

ANNOUNCEMENT/S

ADJOURNMENT

In lieu of the regular meeting for Thursday, December 1, 2016, SCAG will hold its 7th Annual Economic Summit at The L.A. Hotel Downtown, 333 S. Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, CA 90071.

The next regular meeting of the Regional Council is scheduled for January 5, 2017 and will held at the SCAG Los Angeles Office.



DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Regional Council (RC)

FROM: Sarah Jepson, Manager, Active Transportation and Special Projects,
Jepson@scag.ca.gov; (213) 236-1955

SUBJECT: SCAG's *Go Human* Campaign Update

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

For Information Only - No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In September 2015, SCAG launched "Go Human," a region-wide active transportation safety and encouragement campaign. This report provides an overview of activities and impacts of the campaign to date, as well as, highlights opportunities for local jurisdictions to participate in future phases, including by applying for technical assistance through SCAG's Sustainability Planning Grant (SPG) Call for Proposals. Applications for the SPG are due November 18, 2016.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan, Goal 1 (Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies), Objective C (Provide practical solutions for moving new ideas forward).

BACKGROUND:

In 2014 SCAG's General Assembly adopted a motion to pursue a regional effort to promote bicycle and pedestrian safety. In September 2015, SCAG launched *Go Human*, a region-wide active transportation safety and encouragement campaign funded by a grant from the statewide competitive portion of 2014 Active Transportation Program (ATP) and regional funding from the Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC). The primary goals of the *Go Human* campaign are to reduce collisions involving pedestrians and bicyclists, while increasing the levels of walking and biking in Southern California. To achieve these goals, SCAG and its partners implemented a regional advertising campaign focused on promoting roadway safety, a series of open streets events and complete streets demonstration projects, and active transportation trainings for local champions.

Advertising Campaign

SCAG launched the paid media component of *Go Human* from September to December of 2015, the time of year with the highest rate of collisions due to reduced daylight hours. The media purchases targeted drivers, bicyclists and pedestrians with a "point of engagement" strategy, utilizing bus tails, bulletins, billboards, radio advertisements and bus shelters, among others. To date, the campaign has successfully achieved over 390 million impressions (each time someone views the advertisement) and developed over 40 partnerships with cities and agencies to extend the reach of the campaign (including

REPORT

forthcoming ad placements in the California Department of Motor Vehicles Driver's Handbook). SCAG completed an evaluation of the campaign effectiveness and found that one in five drivers reported seeing one of the ads and that 80 percent of drivers found the ads motivating enough to change their behavior. In June 2016, the campaign received two awards from the National Association of Government Communicators for its logo and poster design.

To complement the paid media, *Go Human* generated over 40 earned media pieces resulting in over 13 million media impressions. While most articles were published around the launch of the campaign, additional coverage was secured post-launch to align with seasonal media opportunities in collaboration with elected officials and partners across the region. The website also hosts the *Go Human* blog and links to the campaign Facebook and Twitter accounts, which are available to promote local projects and information from across the region.

SCAG encourages local agencies to get involved to expand the campaign. SCAG can provide advertisements in English and Spanish (as well as Chinese and Vietnamese upon request). In addition a press kit is available for any local or regional agency interested in including the Campaign advertisements on their websites or disseminating information through other channels. Materials are available for viewing on the [Go Human website](#).

Go Human Events

The Open Streets & Temporary Events portion of the Campaign involves partnering with local jurisdictions to host events that inspire more people to walk and bike by transforming streets through temporary improvements (or pop-ups), open streets events and other fun activities that increase awareness of active transportation and complete street concepts. Local partners were selected through a Call for Projects process that SCAG issued in Spring 2015. Through the ATP grant, SCAG had resources to fund six events, but due to the significant interest in the program, SCAG in partnership with the county transportation commissions and local agencies, secured additional funding awards to support all 16 eligible projects that were submitted as a result of the Call for Projects process. The majority of the new funding comes from grants awarded by the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee (MSRC) to partnering agencies. To date, SCAG has implemented seven *Go Human* events, including demonstration projects in Boyle Heights, El Centro, Westminster, Palm Desert, Fontana, the Southeast Cities (Los Angeles) and Long Beach. Planning is underway for additional events in this fiscal year in Rialto, Cudahy, Rancho Cucamonga, Fullerton, Orange County Loop (City of Brea, City of Yorba Linda, City of Anaheim), City of Riverside, Garden Grove and Santa Ana.

An evaluation and final report on the first six events is available on SCAG's website. Highlights include:

- 3.2 million media impressions achieved across all events
- Helped fast-track implementation of Palm Desert's complete streets plan
- Gained public support for planned completed streets improvements in El Centro, Los Angeles, and Westminster
- Provided first and last mile community input for Metro's first/last mile planning efforts along the Blue Line

REPORT

- Over 1,000 feedback surveys completed

Community feedback and input demonstrated the following:

- 98% of survey respondents supported their local governments' plans to make the temporary improvements permanent
- 96% of survey respondents said that the temporary safety improvements made the streets feel safer and more inviting to use
- 96% of survey respondents were inspired to walk and/or bike more because of the events.

The final report also includes a summary of resources developed for *Go Human* events, including design templates and lessons learned that may help local agencies interested in pursuing similar events in their communities.

Toolbox and Trainings

SCAG developed a series of resources, compiled in an on-line toolbox, to assist elected officials, transportation and health professionals, employers and community organizations interested in promoting active transportation and safety in their communities. The resources were developed to address needs and opportunities identified in focus group discussions with the target audiences. Toolbox materials include fact sheets, FAQs, case studies, worksheets, and PowerPoint Templates covering topics such as: county statistics on walking and biking, grant funding strategies, walking and biking audit design, approaches and resources to use data to inform decision making, strategies to increase walking and biking in the workplace, among others.

SCAG has hosted a series of Toolbox Trainings in collaboration with county transportation commissions, county health departments and other agencies across the region to promote the toolbox and available resources. The first training was hosted in coordination with the SCAG's General Assembly and specifically targeted elected officials, providing additional information on *Go Human*, previewing the toolbox resources, and facilitating a site visit to the Palm Desert *Go Human* event. Toolbox trainings targeting a broader range of stakeholders have been completed in four of the six SCAG counties (San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange County and Imperial County), with 86 participants. Additional trainings are being scheduled in Ventura and Los Angeles counties in conjunction with the Sustainability Planning Grant Program outreach.

In addition to the Toolbox Trainings, SCAG has delivered 13 bicycle safety trainings for the general public and conducted one group bicycle ride, reaching 99 participants, with the goals of increasing education around safe bicycling behavior, as well as, advancing an understanding of planning concepts related to infrastructure that facilitates safe walking and biking.

Next Steps

SCAG and its partners have been successful in securing an additional \$4.5 million in grant funding to expand and increase the impact of *Go Human*. The majority of the grant funding is anticipated to be directed toward additional *Go Human* events. As part of a partnership with MSRC, and in coordination with the Regional ATP, SCAG hopes to partner with between 25-30 cities and counties over the next 18

REPORT

months to deliver events that will reach minimum of 200,000 people. Projects implemented through the program may include any combination of the following activities: open streets events or demonstration projects, pedestrian and bicycle education, community-wide advertising, bike-to-work or walk-to-work school day/month programming, production of educational materials like walking and biking maps, and development and implementation of walking school bus or bike trains. All *Go Human* activities are anticipated to result in immediate reduction of criteria pollutants by reducing VMT as the result of street closures and/or other programming. In addition, the *Go Human* programs aim to provide tools, resources, and temporary roadway installations that serve to stimulate walking and biking on a daily basis. Longer-term benefits will include building support and local momentum for the implementation of active transportation infrastructure included in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, which is expected to result in a 2.3 million reduction in VMT per day by 2040.

Five-hundred thousand of *Go Human's* new grant funding was awarded by the Office of Traffic Safety. These resources will be used to expand campaign collateral and fund additional advertising in the region's most vulnerable communities. Successful awareness campaigns require repeated exposure to campaign messaging. By re-running, the campaign in May 2017, SCAG aims to increase exposure and impact of the campaign through increased awareness and public education on the rules of the road.

Local jurisdictions that are interested in partnering with SCAG to host a *Go Human* event, share awareness messaging and advertisements in their communities, or facilitate an active transportation training are encouraged to contact Julia Lippe-Klein (lippe-klein@scag.ca.gov), 213-236-1856, for more information.

In addition, SCAG has recently released its 2016 Sustainable Planning Grant Call for Proposals. *Go Human* demonstration projects and advertising are an eligible project type under this funding source. SCAG is encouraging local communities to apply for these demonstration projects as an opportunity to build community support and conduct outreach for future active transportation infrastructure projects. Application materials are available on SCAG's Sustainability Website (<http://sustain.scag.ca.gov/Pages/DemoProjApplication.aspx>). Applications are due November 18, 2016. For information on the Sustainability Planning Grants Call for Projects contact Rye Baerg (baerg@scag.ca.gov), 213-236-1866.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Funding for the *Go Human* Campaign is provided primarily through specialized grants by the California Active Transportation Program, Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee, and the Office of Traffic Safety with matching resources provided by SCAG. The project is budgeted in the FY 16-17 OWP in 225.03564.01, 225.03564.02, 225.03564.04, 225.03564.05, 225.03564.07 and 225.03564.09

ATTACHMENT:

PowerPoint Presentation: "Southern California Active Transportation Safety & Encouragement Campaign"



Southern California Active Transportation Safety & Encouragement Campaign

November 3, 2016

Sarah Jepson
Manager, Active Transportation & Special Programs
Southern California Association of Governments



Regional Context



Campaign Overview


Goals

- Public Education
 - Safety
 - Encouragement
- Empower, create local champions
- Coordination/Collaboration

Funding

- \$2.3 M California Transp. Commission ATP Grant

Campaign Components



The graphic features the 'g@human' logo at the top left. Below it, the text reads 'No es solo una señal. Fijate en ella antes de dar vuelta.' (It's not just a sign. Look at it before you turn.). The central image shows a woman walking through a yellow diamond-shaped pedestrian crossing sign. At the bottom, the text 'Advertising Campaign' is displayed on a teal background.



The graphic is a document titled 'HOW TO CONDUCT WALKING AND BIKING AUDITS' with the 'g@human' logo. It contains sections for 'Walk and bike audits', 'Benefits of conducting walking and biking audits', 'Support goal', 'Risk level', 'Equipment used', and 'Health benefits'. At the bottom, a flowchart shows four steps: 'Choose the location for the audit', 'Choose the time of the audit', 'Choose when the audit will take place', and 'Choose how to conduct the audit'. The text 'Toolkits/Trainings' is at the bottom on a teal background.



The graphic shows a person riding a bicycle on a street that has been temporarily closed to traffic. The street is lined with colorful plastic barriers (blue, yellow, and red) and orange traffic cones. The text 'Open Streets & Temporary Events' is at the bottom on a teal background.

Driver Ads

 **It's not just a sign.**
Watch for people walking.



 **It's not just a sign.**
Give people room to ride.



 **It's not just a sign.**
Look for her before you turn.



Pedestrian & Bicyclist Ads

 **Be on the safe side.**
Cross at the corner or crosswalk.



 **Go with the flow.**
Ride in the direction of traffic.



 **No matter how you roll.**
Stop means stop.



Campaign Accomplishments

- 400+ million total estimated impressions
- 40+ of earned media pieces
- 40+ agency partners
- National Association of Government Communicators awards for logo and poster design

Evaluation Results*

The brand and messaging are memorable & motivating

- Over 20% recognized the ads
- Over 80% found the ads to be motivating

* Quantitative survey of 615 drivers

Toolbox & Trainings

- **Skills & Knowledge**
To know the rules of the road
(with or without bike facilities)
- **Empower Local Champions!**
Share info & materials with
your organization, workplace or
city



Trainings

300+ Participants

- 1 Leadership Symposium
- 13 Bike Safety Trainings
- 6 Toolbox Trainings
- 1 Group Ride



Toolbox

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Tools

- Active Transportation Infrastructure
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Grant Funding 101: Tips & Checklists
- How to Conduct Walking & Biking Audits
- How to Facilitate Group Rides
- Open Streets: Paving the Way for New Infrastructure
- Using Data for Active Transportation Decision Making
- Using Go Human's Advertising Materials
- Workplaces: Simple Strategies to Promote Walking & Biking

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION FACTS & FIGURES

- Most county-wide Non-Motorist Transportation Plan
- San Bernardino County's public health department has incorporated Safe Routes to Schools into their programming and outreach efforts with local sites.
- 7 Cities with Complete Streets Programs, and 6 in progress.
- 21% of cities within San Bernardino County have completed or are in the planning phase of a local Safe Routes to Schools Plan or Program.

TRIPS BY MODE

- 9.7%
- 0.72%
- 1.52%

5% OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH NO CAR ACCESS

MILES OF BIKEWAY BY CLASS (2012)

CLASS	MILES
CLASS 1 (Blue)	77
CLASS 2 (Green)	276
CLASS 3 (Red)	150

SAFETY CONCERNS

Category	Injuries	Killed
448 INJURIES	51 KILLED	
395 INJURIES		7 KILLED

Toolbox

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE

USING GO HUMAN'S ADVERTISING MATERIALS

GRANT FUNDING 101: TIPS AND CHECKLISTS

These three toolkits from Go Human provide comprehensive guidance on infrastructure, advertising, and grant funding. The infrastructure toolkit includes speed limit charts and photos of various bike lanes. The advertising toolkit features images of various signs and posters. The grant funding toolkit contains a detailed checklist for successful applications.

Open Streets & Demonstration Projects

- Re-imagine streets for walking and biking
- 15 events by June 2017



Demonstrate Infrastructure



Demonstrate Place Making Design Features



Education and Encouragement





Event Outcomes –To Date

"Please make it livable, walkable, and accessible to all folks."

"Looking forward to all the changes it's going to bring to the neighborhood."

"Thank you! Make biking safer."

"Love to see the community come together and seeing families and kids having fun."

"I love today. It's awesome. We should have this more often."

"Looking forward to the finished product."

"More bike lanes!"

Community Input

98%

of survey respondents supported their local governments' plans to make the temporary improvements permanent.

96%

of survey respondents said that the temporary safety improvements made the streets feel safer and more inviting to use.

Event Outcomes –To Date

Raised
Awareness

3.2M
Media Impressions

Facilitating
Permanent
Change

6 Complete Streets
1 First-Last Mile

Created
Resources


Video
Design Templates



Keys to Success: Partnerships



Keys to Success: Leveraging



Keys to Success: Leadership



Join Us!

May 2017 Advertising Campaign

- Partner Outreach Fall 2016
- Outlet Identification Spring 2017

Digital Resources

- Web banners in English & Spanish
- Flyers with encouragement facts and safety tips in multiple languages



Join Us!

Sustainability Planning Grants

- Go Human Eligible Projects
 - Events, Ads, Trainings
- Go Human Application Resources
 - GoHumanSocial.org (Resources Tab)
- Applications Due November 18
 - sustain.scag.ca.gov





Thank You!

Sarah Jepson
Manager, Active Transportation & Special Programs
jepson@scag.ca.gov



This Page Intentionally Left Blank

DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)
Regional Council (RC)

FROM: Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer, panas@scag.ca.gov (213) 236-1817

SUBJECT: Amendment 2 to the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Overall Work Program (OWP)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL:



RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Adopt Resolution No. 16-584-1 approving Amendment 2 to the FY 2016-17 OWP and authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to submit the necessary documentation to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Staff recommends that the Regional Council adopt Resolution No. 16-584-1 approving Amendment 2 to the FY 2016-17 OWP. Amendment 2 will increase the overall budget by \$4.8 million from \$71.0 million to \$75.8 million. The budget increase in Amendment 2 results mainly from: the programming of unspent FY 2015-16 Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) funds for a total of \$2.3 million for regional transportation planning projects; adding approximately \$0.4 million in Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds as match for consultant work funded with federal fund; programming two new Caltrans Sustainable Planning Program grants for a total of \$1.0 million; and adding \$0.1 million from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) for the expansion of the regional Active Transportation Database. Finally, this amendment includes grant balance adjustments in the amount of approximately \$1.1 million. This is a formal amendment and the changes require revising the funding amounts in the Overall Work Program Agreement (OWPA) between Caltrans and SCAG.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan Goal 3: Enhance the Agency's Long-term Financial Stability and Fiscal Management.

BACKGROUND:

In May 2016, the Regional Council adopted the FY 2016-17 Comprehensive Budget that included the FY 2016-17 OWP with a budget of \$66,019,959. Amendment 1 to the OWP was approved by the Regional Council on September 29, 2016 increasing the budget from \$66.0 million to \$71.0 million. At this time, another amendment is needed as described below.

DISCUSSION:

Amendment 2 includes the following changes:

- 1) Programming \$2.3 million of unspent FY 2015-16 CPG funds for regional transportation planning projects, of which \$0.2 million is for ongoing projects and \$2.1 million is for new projects that were deferred in the FY 2016-17 Adopted OWP.

REPORT

- 2) Adding \$0.4 million in Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds as match for consultant work funded with CPG funds.
- 3) Programming two new Caltrans Sustainable Planning Program grants for a total of \$1.0 million for the I-105 Corridor Sustainability Study and the City of Santa Ana Active Transportation Plan.
- 4) Adjustments of approximately \$1 million in various project budgets to reflect remaining grant balances and adding \$0.1 million from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) for the expansion of the regional Active Transportation Database.

The specific changes for Amendment 2 are as follows:

FY 2016-17 OWP AMENDMENT 2						
Project Task No.	Project Task Name	Budget Request	CPG Total	TDA	GRANTS	In-Kind/Local
Continuing Work from FY16						
015-0159.04	Value Pricing Project Management Assistance	\$ 50,000	\$ 44,265	\$ 5,735		
130-0162.18	Goods Movement Planning	\$ 150,000	\$ 132,795	\$ 17,205		
055-1531.01	Southern California Economic Growth Strategy	\$ 5,054	\$ -	\$ 5,054		
225-2659.03	Scenario Planning Module - Land Conservation	\$ -	\$ (13,279)	\$ 13,279		
		\$ 205,054	\$ 163,781	\$ 41,273	\$ -	\$ -
Projects Deferred in the FY17 Adopted OWP						
010-1631.05	TDM Strategic Plan	\$ 200,000	\$ 177,060	\$ 22,940		
100-1630.03	Regional ITS Strategic Plan and Regional ITS Architecture Update	\$ 250,000	\$ 221,325	\$ 28,675		
010-0170.07	Implementation Strategy for the 2016 RTP/SCS	\$ 100,000	\$ 88,530	\$ 11,470		
065-0137.09	CEO Sustainability Working Group	\$ 100,000	\$ 88,530	\$ 11,470		
065-2663.03	2050 GHG Pathways Regional Study	\$ 150,000	\$ 132,795	\$ 17,205		
065-4092.01	Adaptation Analysis	\$ 100,000	\$ 88,530	\$ 11,470		
150-4094.02	Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) Technical Assistance	\$ 100,000	\$ 88,530	\$ 11,470		
150-4096.01	RTP/SCS Land Use Policy and Program Development	\$ 100,000	\$ 88,530	\$ 11,470		
150-4096.02	Regional Growth and Policy Analysis	\$ 90,000	\$ 79,677	\$ 10,323		
055-0133.06	University Partnership	\$ 30,000	\$ 26,559	\$ 3,441		
095-1533.01	Regional Transportation Plan Outreach	\$ 50,000	\$ 44,265	\$ 5,735		
		\$ 1,270,000	\$ 1,124,331	\$ 145,669	\$ -	\$ -
New Budget Requests						
150-4095.03	SCAG Regional Active Transportation Data Partnership Platform	\$ 200,000	\$ 88,530	\$ 11,470	\$ 100,000	
150-4094.01	Integrated Sustainability Program	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 885,300	\$ 114,700		
		\$ 1,200,000	\$ 973,830	\$ 126,170	\$ 100,000	\$ -
Other Adjustments						
055-0704.02	Region-wide Data Coordination	\$ (112,960)	\$ (100,000)			\$ (12,960)
045-0694.03	Professional GIS Services Program Support	\$ 81,120	\$ 71,816			\$ 9,304
050-0169.01	RTP/SCS Active Transportation Development & Implementation	\$ (20,239)	\$ (17,917)			\$ (2,322)
015-0159.02	Transportation User Fee - Planning Groundwork Project Phase II	\$ 67,773	\$ 60,000			\$ 7,773
		\$ 15,694	\$ 13,899	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,795
145.4424.01	I-105 Corridor Sustainability Study	\$ 625,000		\$ 125,000	\$ 500,000	
145.4425.01	City of Santa Ana Active Transportation Plan	\$ 507,001		\$ 2,180	\$ 448,848	\$ 55,973
		\$ 1,132,001	\$ -	\$ 127,180	\$ 948,848	\$ 55,973
Grant Balance Adjustments						
065-0137.01	Sustainability Prog Call for Projects	\$ 50,145			\$ 50,145	
266-0715.04	SGC - AHSC Pilot Program	\$ 76,337			\$ 76,337	
265-2125.02	Express Travel Choices Phase III	\$ 16,543		\$ (89,307)	\$ 105,850	
260-0469.01	Administration of JARC & New Freedom Prog	\$ (5,213)			\$ (5,213)	
225-3564.01	Southern CA Safety & Encouragement Campaign	\$ 217,857			\$ 217,857	
225-3565.01	First Mile/Last Mile Greenhouse Demo	\$ 32,050		\$ 6,410	\$ 25,640	
145-2567.01	Calexico Transit Needs Assessment Study	\$ (9,317)			\$ (8,248)	\$ (1,069)
145-2570.01	Imperial Valley SDSU Transit Shuttle Analysis	\$ 152,256			\$ 134,792	\$ 17,464
145-3170.01	City of Thousand Oaks Transit Student Internship	\$ (10,002)			\$ (8,573)	\$ (1,429)
145-3172.02	Gold Coast Transit Internship	\$ (8,452)			\$ (7,483)	\$ (969)
145-3173.01	Thousand Oaks Transit Master Plan	\$ (65,581)			\$ (57,018)	\$ (8,563)
145-3174.01	Pasadena Transit Div Student Internship	\$ (2,814)			\$ (2,491)	\$ (323)
145-3253.01	State Routes 57 & 60 Confluence, Feasibility Study	\$ 11,738			\$ 9,390	\$ 2,348
145-3475.01	Transit Climate Adaptation & Resiliency Assessment for So. CA.	\$ 90,001		\$ 10,323	\$ 79,678	
145-3477.01	RTA First and Last Mile Strategic Mobility Assessment	\$ 69,942			\$ 61,549	\$ 8,393
145-3480.01	Aviation Blvd Multimodal Corridor Plan	\$ 137,000			\$ 109,600	\$ 27,400
145-3481.01	Pacific Coast Highway Parking Master Plan	\$ (184,904)			\$ (147,923)	\$ (36,981)
145-3482.01	Malaga Bridge Community-based Opportunities Analysis	\$ 221,325			\$ 177,060	\$ 44,265
145-3483.01	Anaheim Integrated Transportation & Capacity Building Plan	\$ (1,941)			\$ (956)	\$ (985)
145-3824.01	Active Transportation Data Planning Project	\$ (7,953)			\$ (7,040)	\$ (913)
145-3829.01	Active Streets LA - Pedestrian & Bicycle Friendly Streets for So.	\$ 62,927			\$ 55,710	\$ 7,217
145-3830.01	Customer Based Ridesharing & Interconnectivity Study	\$ 58,728			\$ 48,538	\$ 10,190
145-3831.01	Huntington Drive Safe Streets Corridor Plan	\$ 38,618		\$ 417	\$ 34,190	\$ 4,011
145-3832.01	LA River Bikeway Feasibility Study	\$ 59,352		\$ 415	\$ 52,545	\$ 6,392
		\$ 998,642	\$ -	\$ (71,742)	\$ 993,936	\$ 76,448
		\$ 4,821,391	\$ 2,275,841	\$ 368,550	\$ 2,042,784	\$ 134,216



REPORT

FISCAL IMPACT:

The proposed Amendment 2 to the FY 2016-17 OWP will result in a budget increase of approximately \$4.8 million, increasing the OWP from \$71.0 million to \$75.8 million.

ATTACHMENT:

Resolution No. 16-584-1

This Page Intentionally Left Blank



RESOLUTION NO. 16-584-1

**A RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG)
APPROVING AMENDMENT 2 TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2016-17
OVERALL WORK PROGRAM (OWP)**

Main Office

818 West 7th Street
12th Floor
Los Angeles, California
90017-3435
t (213) 236-1800
f (213) 236-1825
www.scag.ca.gov

Officers

President
Michele Martinez, Santa Ana

First Vice President
Margaret E. Finlay, Duarte

Second Vice President
Alan Wapner, Ontario

Immediate Past President
Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro

**Executive/Administration
Committee Chair**

Michele Martinez, Santa Ana

Policy Committee Chairs

Community, Economic and
Human Development
Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake

Energy & Environment
Carmen Ramirez, Oxnard

Transportation
Barbara Messina, Alhambra

WHEREAS, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the six county region consisting of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial counties pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 134 et seq. and 49 U.S.C. § 5303 et seq.;

WHEREAS, SCAG has developed the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 Comprehensive Budget that includes the following budget components: the General Fund Budget; the Overall Work Program (OWP); the Indirect Cost Budget (ICAP); and the Fringe Benefits Budget;

WHEREAS, the OWP is the basis for SCAG’s annual regional planning activities and budget;

WHEREAS, in conjunction with the OWP Agreement and Master Fund Transfer Agreement, the OWP constitutes the annual funding contract between the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and SCAG for Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) funding;

WHEREAS, SCAG is also eligible to receive other Federal and/or State grant funds for certain regional transportation planning related activities. For such funding upon award, the funds are implemented through the OWP and SCAG the applicable Federal or State agency shall execute the applicable grant agreement;

WHEREAS, SCAG’s Regional Council approved the OWP for FY 2016-17 in May 2016, which was subsequently approved by Caltrans in June 2016. The Regional Council approved Amendment 1 to the OWP in September 2016; and

WHEREAS, Amendment 2 to the OWP for FY 2016-17, along with its corresponding staff report, has been reviewed and discussed by SCAG’s Regional Council on November 3, 2016.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Regional Council of the Southern California Association of Governments, that Amendment 2 to the OWP for FY 2016-17 is approved and adopted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Regional Council hereby authorizes submittal of Amendment 2 to the FY 2016-17 OWP to the participating State and Federal agencies.
2. SCAG pledges to pay or secure in cash or services, or both, the matching funds necessary for financial assistance.
3. The SCAG Executive Director, or in his absence, the Chief Financial Officer, is hereby designated and authorized to execute all related agreements and other documents on behalf of the Regional Council.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Regional Council of the Southern California Association of Governments at its regular meeting this 3rd day of November, 2016.

Michele Martinez
President, SCAG
Councilmember, City of Santa Ana

Attested by:

Hasan Ikhata
Executive Director

Approved as to Form:

Joann Africa
Chief Counsel

NO. 583
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2016

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE REGIONAL COUNCIL. A VIDEO RECORDING OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE ON THE SCAG WEBSITE AT: www.scag.ca.gov/scagtv/index.htm

The Regional Council (RC) of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) held its meeting at 818 W. 7th Street, 12th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017. A quorum was present.

Members Present

Hon. Michele Martinez, President	<i>Santa Ana</i>	District 16
Hon. Margaret E. Finlay, 1st Vice President	<i>Duarte</i>	District 35
Hon. Alan Wapner, 2 nd Vice President	<i>Ontario</i>	SANBAG
Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, Imm. Past Pres.	<i>El Centro</i>	District 1
Hon. Michael D. Antonovich		Los Angeles County
Hon. Michelle Steel		Orange County
Hon. Keith Millhouse	<i>Moorpark</i>	VCTC
Hon. Greg Pettis	<i>Cathedral City</i>	District 2
Hon. Jim Hyatt	<i>Calimesa</i>	District 3
Hon. Clint Lorimore	<i>Eastvale</i>	District 4
Hon. Randon Lane	<i>Murrieta</i>	District 5
Hon. Frank Navarro	<i>Colton</i>	District 6
Hon. Larry McCallon	<i>Highland</i>	District 7
Hon. L Dennis Michael	<i>Rancho Cucamonga</i>	District 9
Hon. Ray Marquez	<i>Chino Hills</i>	District 10
Hon. Bill Jahn	<i>Big Bear Lake</i>	District 11
Hon. Fred Minagar	<i>Laguna Niguel</i>	District 12
Hon. Barbara Kogerman	<i>Laguna Hills</i>	District 13
Hon. Steven Choi	<i>Irvine</i>	District 14
Hon. John Nielsen	<i>Tustin</i>	District 17
Hon. Steve Hwangbo	<i>La Palma</i>	District 18
Hon. Kris Murray	<i>Anaheim</i>	District 19
Hon. Art Brown	<i>Buena Park</i>	District 21
Hon. Marty Simonoff	<i>Brea</i>	District 22
Hon. Victor Manalo	<i>Artesia</i>	District 23
Hon. Ali Saleh	<i>Bell</i>	District 27
Hon. Dan Medina	<i>Gardena</i>	District 28
Hon. Rex Richardson	<i>Long Beach</i>	District 29
Hon. Lena Gonzalez	<i>Long Beach</i>	District 30
Hon. Margaret Clark	<i>Rosemead</i>	District 32
Hon. Barbara Messina	<i>Alhambra</i>	District 34



Members Present – continued

Hon. Jonathan Curtis	<i>La Cañada Flintridge</i>	District 36
Hon. Carol Herrera	<i>Diamond Bar</i>	District 37
Hon. Sam Pedroza	<i>Claremont</i>	District 38
Hon. James Gazeley	<i>Lomita</i>	District 39
Hon. Vartan Gharpetian	<i>Glendale</i>	District 42
Hon. Steven Hofbauer	<i>Palmdale</i>	District 43
Hon. John Sibert	<i>Malibu</i>	District 44
Hon. Carmen Ramirez	<i>Oxnard</i>	District 45
Hon. Carl Morehouse	<i>San Buenaventura</i>	District 47
Hon. Karen Spiegel	<i>Corona</i>	District 63
Hon. Ryan McEachron	<i>Victorville</i>	District 65
Hon. Antonio Lopez	<i>San Fernando</i>	District 67
Hon. Rusty Bailey	<i>Riverside</i>	District 68
Hon. Jeffrey Giba	<i>Moreno Valley</i>	District 69

Members Not Present

Hon. Jack Terrazas		Imperial County
Hon. Mark Ridley-Thomas		Los Angeles County
Hon. Jim Katapodis		OCTA
Hon. Curt Hagman		San Bernardino County
Hon. Linda Parks		Ventura County
Hon. Chuck Washington		Riverside County
Hon. Jan Harnik	<i>Palm Desert</i>	RCTC
Hon. Deborah Robertson	<i>Rialto</i>	District 8
Hon. Steve Nagel	<i>Fountain Valley</i>	District 15
Hon. Tri Ta	<i>Westminster</i>	District 20
Hon. Gene Daniels	<i>Paramount</i>	District 24
Hon. Sean Ashton	<i>Downey</i>	District 25
Hon. José Luis Solache	<i>Lynwood</i>	District 26
Hon. Andrew Sarega	<i>La Mirada</i>	District 31
Hon. Gene Murabito	<i>Glendora</i>	District 33
Hon. Judy Mitchell	<i>Rolling Hills Estates</i>	District 40
Hon. Pam O'Connor	<i>Santa Monica</i>	District 41
Hon. Glen Becerra	<i>Simi Valley</i>	District 46
Hon. Gilbert Cedillo	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 48
Hon. Paul Krekorian	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 49/Public Transit Rep.
Hon. Bob Blumenfield	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 50
Hon. David Ryu	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 51
Hon. Paul Koretz	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 52
Hon. Nury Martinez	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 53
Hon. Marqueece Harris-Dawson	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 55
Hon. Curren D. Price, Jr.	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 56
Hon. Herb Wesson, Jr.	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 57
Hon. Mike Bonin	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 58



Members Not Present - continued

Hon. Mitchell Englander	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 59
Hon. Mitch O’Farrell	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 60
Hon. José Huizar	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 61
Hon. Joe Buscaino	<i>Los Angeles</i>	District 62
Hon. Erik Peterson	<i>Huntington Beach</i>	District 64
Hon. Michael Wilson	<i>Indio</i>	District 66
Hon. Ross Chun	<i>Aliso Viejo</i>	TCA
Hon. Mary “Maxine” Resvaloso	<i>Torres-Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians</i>	Tribal Government Rep.
Mr. Randall Lewis	<i>Lewis Group of Companies</i>	Business Rep.
Hon. Eric Garcetti	<i>Los Angeles</i>	(Member-at-Large)

Staff Present

- Hasan Ikhata, Executive Director
- Debbie Dillon, Deputy Executive Director, Administration
- Darin Chidsey, Director, Strategy, Policy and Public Affairs
- Huasha Liu, Director, Land Use and Environmental Planning
- Naresh Amatya, Director, Transportation Planning
- Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer
- Joe Silvey, General Counsel
- Joann Africa, Chief Counsel
- Tess Rey-Chaput, Office of Regional Council Support

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Michele Martinez called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m. and asked Councilmember L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga, District 9, to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

President Martinez opened the Public Comment period.

President Martinez announced that a public comment was received by email from Geoffrey Hirsch who was unable to attend the meeting. As requested by Mr. Hirsch, President Martinez read the comment which was regarding a call to increase awareness concerning the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and to address accessibility issues for people in wheelchairs, walkers, etc... in the South Bay area of Los Angeles County. President Martinez stated that Mr. Hirsch also requested that the matter be placed on the Regional Council agenda at a future meeting.

President Martinez closed the Public comment period.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

President Martinez announced that Action/Discussion Items will immediately follow the Presentation Item. The Executive Director’s and the President’s Report will be after the Consent Calendar.



PRESENTATION ITEM**1. Draft 2016 South Coast Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)**

President Martinez welcomed and introduced Wayne Nastri, Acting Executive Officer, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

Wayne Nastri provided background information and stated that the AQMP (referred to here as the “Plan”) is the blueprint on how the SCAG region will accomplish the federal clean air standards. He introduced Dr. Philip Fine, Deputy Executive Officer. Dr. Fine discussed air quality trends (ozone); the standards to be addressed in the Plan; the 8-hour ozone strategy targeting 2023 to ensure a 1-hour attainment for 2022; the federal, state and regional authority and responsibility; the emission analysis of statewide v. national standards; AQMP’s past and current approach with respect to regulatory measures and facility-based measures; incentive funding and weighing the investment and current status of the revised draft Plan. In closing, Dr. Fine provided the Plan’s development timeline through December 2016.

President Martinez opened the item for discussion.

Councilmember Jeffrey Giba, Moreno Valley, District 69, inquired about enforcement without regulatory authority. Dr. Philip Fine responded that the primary authority is the federal and state level and stated that mechanisms are established in a collaborative way.

Councilmember Kris Murray, Anaheim, District 19, expressed concerns regarding non-attainment standards based on stationary and mobile sources and the funding mechanisms that need to be identified. She also commented on the importance of federal government assistance rather than continuing with very stringent regulations without funding to achieve these goals.

Councilmember Greg Pettis, Cathedral City, District 2, agreed with the comment made by Councilmember Murray and noted that he is also concerned with additional regulations the federal government may place on stationary and mobile sources without adequate funding.

Councilmember Karen Spiegel, Corona, District 63, asked a question about California’s regulation and funding compared with other states. Wayne Nastri responded that South Coast and San Joaquin Valley air basins are designated as an extreme nonattainment area for ozone and there is no funding for these areas.

Councilmember Carl Morehouse, San Buenaventura, District 47, asked a question regarding the role of congressional delegation with respect to funding. Wayne Nastri responded that we need to leverage the relationship with our representatives by reaching out to other states while building a collaborative coalition.

President Martinez closed the discussion.

On behalf of the Regional Council and SCAG Board Officers, Hasan Ikhata thanked Wayne Nastri and presented him with a token of appreciation.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

President Martinez reminded the members to vote on the communicator keypad using their pre-coded identifying smartcard and to insert the smartcards in the keypad when voting; to remove the cards if they need to leave the meeting room; and to re-insert the cards when they return to the meeting. The electronically-recorded votes will indicate how each member voted, by selecting “1” for a “Yes” vote; “2” for a “No” vote and “3” for an “Abstention.” These votes will be a part of the official record of the Regional Council minutes of the meeting.

2. Criteria for Sustainability Program Call for Proposals

President Martinez introduced the item. Hasan Ikhata, Executive Director, provided background information.

A MOTION was made (Pettis) to approve the guidelines and scoring criteria for the Call for Proposals for SCAG's Sustainability Program. Motion was SECONDED (McEachron) and passed by the following votes:

FOR: Antonovich, Bailey, Brown, Choi, Clark, Curtis, Finlay, Gazeley, Gharpetian, Giba, Gonzalez, Herrera, Hofbauer, Hwangbo, Hyatt, Jahn, Kogerman, Lopez, Lorimore, Manalo, Marquez, M. Martinez, McCallon, McEachron, Medina, Messina, Michael, Minagar, Morehouse, Murray, Navarro, Nielsen, Pedroza, Pettis, Ramirez, Richardson, Saleh, Sibert, Simonoff, Spiegel, Steel, Viegas-Walker and Wapner (43).

AGAINST: None (0).

ABSTAIN None (0).

3. Amendment 1 to the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Overall Work Program (OWP)

President Martinez introduced the item. Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer, provided background information.

A MOTION was made (Jahn) to adopt Resolution No. 16-583-1 approving Amendment 1 to the FY 2016-17 OWP and authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to submit the necessary documentation to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Motion was SECONDED (Navarro) and passed by the following votes:

FOR: Antonovich, Bailey, Brown, Choi, Clark, Curtis, Finlay, Gazeley, Gharpetian, Giba, Gonzalez, Herrera, Hofbauer, Hwangbo, Hyatt, Jahn, Kogerman, Lopez, Lorimore, Manalo, Marquez, M. Martinez,* McCallon, McEachron, Medina, Messina, Michael, Minagar, Morehouse, Murray, Navarro, Nielsen, Pedroza, Pettis, Ramirez, Richardson, Saleh, Sibert, Simonoff, Spiegel, Steel, Viegas-Walker and Wapner (43).

AGAINST: None (0).

ABSTAIN: None (0).

Before the voting was closed, President Martinez indicated that she intended to vote “Yes” on this item; however, inadvertently voted “No” on her electronic device. General Counsel, Joe Silvey, directed staff to record President Martinez’s “Yes” vote and is annotated* above.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

4. Minutes of the Regional Council Meeting, September 1, 2016
5. SCAG Participation in the Workshop and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Signing Ceremony in Beijing, China
6. Proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Department of Urban Planning and Real Estate of Chung-Ang University (DUPRE of CAU) in Korea to Promote Joint Research and Exchange of Information on Urban Planning Real Estate and Public Policy
7. SCAG Participation at the International Conference in South Korea
10. Approval of Additional Stipend Payments
11. SCAG Membership and Sponsorship

Receive and File

13. 2030 Scoping Plan Update and Related Initiatives
14. Housing Summit – October 11, 2016
15. Purchase Orders \$5,000 but less than \$200,000; Contracts \$25,000 but less than \$200,000; and Amendments \$5,000 but less than \$75,000
16. 2016 Meeting Schedule of the Regional Council and Policy Committees
17. 2017 Meeting Schedule of the Regional Council and Policy Committees
18. Los Angeles Headquarters Building Lease
19. CFO Monthly Report
20. September State and Federal Legislative Update

A MOTION was made (McCallon) to approve Agenda Item Nos. 4 through 11, except for Item Nos. 8, 9 and 12 that were pulled from the Consent Calendar for a separate discussion; and to Receive and File Item Nos. 13 through 20, except for Item No. 12. Motion was SECONDED (Jahn) and passed by the following votes:

FOR: Antonovich, Bailey, Brown, Choi, Clark, Curtis, Finlay, Gazeley, Gharpetian, Giba, Gonzalez, Herrera, Hofbauer, Hwangbo, Hyatt, Jahn, Kogerman, Lopez, Lorimore, M. Martinez, Manalo, Marquez, McCallon, McEachron, Medina, Messina, Michael, Minagar, Morehouse, Murray, Navarro, Nielsen, Pedroza, Pettis, Ramirez, Richardson, Sibert, Simonoff, Spiegel, Steel, Viegas-Walker and Wapner (42).

AGAINST: None (0).

ABSTAIN: None (0).

PULLED AGENDA ITEM NOS. 8, 9 AND 12

8. Proposition 53: Revenue Bonds, Statewide Voter Approval Initiative Constitutional Amendment – OPPOSE

Supervisor Michelle Steel, asked to pull Agenda Item No. 8, and explained that Proposition 53 requires statewide voter approval before any revenue bonds can be issued by a public agency for certain infrastructure projects if the bond amount exceeds \$2 billion dollars. Supervisor Steele further stated that California has a deficit of over \$400 billion dollars—which is double of the state’s annual budget—and stated that if legislators stayed under the budget, Proposition 53 will not be necessary. Moreover, Supervisor Steel stated that statewide voter approval should be necessary before issuing any bonds; therefore, she stated that she did not support staff’s recommendation to oppose the measure.

Councilmember Margaret Clark, Rosemead, District 32, commented that there may be transportation projects that could be stopped by a minority. Therefore, she stated support for staff’s recommendation to oppose the measure.

Councilmember Karen Spiegel, Corona, District 63, commented that the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) took an “oppose” position on Proposition 53.

A MOTION was made (McCallon) to support staff’s recommendation to oppose Proposition 53. Motion was SECONDED (Finlay) and passed by the following votes:

FOR: Antonovich, Bailey, Brown, Choi, Clark, Curtis, Finlay, Gazeley, Gharpetian, Giba, Gonzalez, Herrera, Hofbauer, Hwangbo, Hyatt, Jahn, Kogerman, Lopez, Lorimore, M. Martinez, Manalo, Marquez, McCallon, Medina, Messina, Michael, Millhouse, Minagar, Morehouse, Murray, Navarro, Pedroza, Pettis, Ramirez, Richardson, Sibert, Spiegel, Viegas-Walker and Wapner (39).



AGAINST: Nielsen, Simonoff and Steel (3).

ABSTAIN: None (0).

9. Proposition 54: Legislature, Legislation and Proceedings Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Stature – SUPPORT

Councilmember Greg Pettis, Cathedral City, District 2, commented that although this item passed at the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC), the vote was not unanimous.

A MOTION was made (McCallon) to support staff recommendation. Motion was SECONDED (Finlay) and passed by the following votes:

FOR: Antonovich,* Bailey, Brown, Choi, Clark, Curtis, Finlay, Gazeley, Gharpetian, Giba, Gonzalez, Herrera, Hofbauer, Hwangbo, Jahn, Kogerman, Lopez, Lorimore, M. Martinez, Manalo, Marquez, McCallon, Medina, Michael, Millhouse, Minagar, Morehouse, Murray, Navarro, Nielsen, Pedroza, Ramirez, Richardson, Sibert, Simonoff, Spiegel, Steel, Viegas-Walker and Wapner (38).

AGAINST: Hyatt, Messina and Pettis (3).

ABSTAIN: None (0).

Before the voting was closed Supervisor Antonovich indicated that he intended to vote “Yes” on this item; however, inadvertently voted “No” on his electronic device. General Counsel, Joe Silvey, directed staff to record Supervisor Antonovich’s vote as a “Yes” vote and is annotated* above.

12. California Communities Environmental Health Screening (CalEnviroScreen) Tool – Update on Draft Version 3.0

Councilmember Keith Millhouse, Moorpark, VCTC, asked to pull Receive and File Agenda Item No. 12 and commented that 70% of the population in the SCAG region is the most impacted by pollution. Councilmember Millhouse suggested that when applying for Cap-and-Trade funds to potentially help those ‘disadvantaged communities,’ it is important to note that we should be getting at least 70% of the funds; otherwise, it would be against environmental justice.

Councilmember Larry McCallon, Highland, District 7, clarified that the CalEnviroScreen Tool encompasses much more and that to characterize it is for “disadvantaged communities,” is incorrect.

Councilmember Margaret Clark, Rosemead, District 32, commented that one of the factors that a community may be characterized as a ‘disadvantaged community’ is the rising cost of home prices that may be higher than the median income.

Councilmember Carmen Ramirez, Oxnard, District 45, echoed comments made by Councilmember Keith Millhouse.



Immediate Past President Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, District 1, expressed concerns regarding the label “disadvantaged community.” At the Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee meeting, Past President Viegas-Walker reported that the members came up with other nomenclature to replace the label “disadvantaged community” including “communities with opportunities” or “promising communities.”

President Martinez echoed Past President Viegas-Walker’s comments and asked staff to clearly define what ‘social equity’ is to SCAG.

Hasan Ikhata, Executive Director, assured the members that their concerns will be included as part of the comments on the Draft CalEnviroScreen Tool, such as a clear definition of “social equity.”

Councilmember Barbara Kogerman, Laguna Hills, District 13, suggested considering the term “eligible communities” in lieu of “promising communities,” as there will be no “promising communities” in Orange County or south of Irvine.

Councilmember L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga, District 9, suggested taking this issue to our legislators to correct this nomenclature and to change it to a positive label.

Councilmember Steve Hofbauer, Palmdale, District 43, suggested verifying the matrix [Results Based on Draft Version 3.0] on how CalEPA came up with these indicators and how the communities are represented.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

FirstNet Subcommittee LA-RICS Tour and Meeting – Update [No report was provided.]

Go Human – “Activate Uptown”

Councilmember Rex Richardson, Long Beach, District 29, invited the members to attend the Go Human – “Activate Uptown” event in Long Beach, scheduled for October 1, 2016, from 10AM – 4PM. He announced the event is free to all with open streets block party, live music, activities, food, crafts and entertainment. Activate Uptown will showcase a reimagined streetscape to make walking and biking safer and more enjoyable.

Committee Appointments

President Martinez welcomed and announced the following appointments:

New Regional Councilmember

Hon. L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga, District 9

Additional Appointment to the First Responder Network Subcommittee

Hon. Ray Marquez, Chino Hills, District 10



Appointments to the Transportation Committee

Hon. L. Dennis Michael, Rancho Cucamonga, District 9

Hon. Jess Talamantes, Burbank, SFVCOG

Appointments to the Strategic Plan Subcommittee

1. Hon. Margaret Finlay, Duarte (Los Angeles County)
2. Hon. Alan Wapner, Ontario (San Bernardino County)
3. Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro (Imperial County)
4. Hon. Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica (Los Angeles County)
5. Hon. Carmen Ramirez, Oxnard (Ventura County)
6. Hon. Margaret Clark, Rosemead (Los Angeles County)
7. Hon. Jan Harnik, Palm Desert (Riverside County)
8. Hon. Michele Martinez, Santa Ana (Orange County)

Business Update

As the business representative for the Regional Council, Randall Lewis of Lewis Group of Companies, expressed concerns with respect to a new legislation that will be implemented by our legislators in Sacramento which will have a significant impact on the economy of Southern California. Mr. Lewis stated the business community will rely on SCAG to take a lead on this matter.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Hasan Ikhata, Executive Director, noted Agenda Item No. 18, regarding the Los Angeles Headquarters Building Lease. He reported that in January 2016, the Regional Council directed staff to review the agency's building lease and to evaluate options for a potential lease of the current space or consider other buildings. After a Request for Proposal (RFP) was completed, Mr. Ikhata reported that Savills Studley, Inc. was awarded a contract to assist the agency with conducting an evaluation and managing its real estate options. Mr. Ikhata stated that SCAG's Officers would provide guidance to the process and assist with the final phases of the evaluation. He stated that four (4) buildings are currently under consideration. At the November 3, 2016 Regional Council Closed Session meeting, staff will discuss the terms of the potential lease.

Mr. Ikhata reported that the California Air Resources Board (ARB) is in the process of updating their Climate Change Scoping Plan, which includes the state's vision, goals, and strategies for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Updates to the Scoping Plan will shape climate change priorities and funding opportunities for the next few years. Mr. Ikhata stated that SCAG is preparing comments and recommendations to the document and will continue to apprise the Regional Council throughout the process.

Mr. Ikhata reminded the members of the upcoming California Housing Summit scheduled for October 11, 2016, at The L.A. Hotel Downtown Los Angeles. He urged the members to invite their colleagues to participate at the Summit.

Lastly, Mr. Ikhata announced that Dr. Lucy Jones will lead SCAG's Earthquake Preparedness Initiative with seven (7) Subregional Seminars in the SCAG region. A schedule of these regional seminars is included in the agenda packet.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Executive/Administration Committee (EAC) Report

In the absence of Chair Michele Martinez at the EAC meeting, Vice Chair Margaret Finlay reported that all EAC-related items were covered in the Regional Council meeting.

Transportation Committee (TC) Report

As Chair of the Transportation Committee, Councilmember Barbara Messina, Alhambra, District 34, reported that Metrolink Executive Director Art Leahy provided an update of current changes that are underway and addressed comments from TC members with respect to funding issues, service improvements, technology enhancements and mobile ticketing.

Councilmember Keith Millhouse commented that Metrolink is the first commuter train in the country equipped with a positive train control. He stated that the accident that recently occurred with the New Jersey transit train would have been prevented had the train been equipped with a positive train control. While there may have been challenges with Metrolink, Councilmember Millhouse emphasized this is one of Metrolink's many significant accomplishments.

Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee Report

As Chair of the of the CEHD Committee, Councilmember Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake, District 11, reported that the committee heard presentations on Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District/Community Revitalization and Investment Authority (EIFD/CRIA) Screen Tool; Metropolitan Futures Initiative; and the CalEnviroScreen Tool Version 3.0.

Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)

As Chair of the EEC, Carmen Ramirez, Oxnard, District 45, reported that the committee heard presentations on the CalEnviroScreen Tool Version 3.0 and Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District/Community Revitalization and Investment Authority (EIFD/CRIA) Screen Tool.

Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) Report

In the absence of the Chair, Vice Chair Clint Lorimore, Eastvale, District 4, noted that the State and Federal Legislative Update report has been provided to the members which is a compilation of a list of bills that are of particular interest to the region. He reported on SCAG Sponsorships and Memberships which is part of the Regional Council packet. Vice Chair Lorimore announced that the Executive Education Forum for Local Leaders, a USC Sol Price School of Public Policy Program, is now taking applications and to let staff know if interested in participating.

CLOSED SESSION ITEM

Joe Silvey, General Counsel advised that the Regional Council would move to a Closed Session in accordance with California Government Code Section 54956.9 (a) for a conference with legal counsel regarding existing litigation in the matter of City of El Segundo v. SCAG (LASC Case No. BS162452).

At the end of the Closed Session, Joe Silvey, General Counsel, announced that no action had been taken that is required to be reported.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, President Martinez adjourned the Regional Council meeting at 1:48 p.m.

DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Regional Council (RC)
Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)

FROM: Jason Greenspan, Manager of Sustainability, greenspan@scag.ca.gov, (213) 236-1859

SUBJECT: CivicSpark - Sponsorship Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve Sponsorship Agreement and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for CivicSpark Program.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Staff is recommending that the Regional Council approve (1) a Sponsorship Agreement with the Local Government Commission (LGC) for a total amount of \$75,000 for the CivicSpark Program in FY 2016-17, and (2) a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) so that SCAG may serve as a regional coordinator for the CivicSpark program. In its third year, SCAG and LGC are partnering to sponsor the program.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan: Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; and Goal 2: Obtain Regional Transportation infrastructure Funding and Promote Legislative Solutions for Regional Planning Priorities.

BACKGROUND:

The CivicSpark AmeriCorps Program ("CivicSpark Program") is a program implemented by the Local Government Commission (LGC) in partnership with the State of California Governor's Office of Planning & Research (OPR). Specifically, LGC through the CivicSpark Program, works with organizations to address climate change matters in their respective areas and provide capacity-building support to local governments through research, planning and project implementation activities.

After EAC approval on January 22, 2015, the LGC and SCAG entered into a Sponsorship Agreement whereby for SCAG's sponsorship amount of \$75,000, members from the CivicSpark Program were placed at SCAG and have been assisting the agency and member jurisdictions with the implementation of 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) transportation and land use policy initiatives. Through the Sponsorship Agreement, SCAG has three (3) CivicSpark Program members to work on SCAG's Sustainability Program and Green Region Initiative, and assist with sustainability-oriented planning, transit-oriented development (TOD), affordable housing, complete-streets, and climate action planning. In addition, these CivicSpark members are assisting SCAG staff in identifying sustainability strategies and best practices that can be



REPORT

implemented by local jurisdictions. An update on the Program was provided to the EEC on September 1, 2016, and a map displaying regional sustainability progress as reported on by Program staff is available for viewing at:

<http://scag.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=3d287a90316c417582c2ef95975e69af>.

The Sustainability Call for Proposals, which was issued on September 29th pursuant to the Regional Council's approval of Program Guidelines and Criteria, is a key SCAG initiative for implementing the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, combining assistance for integrated land use and transportation planning with Green Region assistance aimed at local sustainability and Active Transportation assistance for bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts. With programmatic assistance to be provided by the CivicSpark Program, the Sustainability Call for Proposals is intended to support SCAG member jurisdictions in implementing regional policies at the local level, focusing on voluntary efforts that will meet local needs and contribute to implementing the SCS, reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and providing the range of local and regional benefits outlined in the SCS. The Call for Proposals applications are informed by SCAG's Sustainability Indicators database which is prepared and maintained by CivicSpark.

Due to the great success of the CivicSpark program in the first two years, SCAG seeks to continue it for a third year covering the period October 16, 2016 to October 16, 2017. As before, SCAG would contribute \$75,000 to deploy three CivicSpark members, who will work in the Sustainability Department at SCAG. The Sponsorship Agreement documents this arrangement. SCAG also assists LGC in administering the CivicSpark program in the SCAG region by serving as a regional coordinator, providing meeting space, and hosting regional CivicSpark workshops, for which SCAG receives a nominal reimbursement. The MOU describes the regional coordinator role. These activities are determined jointly by SCAG and LGC at the beginning of each annual program cycle.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The total cost of \$75,000 is included in SCAG's FY 16-17 Overall Work Program (OWP) for RTP/SCS implementation.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. CivicSpark Sponsorship Agreement between SCAG and LGC
2. CivicSpark Memorandum of Understanding between SCAG and LGC

CivicSpark SCAG Sponsorship Agreement

This Sponsorship Agreement (“Agreement”) is made as of September 17, 2016 (the “Effective Date”) between the Local Government Commission. (“LGC”), and the Southern California Association of Governments (“Sponsor” or “SCAG”), collectively referred to herein as the “Parties.” The Parties hereby agree as follows:

1. **CivicSpark Program:** LGC is implementing the CivicSpark AmeriCorps program (also referred to herein as “CivicSpark Program”) in the Los Angeles Region from October 10, 2016 to September 30, 2017 (the “Service Year”). The term of this Agreement begins on the Effective Date and shall continue until thirty (30) calendar days after the Service Year has ended. CivicSpark AmeriCorps members are supporting local government climate capacity activities. For purposes of the CivicSpark Program and this Agreement, SCAG is considered a “local government” and SCAG’s work is consistent with the meaning of the CivicSpark Program’s “local government climate capacity activities.”
 - a. **Purpose:** Local governments have been and will continue to take a leading role in California’s response to climate change. However budget constraints, the loss of key tools and funding sources, and limited technical familiarity with emerging tools and practices, pose significant challenges to local communities – large and small – as they seek to implement these efforts quickly and effectively. To help local governments overcome these obstacles, the Local Government Commission, in partnership with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research implements the CivicSpark Program in accordance with our program design and federal AmeriCorps guidelines (see Exhibits A and B for details on Program design and prohibited activities, the terms of which are incorporated herein by this reference).
 - b. **Objectives:** As a Governor’s Initiative of AmeriCorps, the LGC through CivicSpark will assemble teams (Regional Coordinators and 3-10 AmeriCorps members) in regional hubs where they will provide capacity-building support to local governments through research, planning and project implementation activities.
2. **Sponsorship:** Because of CivicSpark’s purpose and objectives, Sponsor desires to identify itself as an Official Sponsor of the CivicSpark Program and receive the benefits provided for in this Agreement in return for the Sponsorship Fee.
 - a. **Sponsorship Type:** Sponsor is electing to sponsor CivicSpark as a Project Sponsor. Specifically, CivicSpark AmeriCorps Members (also referred to herein as “Fellows”) will work with SCAG to support SCAG’s approved Joint Sustainability Work Programs and assist multiple jurisdictions in various counties within the SCAG region. SCAG will collaborate with LGC to determine the appropriate and mutually agreeable scope that is consistent with the SCAG’s sponsorship goals and source of funding and the CivicSpark Fellows. For details on sponsorship types see Exhibit C for sponsorship types.
 - b. **Sponsorship Amount:** As a Project Sponsor, Sponsor will pay a Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$75,000) Sponsorship Amount to LGC. LGC will only use this sponsorship from SCAG for the sole implementation of CivicSpark Program activities, which includes placing Fellows to work at SCAG. Additionally for the duration of the Service Year, Sponsor will provide support of project activities by providing a workspace, computer and phone equipment for at least three (3) Fellows to work in at Sponsor’s main office located at 818 West Seventh Street, 12th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017.
 - c. **Sponsorship Payments:** All payments by Sponsor under this Agreement shall be made by cash or check payable to “The Local Government Commission” and delivered to LGC’s office as identified in Section 8 herein. Sponsorship payments are to be made in accordance with the following schedule:

- i. Deposit (20% of total sponsorship) – within thirty (30) calendar days of the Effective Date of this Agreement;
 - ii. Payment 1 (40% of total sponsorship) – ninety (90) calendar days after payment of the Deposit;
 - iii. Payment 2 (40% of total sponsorship) – ninety (90) days after payment of Payment 1.
 - d. **Sponsorship Benefits:** In consideration of the Sponsor's commitment, Sponsor will receive the following benefits listed below. LGC will arrange and bear all costs and expenses related to these benefits. Sponsor acknowledges that all benefits relate only to the type of sponsorship outlined in Section I above, and not to other CivicSpark activities in other regions. The exact benefits are dependent upon donation amount, but may include
 - i. Sponsor recognition on regional CivicSpark webpage;
 - ii. Sponsor recognition in regional newsletters;
 - iii. Sponsor recognition on printed materials (when available);
 - iv. Opportunity to speak at CivicSpark events (when appropriate to project scope);
and
 - v. Sponsor logo on participant thank you email(s) (related to sponsored project activities).
3. **Grant of License:** Sponsor grants to LGC the free, limited, non-exclusive, nontransferable, nonassignable, revocable right and license to use the Sponsor's name and relevant marks solely in connection with the terms of this Agreement.
 - a. LGC owns CivicSpark mark set forth at the top of this Agreement (the "CivicSpark Mark"). During the Term and for one (1) year thereafter, Sponsor may use the CivicSpark Mark to acknowledge its sponsorship of CivicSpark as follows: "The Southern California Association of Governments is a proud Sponsor of the Los Angeles Region CivicSpark Team for the 2016-17 Service Year." Sponsor may not use the CivicSpark Mark in connection with the sale of a product or service.
 - b. Any other use of the CivicSpark Mark other than the language set forth above shall require the prior written review and approval of LGC. Requests for review and approval shall be sent to the contact listed below. Upon request, Sponsor will provide LGC with copies of Sponsor materials that use the CivicSpark Mark.
4. **No Endorsement.** Acknowledgement of Sponsor's sponsorship, while identifying the Sponsor, will not endorse Sponsor's products or services. Further, the Parties agree not to use each other's intellectual property in any way that would imply endorsement of one's self or demean, defame, embarrass, diminish or cause any harm to the other.
5. **Independent Contractor.** It is the intent of the Parties that LGC is and shall remain an independent contractor, and LGC shall (i) comply in all material respects with all the laws, rules, ordinances, regulations and restrictions applicable to the services, and (ii) pay all federal and state taxes applicable to LGC, whether levied under existing or subsequently enacted laws, rules or regulations. The Parties hereto do not intend to create any employer-employee or master-servant relationship of any kind and acknowledge that for purposes of the CivicSpark Program and this Agreement, the Fellows are considered to be employees of LGC and not of the Sponsor.
6. **Insurance.** LGC agrees to maintain: (1) commercial general liability insurance with minimum limits of \$1,000,000, written on an occurrence form basis, protecting it from claims for personal injury (including bodily injury and death) and property damage which may arise from on in connection with the performance

of Consultant's Services hereunder or from or out of any act or omission of Consultant, its officers, directors, agents, subcontractors or employees; (2) professional liability insurance with minimum limits of \$1,000,000; (3) automobile liability insurance with minimum limits of \$1,000,000 applicable to bodily injury, death, and loss of or damage to property per occurrence; and (4) worker's compensation insurance as required by law. If requested, LGC shall provide a certificate of said insurance and an additional insured endorsement to the Sponsor within ten (10) days of the execution of this Agreement.

7. **Limitation of Liability.** With regard to the services to be performed by the LGC pursuant to the terms of this Agreement, the LGC shall not be liable to the Sponsor, or to anyone who may claim any right due to LGC's relationship with the Sponsor for any acts or omissions in the performance of said services on the part of the LGC or its Fellows, except when said acts or omissions are the result of any willful misconduct by LGC. Sponsor shall hold the LGC free and harmless from any obligations, costs, claims, judgments, attorney's fees, and attachments arising out of the services rendered to the Sponsor pursuant to the terms of this Agreement or in any way connected with the rendering of said services, except when the same shall arise due to the willful misconduct of the LGC.
8. **Notices.** All notices or other communications required or permitted to be given hereunder shall be in writing and shall be deemed to have been given when delivered if personally delivered, or three (3) business days after mailing if mailed by certified mail, postage prepaid, return receipt requested, and shall be addressed as follows:

To the Sponsor:

Basil Panas
Chief Financial Officer
Southern California Association of Governments
818 West Seventh Street, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017-3435
213-236-1817
213-236-1825 fax
panas@scag.ca.gov

To LGC:

Linda Cloud
Local Government Commission
909 L Street, Suite 1700
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-448-1198
916-448-8246 fax
lcloud@lgc.org

Either party may change its address by giving written notice thereof to the other party.

9. **Mutual Indemnification.** Sponsor will indemnify and hold harmless LGC and all its affiliates, and their officers, agents and employees from any losses, claims, actions, suits, proceedings, investigations, arbitrations, assessments, settlements, penalties, damages, liabilities, costs and other expenses, including reasonable attorney's fees, arising out of (i) any infringement of trademark, copyright or similar rights by Sponsor; or (ii) a breach by Sponsor of its obligations under this Agreement.

LGC will indemnify and hold harmless Sponsor and all its affiliates, and their officers, agents and employees from any losses, claims, actions, suits, proceedings, investigations, arbitrations, assessments, settlements, penalties, damages, liabilities, costs and other expenses, including reasonable attorney's fees, arising out of (i) any infringement of trademark, copyright or similar rights by LGC; or (ii) a breach by LGC of its obligations under this Agreement.

Neither party will be liable for any indirect, special or consequential damages. This limitation of liability

will not limit either party's obligation to indemnify the other party for a third party claim under this Section, or a party's gross negligence or willful misconduct.

10. **Force Majeure.** Neither Sponsor nor LGC will be deemed to be in default of any provision of this Agreement, or for failures in performance, resulting from acts or events beyond its reasonable control (a "Force Majeure Event") for the duration of the Force Majeure Event.
11. **Applicable Law and Jurisdiction.** This Agreement will be governed by the laws of the State of California. The Parties hereby agree and consent to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the State of California.
12. **Dispute Resolution; Attorneys' Fees.** Any dispute arising under this Agreement which is not disposed of by mutual agreement shall be decided through binding arbitration by a three (3) member panel in accordance with the rules of the American Arbitration Association. The party prevailing in any action at law or in equity necessary to enforce or interpret the terms of this Agreement shall be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees, costs, and necessary disbursements in addition to any other relief to which that party may be entitled.
13. **Compliance with Laws, Rules and Regulations.** The Parties agrees to perform all activities under this Agreement in accordance and in full compliance with all applicable Federal, State and local statutes, rules regulations and policies.
14. **Cost Principles**
 - a. LGC agrees to comply with the following:
 1. The Contract Cost Principles and Procedures, 48 Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Acquisition Regulations System, Chapter 1, Subchapter E, Part 31, et seq. (Office of Management and Budget Circular A-87 Revised, "Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments)," shall be used to determine the acceptability of individual project cost items; and
 2. The Federal administrative procedures in accordance with 49 Code of Federal Regulations, Part 18, "Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments."
 - b. Any costs for which LGC receives reimbursement or credit that is determined by a subsequent audit or other review by either SCAG, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) or other State, Federal or local authorities to be unallowable under, but not limited to, OMB Circular A-87 Revised; 48 CFR, Chapter 1, Subchapter E, Part 31; or 49 CFR, Part 18, are to be repaid by LGC within thirty (30) calendar days of LGC receiving notice of audit findings and a written demand for reimbursement from SCAG. Should LGC fail to reimburse unallowable costs due SCAG within thirty (30) calendar days of demand, or within such other period as may be agreed between both parties hereto, SCAG is authorized to withhold future payments due to the LGC.
15. **Records Retention and Audits**
 - a. LGC shall maintain all source documents, books and records connected with the Project under this Agreement for a minimum of four (4) years from the date audit resolution is achieved for each annual SCAG OWP, and shall make all supporting information available upon request for inspection and audit by representatives of SCAG, the California State Auditor, or other authorized government agency. Copies shall be made and furnished by SCAG upon request at no cost to SCAG.
 - b. SCAG shall maintain all source documents, books and records connected with the Project under this Agreement and procurement of the Consultant and all work performed for a minimum of four (4) years, and shall make all supporting information available upon request for inspection and audit by representatives of LGC, the California State Auditor, or other authorized government agency. Copies shall be made and furnished by LGC upon request at no cost to the LGC.

- c. LGC shall establish and maintain an accounting system conforming to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) to support Invoices which segregate and accumulate the costs of work elements by line item and produce Progress Reports which clearly identify reimbursable costs and other expenditures by OWP work elements.
- d. If applicable, LGC agrees to include all costs associated with this Agreement and any amendments thereto to be examined in the annual audit and in the schedule of activities to be examined under a single audit prepared by LGC in compliance with Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133.
- e. Neither the pendency of a dispute nor its consideration by a Party or the State shall excuse the other Party from full and timely performance in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.

16. Federal Certifications and Assurances

- a. LGC shall adhere to the requirements contained in SCAG's annual Certification and Assurances (FHWA and FTA "Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process Certification") submitted as part of SCAG's OWP, pursuant to 23 CFR 450.334 and the 23 U.S.C. 1234. This Certification shall be published annually in SCAG's OWP. Such requirements shall apply to LGC to the same extent as SCAG and may include, but are not limited to:
 - 1). Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title VI Assurance executed by California under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;
 - 2). Pub. Law 105-178, 112 Stat. 107 and any successor thereto, regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in FHWA and FTA funded projects (Sec. 105(f), Pub. L. 970424, 96 Stat. 2100, 49 CFR part 26); and
 - 3). The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327, as amended) and the United States Department of Transportation (US DOT) implementing regulations (49 CFR 27, 37, and 38).
- b. LGC shall additionally comply with the requirements contained in the annual FTA "Certifications and Assurances for FTA Assistance," including "Certifications and Assurances Required of Each Applicant" and the "Lobbying Certification" in compliance with 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53; published annually in SCAG's OWP. Such assurances shall apply to LGC to the same extent as SCAG, and include but are not limited, the following areas:
 - 1). Standard Assurances
 - 2). Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters for Primary Covered Transactions
 - 3). Drug Free Work Place Agreement
 - 4). Intergovernmental Review Assurance
 - 5). Nondiscrimination Assurance
 - 6). DBE Assurance
 - 7). Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Disability
 - 8). Certification and Assurances Required by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget
- c. Federal Lobbying Activities Certification.
 - 1). By signing this Agreement, LGC certifies, to the best of its knowledge and belief, that no State or Federal funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of LGC, respectively, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any State or Federal agency, a Member of the State Legislature or United States Congress, an officer or employee of the Legislature or Congress, or any employee of a Member of the Legislature or Congress in connection with the awarding of any State or Federal contract, the making of any State or Federal grant, the making of any Federal loan, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, or the

extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any State or Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement.

- 2). If any funds other than State or Federal funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any Federal agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant, LGC, as applicable, shall complete and submit Federal Standard Form-LL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with those form instructions."
- 3). This certification is a material representation of fact, upon which reliance was placed when this Agreement was entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by Section 1352, Title 31, U.S.C. and by the Master Fund Transfer Agreement between SCAG and the State.

17. Equal Employment Opportunity/Nondiscrimination

- a. In the performance of work undertaken pursuant to this Agreement, the Parties and their assignees and successors in interest, shall affirmatively require that their employees and contractors shall not unlawfully discriminate, harass or allow harassment, against any employee or applicant for employment because of sex, race, color, ancestry, religious creed, national origin, physical disability (including HIV and AIDS), medical condition (cancer), age, marital status, denial of family and medical care leave, and denial of pregnancy disability leave.
- b. The Parties shall ensure that the evaluation and treatment of their employees and applicants for employment are free from such discrimination and harassment. The Parties shall comply with the provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act (Government Code, Section 12900 et seq.) and the applicable regulations promulgated there under (California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Section 7285.0 et seq.). The applicable regulations of the Fair Employment and Housing Commission implementing the Government Code sections referenced above, are incorporated into this Agreement by reference and made a part hereof as if set forth in full.
- c. Noncompliance: In the event of noncompliance by either Party with the nondiscrimination provisions of this Agreement, the other Party may cancel, terminate or suspend the Agreement, in whole or in part.
- d. If required by DOT, additional or alternate sanctions for noncompliance may be imposed.

18. Conflict of Interest

The Parties shall comply with Federal and State conflict of interest laws, regulations and policies.


19. **Entire Agreement; Amendments.** This Agreement contains all of the agreements of the Parties hereto with respect to the matters contained herein and no prior or contemporaneous agreement or understanding, oral or written, pertaining to any such matters shall be effective for any purpose. No provision of this Agreement may be amended or added to except by an amendment in writing signed by the Parties hereto or their respective successors in interest.
20. **Headings.** The headings of this Agreement are for purposes of reference only and shall not limit or define the meaning of the provisions of this Agreement.
21. **Severability.** If any paragraph, section, sentence, clause or phrase contained in this Agreement shall become illegal, null or void or against public policy, for any reason, or shall be held by any court of competent jurisdiction to be illegal, null or void or against public policy, the remaining paragraphs, sections, sentences, clauses or phrases contained in this Agreement shall not be affected thereby.

- 22. **Waiver.** The waiver of any breach of any provision hereunder by any party hereto shall not be deemed to be a waiver of any preceding or subsequent breach hereunder.
- 23. **Successors and Assigns.** This Agreement shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the respective successors and assigns of the parties hereto.
- 24. **Warranty of Authority.** Each of the undersigned hereby warrants that he/she has authority on behalf of his or her principal to execute this Agreement and to bind such principal to the terms hereof.
- 25. **Counterparts.** This Agreement may be executed by electronic or hard-copy signature and in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be one and the same instrument. The exchange of executed copies of this Agreement by facsimile, email or other electronic transmission will constitute effective execution and delivery of this Agreement for all purposes. Signatures of the parties transmitted by such methods will be treated in all respects as having the same effect as an original signature.
- 26. **Effective Date.** The Effective Date of this Agreement shall mean the date (meaning the last date indicated below) that the Parties have fully executed this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, LGC and Sponsor have caused this Agreement to be executed by their duly authorized representatives.

Local Government Commission ("LGC")

By:




Print Name: Linda Cloud

Title: Managing Director

Date: 9/9/2016

Southern California Association of Governments ("Sponsor")

By:



Print Name: Basil Panas

Title: Chief Financial Officer

Date: 9/14/16

Approved as to form:


Joann Africa, Chief Counsel

Exhibit A: Program Design

LGC has contracted with the Corporation of National and Community Service to implement CivicSpark as an AmeriCorps program. AmeriCorps Fellows can only work on service outlined in performance measures (see below) approved by the Corporation for National and Community Service. These performance measures define how CivicSpark will provide this service to local governments by conducting assessments, implementing planning or action projects, engaging volunteers, and transferring knowledge to local government staff. CivicSpark Fellows are only allowed to perform activities specifically outlined below and may not perform those prohibited activities as seen in Exhibit "B". All CivicSpark project scopes must align with the measures below:

- 1) Capacity Building for Local Governments – Fellow's direct service hours should be spent building capacity for local government beneficiaries to address their need around climate change response, assisting them to develop projects that they would otherwise not be able to complete. Capacity building for CivicSpark Fellows will be delivered in 4 stages including gap assessments, research, action, and implementation service projects, volunteer engagement, and knowledge transition.
- 2) Volunteer Engagement – All CivicSpark Fellows should have the opportunity to build further capacity for local governments by engaging, recruiting, and supporting volunteers. Volunteers may be engaged only one-time, (e.g. – volunteers to assist for a specific event such as Earth Day or service activities), or on-going, such as interns..
- 3) Training and Professional Development for Fellows – Fellows can spend up to 20% of their 1700-hour service year on training. Training includes the 2-week intensive orientation at the start of the service year, continued monthly trainings, and professional development and networking opportunities. Training hours ensure that Fellows have the training and tools they need to succeed in their sustainability work.

The majority of direct service portion of the work provided by CivicSpark to local governments only involves the first two measures. The third measure is realized principally through training and professional development activities provided by LGC to CivicSpark Fellows. Some activities that occur while working with local governments may be considered training and professional development such as networking events and trainings that might be hosted by the local government.

- 1) General Program Responsibilities
 - a) Provide clear guidelines to CivicSpark Fellow regarding AmeriCorps regulations and expectations
 - b) Recruit and train a Regional Supervisor (1000 hours over 13 months) to work with CivicSpark Fellows and Participating local governments
 - c) Recruit and train CivicSpark Fellows to provide capacity building services for the region
 - d) Work to provide support and guidance for CivicSpark Fellows, addressing any concerns that might develop during service year, and striving towards 90% retention of Fellows
 - e) Manage local government service contracts
 - f) Develop and manage local government project scope and deliverables
 - g) Share outcomes from service with Sponsors
- 2) AmeriCorps Fellow Responsibilities
 - a) Pass a state and national and NSOPR background check prior to starting their service year.
 - b) Participate in a 2-week program orientation and complete 250 hours of training through dedicated Fellow training and development and service days.
 - c) Serve an average of 37 hours per week for 11 months, serving a minimum of 1700 hours overall.
 - d) Comply with guidelines for performance measures (Section IV), and abide by regulations on prohibited activities (Exhibit "B").
 - e) Complete accurate reporting in a timely manner for as required by the National Corporation for Service for projects, including assessments, implementation, hours served, volunteers recruited and supported, and transition of knowledge to local governments
 - f) Avoid participation in prohibited activities.
 - g) Identify as an AmeriCorps Fellow and wear AmeriCorps lapel pins or gear during service hours.
 - h) Participate in days of national service including, but not limited to, Martin Luther King Jr. Day of Service, 9/11 Day of Remembrance, and AmeriCorps week Service Day.

Exhibit B: Prohibited Activities

Per federal guidelines, while charging time to the AmeriCorps program, accumulating service or training hours, or otherwise performing activities supported by the AmeriCorps program or the Corporation for National and Community Service, LGC, Supervisors, and CivicSpark Fellows may not engage in the following activities (see 45 CFR § 2520.65):

- 1) Attempting to influence legislation except as approved by Sponsor's governing board;
- 2) Organizing or engaging in protests, petitions, boycotts, or strikes;
- 3) Assisting, promoting, or deterring union organizing;
- 4) Impairing existing contracts for services or collective bargaining agreements;
- 5) Engaging in partisan political activities, or other activities designed to influence the outcome of an election to any public office;
- 6) Participating in, or endorsing, events or activities that are likely to include advocacy for or against political parties, political platforms, political candidates, proposed legislation, or elected officials;
- 7) Engaging in religious instruction, conducting worship services, providing instruction as part of a program that includes mandatory religious instruction or worship, constructing or operating facilities devoted to religious instruction or worship, maintaining facilities primarily or inherently devoted to religious instruction or worship, or engaging in any form of religious proselytization;
- 8) Providing a direct benefit to—
 - a) A business organized for profit;
 - b) A labor union;
 - c) A partisan political organization;
 - d) A nonprofit organization that fails to comply with the restrictions contained in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 related to engaging in political activities or substantial amount of lobbying except that nothing in these provisions shall be construed to prevent participants from engaging in advocacy activities undertaken at their own initiative; and
 - e) An organization engaged in the religious activities described in paragraph 3.g. above, unless CNCS assistance is not used to support those religious activities;
- 9) Conducting a voter registration drive or using CNCS funds to conduct a voter registration drive;
- 10) Providing abortion services or referrals for receipt of such services; and
- 11) Such other activities as CNCS may prohibit.

AmeriCorps Fellows, like other private citizens, may participate in the above listed activities on their own time, at their own expense, and on their own initiative. However, the AmeriCorps logo must not be worn while doing so.

Exhibit C: Sponsorship Types

Statewide Sponsors recognize and support CivicSpark’s environmental, economic and social objectives, and want to make a significant investment in CivicSpark’s growth and success across the state. Sponsor investment in the program can help LGC “buy-down” costs for all participants, allowing greater local participation. For every \$100,000 of statewide support, LGC can reduce costs to local participants 5% across the board. The statewide target is \$200,000/year, which LGC hopes to meet with a range of individual sponsorships.

Regional Sponsors will collaborate with participating organizations and staff in a specific part of the state. Regional Sponsors support one of LGC’s nine regional climate-readiness teams by investing time, resources and talent. A regional team is comprised of 3-10 AmeriCorps Fellows and a Coordinator. Regional sponsors enable CivicSpark to bring its services to local governments in the region for free. A full-time Fellow can be sponsored for \$25,000, while the annual cost of a regional team ranges from \$75,000-\$150,000.

Project Sponsors help support specific climate action – such as renewable energy, greenhouse gas inventories or complete streets projects – in a region or across the state. Sponsors can apply their expertise and passion about a specific climate-action activity to support team Fellows working on that topic. Sponsor support for a project allows LGC to engage local governments around specific issues (water, energy, waste) or specific approaches (LED lighting, green infrastructure, alternative transportation). Project sponsorships start at \$13,000 for a 650-hour project, but can be scaled up for larger projects.

Material Sponsors donate specific resources to help team Fellows operate efficiently and redirect limited funding to other needed areas on-the-ground. As a statewide program made up of 48 Fellows and nine supervisors, LGC needs significant material resources to support program work and function effectively. LGC AmeriCorps Fellows live on a limited allowance – so support for them is also very much appreciated. For example, LGC wants to secure annual cell service with phones, laptops (with MS Office) and Internet service for our Fellows and supervisors. Additional hardware, such as printers, projectors, digital cameras and storage media, are also useful.

Memorandum of Understanding

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is to establish the basic guidelines and expectations between the Local Government Commission (LGC) who manages the CivicSpark Program (CivicSpark) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) who will be acting as a Regional Partner for CivicSpark. For purposes of this MOU, SCAG may also be referred to as “Regional Partner.” In this role, SCAG plans to support regional activities of a CivicSpark team composed of a Regional Coordinator and an estimated three (3) Americorps Members for one Service Year (2016-17). In addition, LGC and SCAG acknowledge that related to this MOU and SCAG’s role as a Regional Partner, they have entered into a “CivicSpark SCAG Sponsorship Agreement” dated September 14, 2016, the terms of which are incorporated herein by reference.

I. Purpose

Local governments have been and will continue to take a leading role in California’s response to climate change. However budget constraints, the loss of key tools and funding sources, and limited technical familiarity with emerging tools and practices, pose significant challenges to local communities – large and small – as they seek to implement these efforts quickly and effectively. To help local governments overcome these obstacles, the Local Government Commission, in partnership with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research implements the AmeriCorps program CivicSpark.

II. Objectives

LGC through CivicSpark will assemble regional teams (a Regional Coordinator and 3-10 AmeriCorps members) centered on regional hubs where they will provide capacity-building support to local governments through research, planning and project implementation activities. It is expected that each year, CivicSpark teams will complete 6-20 defined climate change related projects for and with local governments. CivicSpark directly advances climate change response efforts by:

- 1) Delivering research reports that give decision makers quantitative technical information to enable them to develop appropriate plans;
- 2) Completing plans that provide local governments with specific direction on how and where to launch implementation projects; and
- 3) Conducting implementation projects to demonstrate the viability of specific approaches to the community.

In the intermediate term, CivicSpark strengthens community climate change capacity by:

- 1) Providing local governments with direct experience using the tools, methods and resources they need to sustain or develop climate change programs in the future; and
- 2) Increasing volunteer capacity, so local governments can draw on their own communities to continue to address this need.

In the longer-term, CivicSpark contributes to a more effective state climate change response by:

- 1) Building regional networks of participating local governments and Regional Partners that foster coordination to enable economies of scale in response efforts;
- 2) Addressing specific needs to develop a local response to climate change;
- 3) Creating a statewide platform to develop and disseminate more effective climate change response strategies; and

- 4) Working with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research in coordination with Regional Partners to strengthen linkages between state and local governments in order to better align state and local efforts.

Overall, CivicSpark contributes early, intermediate and long-term support to California’s communities so they can respond to emerging climate change issues in ways that strengthen each community and the state as a whole.

III. Responsibilities of Regional Partner

A core component of CivicSpark is the collaboration with Regional Partners who are already invested in their regional communities. CivicSpark depends on Regional Partners to identify regional needs, aggregate local project work and identify supporting resources so the program can meet regional climate protection goals. With that in mind, CivicSpark has defined the following responsibilities for a Regional Partner:

- 1) Primary responsibilities (direct actions)
 - a) Assist recruitment and commitment of local governments by directly reaching out to local governments and by broadcasting CivicSpark information through their networks.
 - b) Assist effort to identify and secure regional project service and fiscal commitments sufficient to support other CivicSpark teams within the SCAG region. Note: the Regional Partner is NOT liable for providing any fiscal contribution, unless they are also acting as a project partner, in which case a separate project service agreement will be completed by both parties.
 - c) Identify and support a staff person from the organization to be the key contact for AmeriCorps member(s). This person will
 - i) Participate in Regional Partner orientation webinars (total of 4 hours) prior to the start of the Service Year (October/November)
 - ii) Assist in trainings for members on local resources, stakeholders, and culture at some point during the initial orientation (total of 4 hours at some point during first months of the Service Year)
 - iii) Provide an average of 1-2 hours per month for member or staff check-ins and/or trainings
 - iv) Complete quarterly program reporting including in-kind match documentation and annual evaluation surveys.
 - v) Participate in a quarterly Regional Partner network conference call.
 - vi) Communicate immediately with the Regional Coordinator or Project Manager regarding issues or other program concerns.
 - d) Understand and support Member compliance with contracted performance measures (section VI, and regulations on prohibited activities (section VII).
- 2) Secondary Responsibilities (supporting actions)
 - a) Keep LGC informed about regional needs and opportunities, so projects stay current and aligned with local interests.
 - b) As requested by LGC provide feedback on potential projects or partners to ensure alignment with regional needs and appropriateness of project activities.
 - c) Provide context, contacts, and guidance during project startup by being available for calls or meetings with the Regional Coordinator

- d) Support regional recruitment for Members and Regional Coordinators by distributing announcements through regional networks
 - e) Recognize and support participation in AmeriCorps by including AmeriCorps logo and information in appropriate places (website, office) as approved by the Regional Partner.
 - f) Support member and supervisor transition at the end of the service year through networking assistance and dissemination of project outcomes throughout the region.
- 3) Tertiary Responsibilities (workplace actions only if members are housed on site with the Regional Partner).
- a) Introduce member(s) to other organization staff and invite member(s) to staff functions.
 - b) Inform AmeriCorps member(s) about the organization's rules of conduct and appropriate behavior, including procedures for communicating service hours and absences. Provide member(s) with agency policy manuals and/or handbooks.
 - c) Host scheduled site visits as needed by AmeriCorps Project Manager or Program Director.
- 4) Estimated Partner staff time commitments
- a) Project identification and recruitment: 10-20 hours over 4 months prior to the service year.
 - b) Training participation and member training: 5-10 hours in the first 2 months of the service year.
 - c) Member support and guidance during project implementation: 2-3 hours a month over 9 months of the service year.
 - d) Statewide network participation: 1-2 hours a quarter during the service year.

IV. Responsibilities of the LGC through CivicSpark

- 1) Regional Partner Support Responsibilities
- a) Provide an annual stipend of \$8,400 to offset hosting and/or staff costs for Regional Partner participation in CivicSpark. If the Regional Partner provides dedicated office equipment for on-site members, additionally reimburse up to \$1,500 per year for these specific costs. The stipend and if applicable office cost reimbursements will be paid after the start of the service year, upon receipt of an invoice from the Regional Partner.
 - b) Support identification as a regional partner and recruitment of local governments by providing all necessary program materials (logos, email templates, program documentation, applications, contracts, etc.), by holding webinars and conference calls to raise awareness of the program, by developing and maintaining a comprehensive website, and by responding to inquiries from local governments and the regional partner in a timely manner.
 - c) Support effort to identify fiscal contribution by or for local governments by working with the Regional Partner to identify resources and/or by engaging outside funders in CivicSpark.
 - d) Provide clear guidelines, expectations, procedures, evaluation activities, and timelines pertaining to program operations, contracted performance measures (section V), prohibited activities (section VI), and personnel issues through a program manual for Regional Partners.
 - e) Conduct webinar-based orientations (4 hours total) for Regional Partners to review all program guidelines and policies and to answer questions, including clearly communicating guidelines on prohibited activities
 - f) Recognize Regional Partner on website and in relevant marketing materials and communications.
 - g) Share regional project and program wide results.

2) Regional Program Responsibilities

- a) Recruit and train a Regional Coordinator to work (1000 hours over 13 months) with Members and participating project partners.
- b) Recruit and Train three (3) AmeriCorps members to provide at least 1300 hours each of direct capacity building services for projects in the region.
- c) Manage local government service agreements.
- d) Develop and manage local government scopes and support project deliverables

3) AmeriCorps Member Responsibilities

- a) Pass a state and national and NSOPR background check prior to starting their service year.
- b) Participate in a 1-week program orientation and complete at least 120 hours of training through dedicated member training and development and service days.
- c) Serve an average of 37 hours per week for 11 months, serving a minimum of 1700 hours.
- d) Comply with guidelines for contracted performance measures (section VI), and abide by regulations on prohibited activities (section VII).
- e) Complete accurate reporting for AmeriCorps and projects, including assessments, implementation, hours served, volunteers recruited and supported, and transition of knowledge to local governments
- f) Complete required duties and reports in a timely manner as defined by scopes of work, avoid participation in prohibited activities.
- g) Identify as an AmeriCorps member and wear AmeriCorps lapel pins or gear during service hours.
- h) Participate in days of national service including, but not limited to, Martin Luther King Jr. Day of Service, 9/11 Day of Remembrance, and AmeriCorps week Service Day.

V. Contracted Performance Measures

LGC has contracted with the Corporation of National and Community Service to implement CivicSpark as an AmeriCorps program. AmeriCorps Members can only work on service outlined in performance measures contracted through the Corporation for National and Community Service. These performance measures define how CivicSpark will provide this service to local governments by conducting assessments, implementing planning or action projects, engaging volunteers, and transferring knowledge to local government staff. It is LGC policy that no CivicSpark Member is allowed to perform activities that are not specifically awarded in the contracted performance measures. Any project scope work CivicSpark Members are engaged in must align with contracted performance measures. CivicSpark awarded activities include the following performance measures:

- 1) Capacity Building for Local Governments – Member’s direct service hours should be spent building capacity for local government beneficiaries to address their need around climate change response, assisting them to develop projects that they would otherwise not be able to complete. Capacity building for CivicSpark Members will be delivered in 4 stages including gap assessments, research, action, and implementation service projects, volunteer engagement, and knowledge transition.

- 2) Volunteer Engagement – All CivicSpark Members should have the opportunity to build further capacity for local governments by engaging, recruiting, and supporting volunteers. Volunteers may be engaged only one-time, (ie – volunteers to assist for a specific event such as Earth Day or service activities), or on-going volunteers, such as interns. CivicSpark is looking recruit 238 volunteers who will serve a total of 1317 hours to address the needs of local governments.
- 3) Training and Professional Development for Members – Members can spend up to 20% of their 1700-hour service year on training. Training includes the 2-week intensive orientation at the start of the service year, continued monthly trainings, and professional development and networking opportunities. Training hours ensure that Members have the training and tools they need to succeed in their sustainability work.

The majority of direct service portion of the work provided by CivicSpark to local governments only involves the first two measures. The third measure is realized principally through training and professional development activities provided by LGC to CivicSpark members. Some activities that occur while working with local governments may be considered training and professional development such as networking events and trainings that might be hosted by the local government).

VI. Prohibited AmeriCorps member activities:

Per federal guidelines, while charging time to the AmeriCorps program, accumulating service or training hours, or otherwise performing activities supported by the AmeriCorps program or CNCS, staff and members may not engage in the following activities (see 45 CFR § 2520.65):

- 1) Attempting to influence legislation;
- 2) Organizing or engaging in protests, petitions, boycotts, or strikes;
- 3) Assisting, promoting, or deterring union organizing;
- 4) Impairing existing contracts for services or collective bargaining agreements;
- 5) Engaging in partisan political activities, or other activities designed to influence the outcome of an election to any public office;
- 6) Participating in, or endorsing, events or activities that are likely to include advocacy for or against political parties, political platforms, political candidates, proposed legislation, or elected officials;
- 7) Engaging in religious instruction, conducting worship services, providing instruction as part of a program that includes mandatory religious instruction or worship, constructing or operating facilities devoted to religious instruction or worship, maintaining facilities primarily or inherently devoted to religious instruction or worship, or engaging in any form of religious proselytization;
- 8) Providing a direct benefit to—
 - a) A business organized for profit;
 - b) A labor union;
 - c) A partisan political organization;
 - d) A nonprofit organization that fails to comply with the restrictions contained in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 related to engaging in political activities or substantial amount of lobbying except that nothing in these provisions shall be construed to prevent participants from engaging in advocacy activities undertaken at their own initiative; and
 - e) An organization engaged in the religious activities described in paragraph 3.g. above, unless CNCS assistance is not used to support those religious activities;

- 9) Conducting a voter registration drive or using CNCS funds to conduct a voter registration drive;
- 10) Providing abortion services or referrals for receipt of such services; and
- 11) Such other activities as CNCS may prohibit.

AmeriCorps members, like other private citizens, may participate in the above listed activities on their own time, at their own expense, and on their own initiative. However, the AmeriCorps logo must not be worn while doing so.

Please note: Federal funding for members is approved with the understanding that member service is directly supporting AmeriCorps objectives.

VII. Effective Date and Termination

This MOU will become effective on the date of final signatures and will continue until September 30, 2017 (the end of the 2016-17 service year), or when terminated by both parties. The Regional Partner may terminate this MOU with thirty (30) written days’ notice to CivicSpark staff.

VIII. Amendments

This MOU may be amended if both the LGC and SCAG agree to new terms in writing.

IX. Severability

If a portion, term, condition or provision of this MOU is determined by a court to be illegal or in conflict with a law of the State of California, or is otherwise rendered unenforceable or ineffectual, the validity of the remaining portions, terms, conditions and provisions is not affected.

X. Key Contacts

The individuals listed below are identified as key personnel considered essential to the successful implementation of the CivicSpark Program and responsibilities being performed under this MOU.

Local Government Commission

Name:	Kif Scheuer
Job Title:	Program Director
Address	1303 J. St Suite 250, Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone Contact:	415-717-4809
Email Contact:	kscheuer@lgc.org

Regional Partner

Name:	Grieg Asher
Job Title:	Program Manager
Address	818 W. Seventh Street Los Angeles, CA 90017
Phone Contact:	213-236-1869
Email Contact:	asher@scag.ca.gov

Neither the LGC nor SCAG without notification will make any change in key officials thirty days in advance of the proposed change.

XI. Agreement

This Memorandum of Understanding clarifies the focus and intent of the joint working relationship of mutual support, cooperation and coordination between the LGC and SCAG.

Southern California Association of Governments: Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Local Government Commission: Kate Meis, Executive Director

Signature: _____ Date: _____

The original signed Memorandum of Understanding will be filed at LGC. Please keep a copy for your records.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)
Regional Council (RC)

FROM: Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer, (213) 236-1817, panas@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Contracts \$200,000 or Greater: Contract No. 17-012-C1, Videography Services

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve Contract No. 17-012-C1, with Robert Wall Consulting, LLC, in an amount not-to-exceed \$563,925, to provide videography services.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The consultant shall provide videography services, producing informational and promotional videos including an annual SCAG accomplishments video, videos highlighting winners of SCAG's annual Sustainability Awards and short topical videos focusing on individual areas of SCAG's work.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective b: Develop External Communications and Media Strategy to Promote Partnerships, Build Consensus, and Foster Inclusiveness in the Decision Making Process.

BACKGROUND:

Staff recommends executing the following contract \$200,000 or greater:

<u>Consultant/Contract #</u>	<u>Contract Purpose</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>
Robert Wall Consulting, LLC (16-008-C1)	The consultant shall provide videography services.	\$563,925

FISCAL IMPACT:

Funding of \$123,775 is available in the FY 2016-17 budget in project/task number 090-0148.01, and the remaining yearly costs of \$124,600, \$142,575 and \$172,975 are expected to be available in fiscal years 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20 in project/task number 190-0148E.01, subject to budget availability.

ATTACHMENT:

Consultant Contract No. 17-012-C1



CONSULTANT CONTRACT 17-012-C1

Recommended Consultant: Robert Wall Consulting, LLC

Background & Scope of Work: The consultant shall provide videography services, producing informational and promotional videos including an annual SCAG accomplishments video, videos highlighting winners of SCAG's annual Sustainability Awards and short topical videos focusing on individual areas of SCAG's work.

Project's Benefits & Key Deliverables: The project's benefits and key deliverables include, but are not limited to:

- An annual accomplishments video highlighting the agency's key activities during the preceding fiscal year, to be presented at SCAG's largest annual meeting, the Regional Conference and General Assembly;
- A set of 2-3 minute videos highlighting each of the winning projects at SCAG's annual Sustainability Awards Program, which celebrates exemplary projects in the areas of mixed use, transit-oriented development and comprehensive planning throughout the region; and
- As needed short video projects, highlighting selected SCAG projects and regional issues, which will educate and inform or call to action.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective b: Develop External Communications and Media Strategy to Promote Partnerships, Build Consensus, and Foster Inclusiveness in the Decision Making Process.

Contract Amount:	Total not-to-exceed	\$563,925
	Robert Wall Consulting (prime consultant)	\$404,850
	Caitlin Wilbert/Cabin 22 (subconsultant)	\$63,750
	Tom Trisch/Tom11 Films (subconsultant)	\$47,605
	David Sorafine (subconsultant)	\$47,720

Note: Robert Wall Consulting originally proposed \$595,500, but staff negotiated the price down to \$563,925 without reducing the scope of work.

Contract Period: Notice-to-Proceed through June 30, 2020

Project Number(s): 190-0148E.01 **\$563,925**
Funding source: Transportation Development Act (TDA)

Funding of \$123,775 is available in the FY 2016-17 budget in project/task number 090-0148.01, and the remaining yearly costs of \$124,600, \$142,575 and \$172,975 are expected to be available in fiscal years 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20 in project/task number 190-0148E.01, subject to budget availability.

Request-for-Proposal (RFP): SCAG staff notified 660 firms of the release of RFP 17-012-C1 via SCAG's Solicitation Management System. A total of 31 firms downloaded the RFP.

SCAG received the following four (4) proposals in response to the solicitation:

Robert Wall Consulting (3 subconsultants)	\$595,500
Social Interactive, Inc.	\$247,060
Goal Productions (1 subconsultant)	\$685,867
Windsong Productions	\$787,565

Although Windsong Productions originally proposed \$261,245, during the evaluation process the PRC clarified that its proposal had omitted key tasks in three of the four budget years and its actual corrected price was \$787,565.

Selection Process:

The Proposal Review Committee (PRC) evaluated each proposal in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFP, and conducted the selection process in a manner consistent with all applicable federal and state contracting regulations. The PRC did not conduct interviews because the proposals contained sufficient information on which to base a contract award.

The PRC consisted of the following individuals:

- Jeff Liu, Manager of Media & Public Affairs, SCAG
- Margaret de Larios, Public Affairs Specialist, SCAG
- Jonathan Palacio, Associate Transportation Planner, Caltrans District 7

Basis for Selection:

The PRC recommended Robert Wall Consulting for the contract award because the consultant:

- Demonstrated the best understanding of the project, specifically they provided the strongest background in planning, architecture and design, clearest knowledge of SCAG programs and projects, and the best awareness of the role video storytelling plays in SCAG outreach;
- Provided the most impressive portfolio, demonstrating a creative approach and considerable experience producing the type of videos outlined in the Scope of Work;
- Provided the best technical approach, with a clear and realistic schedule and a lean production team that can be flexible according to SCAG's needs as well as be portable across the large region;
- Provided the best overall value for the level of effort proposed; and
- Proposed the lowest price among firms who submitted a complete proposal.

Although one other firm proposed a lower price, the PRC did not recommend this firm for contract award because this firm:

- Submitted an incomplete proposal, with no line item budget or production schedule; and
- Did not clearly demonstrate a sufficient level of effort, primarily because they provided no information about staff hours, to satisfactorily complete the tasks in the Scope of Work.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-012

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Robert Wall Consulting, LLC

Name of Preparer: Robert Wall

Project Title: Videography Services

RFP Number: 17-012 Date Submitted: 09/24/2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:


Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Robert WALL, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Owner of (firm name) Robert Wall Consulting, LLC, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 9/24/2016 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



09/24/2016

Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-012

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Cabin 22 Media, LLC
Name of Preparer: Carlin Wilbert
Project Title: Videography Services
RFP Number: 17-012 Date Submitted: 9/19/16

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:


Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Caitlin Wilbert, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) owner of (firm name) Cabin 22 Media, LLC, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 9/19/16 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



 Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
 (original signature required)

9/19/16

 Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-012

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: _____
Name of Preparer: David Sorafine
Project Title: Videography Services
RFP Number: 17-012 Date Submitted: 9-22-16

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:


Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) David Sorafine, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Videographer of (firm name) _____, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 9-22-16 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.

 _____ Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer (original signature required)	<u>9-22-16</u> _____ Date
--	---------------------------------

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-012

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Tom11 Films
Name of Preparer: Tom Frisch
Project Title: Videography Services
RFP Number: 17-012 Date Submitted: 9/19/2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Thomas S Frisch, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Producer of (firm name) Tom11 Films LLC, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 9/19/2016 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

9/19/2016

Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)
Regional Council (RC)

FROM: Basil Panas; Chief Financial Officer; (213) 236-1817; panas@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Contracts \$200,000 or Greater: Contract Nos. 17-002-C1 through 17-002-C12, On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve Contract Nos. 17-002-C1 through 17-002-C12, with multiple consultants, in an amount not-to-exceed \$1,500,000, to provide on-call economic advisory and outreach services.

The multiple consultants are:

1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
2. California Lutheran University
3. Development Management Group, Inc.
4. Economics & Politics, Inc.
5. Estolano LeSar Perez Advisors
6. Green Tech Coast, Inc.
7. Imprinta Communications Group
8. Kosmont & Associates, Inc. dba Kosmont Companies
9. Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation
10. Orange County Business Council
11. RAND Corporation
12. The Sierra Group

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

SCAG's recent economic analysis work culminated in the Economic and Job Creation Analysis of the adopted 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). As one of the agency's primary transportation planning efforts, the economic data and analysis contained within the RTP/SCS is important to a multitude of planning and research efforts at SCAG. The economic analysis conducted for the RTP/SCS is similarly used in more areas than just the RTP/SCS and is not narrowly constrained to just the RTP/SCS itself but also serves to inform the development of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), annual regional economic outlooks and other economic work, including, but not limited to, the goods movement and active transportation programs.

Continued economic analysis and work is needed during the implementation phase of the RTP/SCS, for efforts related to the agency's economic strategy, and various areas of the agency's planning efforts.

REPORT

SCAG has selected multiple consultants for the contract award, and may request on-call economic services for two (2) major areas: 1) Economic Analysis and Advisory Services; and 2) Outreach Services.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan, Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective b: Develop external communications and media strategy to promote partnerships, build consensus and foster inclusiveness in the decision making process; and Objective c: Provide practical solutions for moving new ideas forward.

BACKGROUND:

Staff recommends executing the following contract \$200,000 or greater:

<u>Consultant/Contract #</u>	<u>Contract Purpose</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>
Consultants Identified Above (17-002-C1 through 17-002-C12)	The consultant shall provide a variety of economic advisory services that will include, but are not limited to: 1) Support for the development and implementation of SCAG’s RTP/SCS; 2) Advisement and consultation regarding the agency’s various planning activities; and 3) Outreach services in relation to the agency’s economic advisory work.	\$1,500,000

FISCAL IMPACT:

Funding of \$220,000 is available in the FY 2016-17 budget, and the remaining is expected to be available in subsequent years, subject to budget availability.

ATTACHMENT:

Consultant Contract Nos. 17-002-C1 through 17-002-C12

CONSULTANT CONTRACT 17-002-C1 through 17-002-C12

Recommended Consultants:

1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
2. California Lutheran University
3. Development Management Group, Inc.
4. Economics & Politics, Inc.
5. Estolano LeSar Perez Advisors
6. Green Tech Coast, Inc.
7. Imprenta Communications Group
8. Kosmont & Associates, Inc. dba Kosmont Companies
9. Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation
10. Orange County Business Council
11. RAND Corporation
12. The Sierra Group

Background & Scope of Work:

In June, 2011, the Southern California Economic Recovery & Job Creation Strategy (“Strategy”) was approved by the Regional Council. The Economic Strategy identifies opportunities for SCAG to partner with member cities, counties, business leaders, organized labor, environmental groups, and other key stakeholders to create jobs to reduce or remove high-priority economic challenges and provide solutions to expedite Southern California’s economic recovery.

In June 2012, SCAG’s Regional Council directed that staff continue work on the Strategy, further economic analysis of SCAG’s 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), and better understand the economic implications of SCAG’s planning activities.

SCAG’s recent economic analysis work culminated in the Economic and Job Creation Analysis of the adopted 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. As one of the agency’s primary transportation planning efforts, the economic data and analysis contained within the RTP/SCS is important to a multitude of planning and research efforts at SCAG. The economic analysis conducted for the RTP/SCS is similarly used in more areas than just the RTP/SCS and is not narrowly constrained to just the RTP/SCS itself but also serves to inform the development of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), annual regional economic outlooks and other economic work, including, but not limited to, the goods movement and active transportation programs.

Continued economic analysis and work is needed during the implementation phase of the RTP/SCS, for efforts related to the agency’s economic strategy, and various areas of the agency’s planning efforts.

SCAG will be obtaining a variety of economic advisory services to support SCAG’s overall planning activities and Economic Recovery and Job Creation Strategy development, as well as outreach services related to these activities.

SCAG has selected multiple consultants for the contract award, and may request on-call services in two major areas: 1) Economic Analysis and Advisory Services; and 2) Outreach Services.

Project’s Benefits & Key Deliverables: The project’s benefits and key deliverables include, but are not limited to:

- Support development of Phase II of Southern California Economic Recovery & Job Creation Strategy;
- Economic analysis and written assessments of SCAG’s planning activities;
- Gather, analyze, and report regional significant economic indicators, as needed;
- Documentation of economic benefits and job impacts of the RTP/SCS, including case studies to better describe economic importance of transportation investments;
- Assessment of economic impacts of transportation investments and cost of delays in the transportation arena, including but not limited to, economic impacts of project acceleration, project certainty, and implications for the Southern California Economic Recovery & Job Creation Strategy;
- Southern California Industry Cluster Analysis including factors in determining the competitive position if each cluster; and
- Increase collaboration with Southern California’s key business, public sector and labor leaders on SCAG’s ongoing planning activities.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective b: Develop external communications and media strategy to promote partnerships, build consensus and foster inclusiveness in the decision making process; and Objective c: Provide practical solutions for moving new ideas forward.

Contract Amount: **Total not-to-exceed** **\$1,500,000**

Note: This is for on-call, or as needed services with consultants to be paid a set hourly rate for their services. As such, there is no specific award amount to each consultant, nor does SCAG guarantee any specific amount of work to a consultant. Therefore, no award amounts are shown below

AECOM Technical Services, Inc.	As Needed
California Lutheran University	As Needed
Development Management Group, Inc.	As Needed
Economics & Politics, Inc.	As Needed
Estolano LeSar Perez Advisors (prime consultant)	As Needed
Economic Roundtable (subconsultant)	
Consulting Services Inc. (subconsultant)	
Green Tech Coast, Inc.	As Needed
Imprenta Communications Group	As Needed
Kosmont & Associates, Inc. dba Kosmont Companies	As Needed
Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation	As Needed
Orange County Business Council	As Needed
RAND Corporation	As Needed
The Sierra Group (prime consultant)	As Needed
Caltrop (subconsultant)	
Betkon, Inc. (subconsultant)	

Contract Period: January 2, 2017 through December 31, 2019

Project Number(s): 055.01531.01 \$100,000

055.01531.02 \$120,000

Funding source(s): Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) – Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transportation Development Act (TDA), Other (as applicable).

Funding of \$220,000 is available in the FY 2016-17 budget, and the remaining is expected to be available in subsequent years, subject to budget availability.

Request-for-Proposal (RFP): SCAG staff notified 2,172 firms of the release of RFP 17-002-C1 via SCAG’s Solicitation Management System. A total of 85 firms downloaded the RFP. SCAG received the following 18 proposals in response to the solicitation:

1. Applied Development Economics, Inc.
2. AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
Subconsultant: Kearns and West
3. California Lutheran University
4. Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
Subconsultant: Beacon Economics
Subconsultant: Network Public Affairs, LLC
Subconsultant: Heather Moro
Subconsultant: Ong & Associates
5. Certified Planning & Public Affairs
6. Development Management Group, Inc.
7. Economic and Planning Systems, Inc.
8. Economics & Politics, Inc.
9. Estolano LeSar Perez Advisors
Subconsultant: Economic Roundtable
Subconsultant: Stantec Consulting Services Inc.
10. Green Tech Coast, Inc.
11. Imprenta Communications Group
12. Kosmont & Associates, Inc. dba Kosmont Companies
13. Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation
14. Orange County Business Council
15. RAND Corporation
Subconsultant: Economic Development Research Group, Inc.
Subconsultant: Madrid Consulting Group, LLC.
Subconsultant: Metcalfe Associates
16. Steer Davies Gleave
Subconsultant: HR&A Advisors Inc.
Subconsultant: Edward J. Bloustein School, Rutgers University
17. Strategy 5 LLC
18. The Sierra Group
Subconsultant: Caltrop
Subconsultant: Betkon, Inc.

Selection Process: The Proposal Review Committee (PRC) evaluated each proposal in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFP, and conducted the selection process in a manner consistent with all applicable federal and state contracting regulations. After evaluating the proposals, the PRC did not conduct interviews because the proposals contained sufficient information upon which to base a contract award.

The PRC consisted of the following individuals:

Darin Chidsey, Director of Strategy, Policy and Public Affairs, SCAG

Simon Choi, Chief of Research and Forecasting, SCAG

Houston Laney, Legislative Analyst II, SCAG

Jonathan Palacio, Associate Transportation Planner, Caltrans, District 7

Frank Wen, Manager of Research and Analysis, SCAG

Basis for Selection: The PRC recommended the contract be awarded to multiple consultants because it will allow SCAG to retain broader level of localized economic expertise and on certain tasks the PRC determined that a team approach would likely improve the quality of the final deliverable. Additionally, awarding the contract to multiple consultants provides SCAG greater flexibility to meet the ‘on call’ needs of the project.

The consultants selected best demonstrated the following:

- An economic expertise in a geographical area or industry field;
- Ability and expertise to preform outreach services;
- Ability to allocate resources to meet SCAG’s need for on-call services;
- Clearly identified previous experience performing economic analysis of a similar scope;
- Understanding of the project intent; and
- Provided rates that were reasonable and within the desired range.

**Conflict Of Interest (COI) Form - Attachment
For November 3, 2016 Regional Council Approval**

Approve Contract Nos. 17-002-C1 through 17-002-C12, with multiple consultants, in an amount not-to-exceed \$1,500,000, to provide on-call economic advisory and outreach services.

The consultants for this contract award include:

Consultant Name	Did the consultant disclose a conflict in the Conflict of Interest Form they submitted with its original proposal (Yes or No)?
1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (prime consultant)	Yes
2. California Lutheran University (prime consultant)	No
3. Development Management Group, Inc.	No
4. Economics & Politics, Inc.	No
5. Estolano LeSar Perez Advisors	No
Subconsultant: Economic Roundtable	No
Subconsultant: Stantec Consulting Services Inc.	No
6. Green Tech Coast, Inc.	Yes
7. Imprenta Communications Group	Yes
8. Kosmont & Associates, Inc. dba Kosmont Companies	Yes
9. Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation	No
10. Orange County Business Council	No
11. RAND Corporation	No
12. The Sierra Group	No
Subconsultant: Caltrop	No
Subconsultant: Betkon, Inc.	No

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: [AECOM Technical Services, Inc.](#)
Name of Preparer: [Lincoln James](#)
Project Title: [On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services.](#)
RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: 8/15/2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

AECOM is a large multinational corporation with over 100,000 employees worldwide. As such, there is no way for us to know whether any of AECOM's managers, partners, or officers are related by blood or marriage/ domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council.

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO [Please see attached Campaign History on the following page](#)

If “yes,” please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) William Anderson, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Vice President of (firm name) AECOM Technical Services, Inc., and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 8/15/2016 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

8/15/2016
Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

**Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
Request for Proposal (RFP) No. 17-002
On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services**

Question #5 on the SCAG Conflict of Interest Form:

Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)? **Yes**

The following is a list of all campaign contributions made by AECOM and ARCOM PAC over the past ten (10) years to current employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council.

Name	Date	Amount	Contributor
Eric Garcetti, People Who Support Eric Garcetti	3/20/2013	\$25,000	AECOM
Lorena Gonzalez for Assembly Encinitas, CA	2/11/2013	\$4,000	AECOM PAC
Curren D. Price, Price for Senate 2014, Burbank, CA	6/8/2012	\$2,000	AECOM PAC
Joe Buscaino for City Council, San Pedro, CA	3/22/2012	\$500	AECOM PAC
Michelle Martinez for State Assembly	12/11/2011	\$2,500	AECOM
Mitch Englander for City Council 2011, Granada Hills, CA	10/5/2010	\$500	AECOM PAC
Kris Murray for Anaheim City Council	2/16/2010	\$1,700	AECOM
Eric Garcetti, LA City Council	10/5/2009	\$500	AECOM
Eric Garcetti, LA City Council	6/1/2009	\$500	AECOM
Nury Martinez for School Board	12/17/2008	\$1,000	AECOM
Felipe Fuentes for Assembly 2008	5/12/2008	\$1,000	AECOM
Bob Blumenfield for State Assembly, CA	4/15/2008	\$1,000	AECOM
Gilbert Cedillo , Officeholder Committee, Carmel, CA	3/5/2008	\$1,000	AECOM PAC
Jose Huizar Officeholder Account, Hollywood, CA	8/2/2006	\$500	AECOM PAC
Mark Ridley-Thomas for Senate Los Angeles, CA	8/2/2006	\$1,500	AECOM PAC

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: CERF @ Cal Lutheran University
Name of Preparer: DAN HAMILTON
Project Title: On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services
RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: 8-14-2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) DAN ELSON HAMILTON, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Director of Economics of (firm name) Center for Economic Research and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 8/14/16 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.

 Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
 (original signature required)

Aug 14 2016

 Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT GROUP, INC.
Name of Preparer: [Signature]
Project Title: ON-CALL ECONOMIC ADVISORY AND OUTREACH SERVICES
RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: AUGUST 1, 2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
N/A	N/A	N/A

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
N/A	N/A

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
N/A	N/A

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
N/A	N/A	N/A

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) MICHAEL JAMES DWUCKE, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) MANAGING PARTNER of (firm name) DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT GROUP, INC., and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated _____ is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

August 1, 2016

Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so **MAY** also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: **Economics & Politics, Inc.**

Name of Preparer: **John E. Husing**

Project Title: **On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services**

RFP Number: **17-003**

Date Submitted: **July 16, 2016**

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

- 1 During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Nature of Financial Interest</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Dates of Service</i>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Relationship</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Relationship</i>
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Dollar Value</i>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) John Husing, (Social Security Number; optional) hereby declare that I am the Vice President of Economics & Politics, Inc. and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated _____ is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



July 16, 2016

Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Estolano LeSar Perez Advisors
Name of Preparer: Cecilia V. Estolano
Project Title: On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services
RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: 8/15/16

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Cecilia V. Estolano, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Co-CEO of (firm name) Estolano LeSar Perez Advisors, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 8/15/16 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.


 _____ 8/15/16
 Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer Date
 (original signature required)

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal.

Name of Firm: Economic Roundtable
Name of Preparer: Patrick Burns, Senior Researcher
Project Title: On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services
RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: August 15, 2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Daniel Flaming, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) President of (firm name) Economic Roundtable, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated August 11, 2016 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.

Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

August 11, 2016

Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Quantec Consulting Services Inc.

Name of Preparer: Rock Miller, PE, PTOE

Project Title: Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services

RFP Number: 17-002 **Date Submitted:** August 15, 2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Rock Miller, PE, PTOE, **hereby declare that I am the (position or title)** Senior Principal **of (firm name)** Antec Consulting Services, Inc. **and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated August 15, 2016 **is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.****



August 15, 2016

Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative from their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal.

Name of Firm: Green Tech Coast Inc.
Name of Preparer: Walter Baker
Project Title: On Call Economic Advisory & Outreach Services
RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: 8-10-16

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Have you or any members of your firm been an employee or officer or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
<u>George Vegas Walker</u>	<u>May 23, 2016</u>	<u>\$ 250.00</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) WALTER B. BAKER, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) CEO of (firm name) Green Tech Coast, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 8-10-16 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.

[Signature] _____ 8-10-16 _____
 Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer Date
 (original signature required)

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

- The SCAG Conflict of Interest Form (Attachment 7)

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Imprenta Communications Group
 Name of Preparer: Mark Grisby
 Project Title: Advisor
 RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: August 12th, 2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Advisor

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:


Name	Date	Dollar Value
David Ryu	2015	\$1,400

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Ronald Wong, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) President & CEO of (firm name) Imprenta Communications Group, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated August 12th, 2016 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



 Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
 (original signature required)

 August 12th, 2016
 Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Kosmont & Associates, Inc. dba Kosmont Companies

Name of Preparer: Susan Perry, Corporate Secretary

Project Title: SCAG On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services

RFP Number: 17-002 **Date Submitted:** August 15, 2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:


Name	Date	Dollar Value
Jonathan Curtis	1/15/2013	\$500.00
Eric Garcetti	5/7/2012	\$100.00
Sam Pedroza	1/2011	\$100.00

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Susan Perry, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Corporate Secretary of (firm name) Kosmont & Associates, Inc. dba Kosmont Companies, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated August 15, 2016 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

*Susan Perry,
Corporate Secretary*

August 15, 2016

Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation

Name of Preparer: Christine Cooper, Ph.D.

Project Title: On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services

RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: 8/15/2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Susan D. Stel, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Executive Vice President & CFO of (firm name) Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated _____ is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



 Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
 (original signature required)

8/12/2016

 Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so **MAY** also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Orange County Business Council

Name of Preparer: Dr. Wallace Walrod / Lucetta Dunn

Project Title: On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services

RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: 8-11-16

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:


Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Lucetta Dunn, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) President and CEO of (firm name) Orange County Business Council, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 8-11-16 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.

 _____ Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer (original signature required)	_____ 8-11-16 Date
--	--------------------------

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: RAND Corporation

Name of Preparer: Anisa Spotswood

Project Title: On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services

RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: August 15, 2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Dennis Flieder, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Director of Contracts & Grants of (firm name) RAND Corporation, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated August 10, 2016 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



 Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
 (original signature required)

8/12/2016

 Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG’s Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG’s Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under “OPPORTUNITIES”, then “Doing Business with SCAG” and scroll down under the “CONTRACTS” tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under “ABOUT” then “Employee Directory”; and Regional Council members can be found under “ABOUT”, then scroll down to “ELECTED OFFICIALS” on the left side of the page and click on “See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts.”

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG’s Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer “yes” to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: The Sierra Group
Name of Preparer: Rebecca Barrantes
Project Title: On-Call Economic Analysis and Outreach Services
RFP Number: 17-002 **Date Submitted:** 8/15/16

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If “yes,” please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Rebecca Barrantes, **hereby declare that I am the (position or title)** President **of (firm name)** The Sierra Group, **and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 8/15/16 **is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.****

Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

8/15/16

Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: CALTROP Corporation

Name of Preparer: Javad Rassouli, Chief Operating Officer

Project Title: On-Call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services

RFP Number: 17-002 **Date Submitted:** August 15, 2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
<hr/>	<hr/>

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:


Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Javad Rassouli, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) **Chief Operating Officer** of (firm name) **CALTROP Corporation**, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated **August 15, 2016** is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



 Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
 (original signature required)

August 15, 2016

 Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 17-002

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG’s Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG’s Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under “OPPORTUNITIES”, then “Doing Business with SCAG” and scroll down under the “CONTRACTS” tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under “ABOUT” then “Employee Directory”; and Regional Council members can be found under “ABOUT”, then scroll down to “ELECTED OFFICIALS” on the left side of the page and click on “See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts.”

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG’s Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer “yes” to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Betkon, Inc.

Name of Preparer: Heather McGuffin

Project Title: On-call Economic Advisory and Outreach Services

RFP Number: 17-002 Date Submitted: August 15, 2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If “yes,” please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Heather McGuffin, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) President of (firm name) Betkon, Inc., and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated _____ is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.

Heather McGuffin

8/1/2016

Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)
Regional Council (RC)

FROM: Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer, (213) 236-1817, panas@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Contract amendment that exceeds \$75,000: Contract No. 12-019-C1, Monthly Managed Information Technology (IT) Services

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve Amendment No. 6 to Contract No. 12-019-C1, with Allied Digital Systems, LLC, in an amount not-to-exceed \$397,912 increasing contract value from \$1,912,960 to \$2,310,872 to provide managed IT services for an additional year.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of this amendment is to add an extension of one (1) year to the contract using the same pricing and terms. During the course of the extension, SCAG plans to issue a competitive procurement for a new IT agreement to carry SCAG through the end of this decade and beyond. The next five to seven years is a critical period for SCAG to build new IT capabilities to better support SCAG's dynamic mission and environment. This amendment exceeds \$75,000. Therefore, in accordance with the SCAG Procurement Manual (dated 11/01/14) Section 8.3, it requires the Regional Council's approval.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan Goal 4: Develop, Maintain and Promote the Utilization of State of the Art Models, Information Systems and Communication Technologies; Objective d: Integrate Advanced Information and Communication Technologies.

BACKGROUND:

Staff recommends executing the following contract amendment greater than \$75,000

<u>Consultant/Contract #</u>	<u>Contract Amendment Purpose</u>	<u>Amended Contract</u>
Allied Digital Systems, LLC, (12-019-C1)	Extend contract term for one (1) year to enable the consultant to continue to provide managed IT services and increase contract value in an amount not-to-exceed \$397,912.	\$2,310,872

FISCAL IMPACT:

Funding of \$124,407 is available in the FY 2016-17 budget in project/task number 811.SCG1163.08, and the remaining amount of \$273,505 is expected to be available in FY 2017-18 budget in project/task number 811.SCG1163.08, subject to budget availability.

ATTACHMENT:

Consultant Contract No. 12-019-C1

CONTRACT 12-019-C1 AMENDMENT 6

Consultant: Allied Digital Systems, LLC (ADSL)

Background & Scope of Work: On March 22, 2012, SCAG awarded an Information Technology (IT) outsource contract to ADSL. This contract was a continuation of SCAG’s IT outsourcing strategy, which leverages expert outside consultants to provide skilled, on-demand 24-hours per day, seven (7) days per week (24x7) Managed Information Technology Services.

The purpose of this amendment is to add an extension of one (1) year using the same pricing and terms. During the course of the one year extension, SCAG plans to issue a competitive procurement for a new IT agreement to carry SCAG through the end of this decade and beyond. The next five to seven years is a critical period for SCAG to build new IT capabilities to better support SCAG’s dynamic mission and environment. The IT industry and the government sector in particular are moving towards cloud offerings that offer digital innovation and data access at reduced capital costs. Hybrid cloud environments (a mix of cloud and on-premises equipment) require new methods of IT service management, integration, security, and optimization. SCAG will benefit from an additional year of market maturity and new pricing structures. Staff expects to use this time to complete research required to specify, evaluate and prepare to negotiate the next agreement. This amendment increases the contract value from 1,912,960 to \$2,310,872 and extends the term from March 31, 2017 to March 31, 2018.

Project’s Benefits & Key Deliverables: The project’s benefits and key deliverables include, but are not limited to:

- Innovative IT strategies and systems to support SCAG’s rapidly growing mission-critical activities;
- Standardized processes and monitoring systems that increase system uptime, reliability, and performance;
- Daily customer support of SCAG staff operations, including 24x7 help desk and off-hours response; and
- Real-time monitoring and management of SCAG’s information security, including firewall and endpoint protection.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 4: Develop, Maintain and Promote the Utilization of State of the Art Models, Information Systems and Communication Technologies; Objective d: Integrate Advanced Information and Communication Technologies.

Amendment Amount:	Amendment 6	\$397,912
	Amendment 5 (administrative – no change to contract’s value)	\$0
	Amendment 4 (administrative – no change to contract’s value)	\$0
	Amendment 3 (administrative – no change to contract’s value)	\$0
	Amendment 2 (administrative – no change to contract’s value)	\$0
	Amendment 1 (administrative – no change to contract’s value)	\$0
	Original contract value	<u>\$1,912,960</u>
	Total contract value is not-to-exceed	\$2,310,872

Note Amendment 6 includes:

Monthly Services at \$24,826 x 12 months	\$297,912
Additional Optional Work	\$100,000

This amendment exceeds \$75,000. Therefore, in accordance with the SCAG Procurement Manual Section 1.4.5, version 10, it requires the Regional Council's approval.

Contract Period: March 1, 2012 through March 31, 2018

Project Number: 811.SCG1163.08 \$2,310,872
Funding source: Indirect Cost

Funding of \$124,407 is available in the FY 2016-17 budget in project/task number 811.SCG1163.08, and the remaining amount of \$273,505 is expected to be available in FY 2017-18 budget in project/task number 811.SCG1163.08, subject to budget availability.

Basis for the Amendment: This contract fulfills SCAG's need for a wide range of technical and staff support services that are the foundation of SCAG's information technology environment. These services include network and server management, laptop and help desk services, information security monitoring, and data center and disaster recovery management. The services support numerous planning, GIS, modeling and administrative systems. ADSL has successfully planned and delivered enhancements to system performance, reliability, redundancy, service delivery, and information security protections. ADSL has been responsive to staff requests and has often provided services above the negotiated service level agreements. Surveys of staff satisfaction are near the top of the range on average.

SCAG maintains a very small headcount relative to the number of staff supported plus the complexity and criticality of IT systems within the organization. This contract allows SCAG staff to focus limited resources on projects and tasks that are strategic, including ongoing collaboration with SCAG staff, IT project planning and budgeting, application development and configuration, database management, audio-visual services, facilities, and vendor management.

SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No./Contract No. 12-019-C1

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS

All persons or firms seeking contracts must complete and submit a SCAG Conflict of Interest Form along with the proposal. This requirement also applies to any proposed subconsultant(s). Failure to comply with this requirement may cause your proposal to be declared non-responsive.

In order to answer the questions contained in this form, please review SCAG's Conflict of Interest Policy, the list of SCAG employees, and the list of SCAG's Regional Council members. All three documents can be viewed online at www.scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under "OPPORTUNITIES", then "Doing Business with SCAG" and scroll down under the "CONTRACTS" tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under "ABOUT" then "Employee Directory"; and Regional Council members can be found under "ABOUT", then scroll down to "ELECTED OFFICIALS" on the left side of the page and click on "See the list of SCAG representative and their Districts."

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG's Deputy Legal Counsel, especially if you answer "yes" to any question in this form, as doing so MAY also disqualify your firm from submitting an offer on this proposal

Name of Firm: Allied Digital Services, LLC
Name of Preparer: Debbie Roa
Project Title: Managed Information Technology Services
Date Submitted: October 12, 2016

SECTION II: QUESTIONS

1. During the last twelve (12) months, has your firm provided a source of income to employees of SCAG or members of the SCAG Regional Council, or have any employees or Regional Council members held any investment (including real property) in your firm?

YES NO

If "yes," please list the names of those SCAG employees and/or SCAG Regional Council members and the nature of the financial interest:

Name	Nature of Financial Interest
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Have you or any members of your firm been an employee of SCAG or served as a member of the SCAG Regional Council within the last twelve (12) months?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, position, and dates of service:

Name	Position	Dates of Service
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

3. Are you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm related by blood or marriage/domestic partnership to an employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council that is considering your proposal?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. Does an employee of SCAG or a member of the SCAG Regional Council hold a position at your firm as a director, officer, partner, trustee, employee, or any position of management?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name and the nature of the relationship:

Name	Relationship
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

5. Have you or any managers, partners, or officers of your firm ever given (directly or indirectly), or offered to give on behalf of another or through another person, campaign contributions or gifts to any current employee of SCAG or member of the SCAG Regional Council (including contributions to a political committee created by or on behalf of a member/candidate)?

YES NO

If "yes," please list name, date gift or contribution was given/offered, and dollar value:

Name	Date	Dollar Value
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

SECTION III: VALIDATION STATEMENT

This Validation Statement must be completed and signed by at least one General Partner, Owner, Principal, or Officer authorized to legally commit the proposer.

DECLARATION

I, (printed full name) Sunil Bhatt, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Chief Technology Officer of (firm name) Allied Digital Services, LLC, and that I am duly authorized to execute this Validation Statement on behalf of this entity. I hereby state that this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form dated 10/12/16 is correct and current as submitted. I acknowledge that any false, deceptive, or fraudulent statements on this Validation Statement will result in rejection of my contract proposal.



10/18/16

Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

Date

NOTICE

A material false statement, omission, or fraudulent inducement made in connection with this SCAG Conflict of Interest Form is sufficient cause for rejection of the contract proposal or revocation of a prior contract award.

DATE: November 3, 2016
TO: Regional Council (RC)
FROM: Hasan Ikhmeta, Executive Director, ikhmeta@scag.ca.gov; 213-236-1800
SUBJECT: Approval of Additional Stipend Payments

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL:



RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve additional stipend payments for the month of June 2016.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Immediate Past President Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, District 1, attended and represented SCAG at several meetings and SCAG-sponsored events and is eligible pursuant to the Stipend Policy. She submitted twelve (12) stipend payment requests for the month of June; eight (8) of which have been paid. However, in accordance with the Regional Council Policy Manual, the remaining four (4) stipend requests are pending for payment as it will require Regional Council approval. Staff is seeking an approval for these additional stipend payments as requested by Immediate Past President Viegas-Walker.

BACKGROUND:

In accordance with Regional Council Policy Manual, Article VI, Sections 1.4 – 1.6, “Regional Council members are eligible to receive up to six (6) per diem stipends per month. The President may authorize up to two (2) additional per diem stipends per month for Regional Council members. Nine (9) or more per diem stipends per month for Regional Council officers and members require Regional Council approval.”

In the month of June 2016, Immediate Past President Viegas-Walker attended several SCAG meetings and SCAG-sponsored events and is eligible pursuant to the Stipend Policy. She submitted a total of twelve (12) stipend payment requests; eight (8) of which have been paid. However, in accordance with the RC Policy Manual, the remaining four (4) stipend requests are pending for payment as it will require Regional Council approval. The unpaid stipend payments were for her attendance at the National Association of Regional Councils (NARC) 50th Annual Conference and Exhibition in Salt Lake City, Utah, for four (4) days from June 26, 27, 28 and 29, 2016.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Funds for stipends are included in the General Fund Budget.

ATTACHMENT:

None


This Page Intentionally Left Blank

DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)
Regional Council (RC)

FROM: Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer, (213) 236-1817, panas@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Purchase Orders \$5,000 but less than \$200,000; Contracts \$25,000 but less than \$200,000; and Amendments \$5,000 but less than \$75,000

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only - No Action Required.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG'S Strategic Plan Goal 3: Enhance the Agency's Long Term Financial Stability and Fiscal Management.

BACKGROUND:

SCAG executed the following Purchase Orders (PO's) between \$5,000 and \$200,000

Software One, Inc.	FY17 Microsoft Agreement	\$114,468
CDW Government, Inc.	FY17 Laptop & Docking Stations	\$94,269
Daily Journal Corporation	FY17 Draft 2017 FTIP Notifications	\$19,700
KC's Mediterranean Grill	FY17 RC Lunch Catering	\$12,000
CDW Government, Inc.	FY17 Maintenance Renewal	\$9,805
City Fare, Inc.	FY17 RC Lunch Catering	\$5,000

SCAG executed the following Contracts between \$25,000 and \$200,000

<u>Consultant/Contract #</u>	<u>Contract's Purpose</u>	<u>Contract Amount</u>
1. Infogroup, Inc. (dba, InfoUSA Marketing, Inc.) 16-022-C1	The consultant shall provide SCAG an employment database to help estimate how many jobs are in the various transportation analysis zones (over 3000 geographical areas) throughout the SCAG region. The database is crucial in the development of SCAG's Regional Transportation/Sustainable Community Strategies (RTP/SCS) because estimated jobs are one of the key inputs used in the (RTP/SCS).	\$71,345
2. The Meltwater Group (17-004-C1)	The consultant shall provide SCAG a web-based service for monitoring and conducting outreach to media, including the capacity to track all news coverage about SCAG and a platform to distribute press releases to journalists.	\$61,784

REPORT

SCAG executed the Amendment between \$5,000 and \$74,999

<u>Consultant/Contract #</u>	<u>Amendment's Purpose</u>	<u>Amendment Amount</u>
N/A	N/A	N/A

ATTACHMENT:
Contract Summaries

CONSULTANT CONTRACT 16-022-C1

Recommended Consultant:	Infogroup, Inc. (dba, InfoUSA Marketing, Inc.)				
Background & Scope of Work:	The consultant shall provide SCAG an employment database to help estimate how many jobs are in the various transportation analysis zones (over 3000 geographical areas) throughout the SCAG region. The database is crucial in the development of SCAG's Regional Transportation/Sustainable Community Strategies (RTP/SCS) because estimated jobs are one of the key inputs used in the (RTP/SCS).				
Project's Benefits & Key Deliverables:	The project's benefit and key deliverable includes, but is not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing employment data that will assist in mapping and researching of business and employment locations throughout the SCAG region.				
Strategic Plan:	This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective: a) Create and facilitate a collaborative and cooperative environment to produce forward thinking regional plans.				
Contract Amount:	Total not-to-exceed \$71,345 InfoUSA Marketing, Inc. (prime consultant)				
	Note: InfoUSA Marketing, Inc. originally proposed \$85,562, but staff negotiated the price down to \$71,345 without reducing the scope of work.				
Contract Period:	August 31, 2016 through August 31, 2019				
Project Number(s):	055-SCG0704B.02 \$71,345 Funding source(s): Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) – Federal Transit Administration (FTA)				
Request-for-Proposal (RFP):	SCAG staff notified 794 firms of the release of RFP 16-022-C1 via SCAG's Solicitation Management System. A total of 24 firms downloaded the RFP. SCAG received the following two (2) proposals in response to the solicitation: <table border="0" style="margin-left: 40px;"><tr><td>InfoUSA Marketing, Inc. (no subconsultants)</td><td style="text-align: right;">\$85,862</td></tr><tr><td>Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. (no subconsultants)</td><td style="text-align: right;">\$111,500</td></tr></table>	InfoUSA Marketing, Inc. (no subconsultants)	\$85,862	Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. (no subconsultants)	\$111,500
InfoUSA Marketing, Inc. (no subconsultants)	\$85,862				
Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. (no subconsultants)	\$111,500				
Selection Process:	The Proposal Review Committee (PRC) evaluated each proposal in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFP, and conducted the selection process in a manner consistent with all applicable federal and state contracting regulations. After evaluating the proposals, the PRC did not conduct interviews because the proposals contained sufficient information on which to base a contract award. The PRC consisted of the following individuals: John Cho, Associate Regional Planner, SCAG Jonathan Palacio, Associate Transportation Planner, Caltrans District 7 Sungbin Cho, Transportation Modeler, SCAG				

Basis for Selection: The PRC recommended InfoUSA Marketing, Inc. for the contract award because the consultant:

- Proposed the lowest price;
- Provided detailed descriptions about the collection of employment data and included more business records than the other firm; and
- Demonstrated the most experience working with metropolitan planning organizations similar to SCAG, such as, the Sacramento Council of Governments.

CONSULTANT CONTRACT 17-004-C1

Recommended Consultant:	The Meltwater Group
Background & Scope of Work:	The consultant shall provide a web-based media monitoring software system for SCAG. Specifically, the consultant shall provide a complete and up-to-date database of journalists and content creators to contact; provide capacity to track all relevant news coverage; as well as a platform to distribute press releases to journalists and provide research and analysis on the effectiveness of a media engagement.
Project's Benefits & Key Deliverables:	<p>The service's benefits and key deliverables include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• News monitoring from U.S.-based print, web and broadcast outlets that track all items published and aired about SCAG as well as key topics and individuals;• A searchable and regularly updated database of journalists and media outlets in the U.S. and the SCAG region in particular;• The ability to distribute press releases to a comprehensive list of media contacts; and• An analytical reporting feature that can track engagement, such as who inquires, who airs/writes stories, who opened SCAG news releases, and links to coverage to individual media campaigns to help determine the effectiveness of a news release.
Strategic Plan:	This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective b: Develop External Communications and Media Strategy to Promote Partnerships, Build Consensus, and Foster Inclusiveness in the Decision Making Process
Contract Amount:	Total not-to-exceed \$61,784 The Meltwater Group (prime consultant)
	Note: The Meltwater Group originally proposed \$66,200, but staff negotiated the price down to \$61,784 without reducing the scope of work.
Contract Period:	September 21, 2016 through June 30, 2019
Project Number(s):	090-0148A.01 \$61,784 Funding source(s): Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) – Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transportation Development Act (TDA)
	Funding of \$17,950 is available in the FY 2016-17 budget, \$21,540 is expected to be available in the available in the FY 2017-18 budget in Project Number 090-0148A.01 and the remaining \$22,294 is expected to be available in the FY 2018-19 budget in Project Number 090-0148A.01, subject to budget availability

Request-for-Quote (RFQ): SCAG staff notified 1,632 firms of the release of RFP 17-004-C1 via SCAG’s Solicitation Management System. A total of 32 firms downloaded the RFP. SCAG received the following two (2) proposals in response to the solicitation:

The Meltwater Group (no subconsultants)	\$66,200
Mercury (no subconsultants)	\$340,000

Selection Process The Proposal Review Committee (PRC) evaluated each proposal in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFQ, and conducted the selection process in a manner consistent with all applicable federal and state contracting regulations. After evaluating the proposals, the PRC did not conduct interviews because the proposals contained sufficient information on which to base a contract award.

The PRC consisted of the following individuals:

Jeff Liu, Manager of Media & Communications (Project Manager)
Houston Laney, Legislative Analyst
Margaret de Larios, Public Affairs Specialist

Basis for Selection: The PRC recommended The Meltwater Group for the contract award because the consultant:

- Demonstrated the best understanding of the project, specifically offering a comprehensive overview of their web-based service that explicitly met each deliverable outlined in the scope of work;
- Provided the best technical approach, for example facilitating user-defined media alerts and press release distribution, unlike the other firm that proposed to act as intermediary with monitoring service;
- Provided the best overall value for the level of effort proposed; and
- Proposed the lowest price. The other firm greatly overestimated the level of effort required to complete the scope of work.

DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Regional Council (RC)
Executive Administration Committee (EAC)
Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee
Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)
Transportation Committee (TC)

FROM: Michael Gainor, Senior Regional Planner, Compliance and Performance Monitoring;
gainor@scag.ca.gov; (213) 236-1822

SUBJECT: 2017 Local Profiles Reports

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only – No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Since 2009, SCAG staff has prepared and updated the Local Profiles reports as part of SCAG's member services. The reports provide current and historical demographic, socio-economic, housing, transportation, and education data compiled from a variety of sources. The 2017 Local Profiles reports, to be released at the May 2017 General Assembly, generally focus on changes that have occurred since 2000. The information is presented to help identify current trends that may assist local governments with community planning and outreach efforts; help companies with expansion or relocation decisions; help residents learn more about their communities; and to serve as a resource to academia.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan; Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective A: Create and facilitate a collaborative and cooperative environment to produce forward thinking regional plans.

BACKGROUND:
The Local Profiles were first released at the SCAG Regional Conference and General Assembly in May 2009, and have been updated every two years since. The Local Profiles provide a quick resource for local data and analysis. As part of the biennial update, the new 2017 Local Profiles reports, scheduled for release at the SCAG General Assembly in May 2017, include updated information and data related to housing, employment, income and education. The data included in the Local Profiles reports is compiled through a wide variety sources and refined through extensive input from our member jurisdictions.

The Local Profiles reports have served as information and communication resources for elected officials, businesses, and residents in our local communities. Local government staff have used the reports to respond to a wide variety of public information inquiries regarding growth and change occurring within



REPORT

their jurisdictions. The Local Profiles are also frequently used by local jurisdictions in support of community planning, public outreach, local visioning initiatives, economic development, grant applications, and marketing and promotional materials. In addition, the biennially produced reports provide a useful tool in support of regional and local performance monitoring. Some examples of how the reports have been used include the provision of locally specific data to support residential and commercial development decision-making by private land development firms; as a community information resource for local jurisdictions in support of General Plan updates; as an appendix to local strategic plans; and as a compendium of relevant local data to support various grant applications by local jurisdictions throughout the SCAG region.

With each edition of the Local Profiles, the selection of specific data and topics to be presented in the reports may evolve to some extent to ensure consistency with the overall goal of providing a highly relevant product that reflects the current priorities in the SCAG region in a concise, easy to read format. For the 2017 Local Profiles several enhancements are being introduced in the reports including a stronger focus on housing and sustainable transportation.

Attachment 1 of this report indicates the set of data items to be included in the 2017 edition of the Local Profiles, including a few new data items.

Attachment 2 of this report provides a Fact Sheet which was developed in support of the 2015 Local Profiles reports. The 2015 Local Profiles are posted on the SCAG website: www.scag.ca.gov/resources/profiles.htm

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Overall Work Program (WBS Number 17-080.SCG00153.05: Data Compilation and Circulation).

ATTACHMENTS:

1. 2017 Local Profiles Data List
2. Local Profiles Fact Sheet

2017 Local Profiles Data (Draft) *Proposed New Data Items in BLUE*

Category	Data Type	Data Source
Population	Total Population: 2015 & 2016	California Department of Finance
	Population: % Hispanic: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Population: % Non-Hispanic White: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Population: % Non-Hispanic Asian: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Population: % Non-Hispanic Black: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Population: % Non-Hispanic American Indian: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Population: % All Other Non-Hispanic: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Population by Age: 2015 & 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Median Age: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Population Density: 2016	SCAG
Households	Number of Households: 2015 & 2016	California Department of Finance
	Average Household Size: 2015 & 2016	California Department of Finance
	Share of Households by Household Size: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Median Household Income: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Share of Households by Household Income: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
Housing	Homeownership Rate: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Median Existing Home Sales Price: 2015 & 2016	Dataquick (CoreLogic)
	Number of Foreclosures	Dataquick (CoreLogic)
	Share of Housing Stock by Decade Built	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Number of Housing Units: 2015 & 2016	California Department of Finance
	Number of Housing Units by Housing Type: 2016	California Department of Finance
	Total Housing Building Permits Issued: 2015 & 2016	Construction Industry Research Board
	Single-Family Housing Building Permits Issued: 2015 & 2016	Construction Industry Research Board
	Multi-Family Housing Building Permits Issued: 2015 & 2016	Construction Industry Research Board
	Housing Cost Burden: Homeowners	American Community Survey (ACS)
Housing Cost Burden: Renters	American Community Survey (ACS)	
Transportation	Transportation Mode Share: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Average Travel Time to Work: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	Top 10 Commuter Work Destination Cities: Table	LEHD O/D Employment Statistics
	Top 10 Commuter Work Destination Cities: Map	SCAG
	Number of Vehicles per Household: 2000, 2010, 2016	American Community Survey (ACS)
	Miles of Bicycle Lanes: 2016	SCAG
	Vehicle Miles Traveled (per capita): 2000, 2010, 2016	SCAG
	Travel Time to Work Distribution (by range of minutes): 2000-2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
Employment	Total Number of Jobs: 2014 & 2015	California Employment Development Dept
	Number of Jobs by Sector: 2015	California Employment Development Dept
	Number of Manufacturing Jobs: 2014 & 2015	California Employment Development Dept
	Number of Construction Jobs: 2014 & 2015	California Employment Development Dept
	Number of Retail Trade Jobs: 2014 & 2015	California Employment Development Dept
	Number of Professional & Management Jobs: 2014 & 2015	California Employment Development Dept
	Average Annual Salary: 2015	California Employment Development Dept
	Average Annual Salary by Sector: 2015	California Employment Development Dept
Retail Sales	Real Retail Sales: 2014 & 2015	California Board of Equalization
Education	% Completed High School or Higher: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	% Completed Bachelor Degree or Higher: 2016	US Census, Nielsen Co
	K-12 Public School Enrollment: 2015 & 2016	California Department of Education
	K-6 Public School Student Enrollment: 2015 & 2016	California Department of Education
	Grades 7-9 Public School Student Enrollment: 2015 & 2016	California Department of Education
	Grades 10-12 Public School Student Enrollment: 2015 & 2016	California Department of Education

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

SCAG LOCAL PROFILES



FOR MORE INFORMATION: Please visit the SCAG website at www.scag.ca.gov or contact Michael Gainor at (213) 236-1822 or via email at LocalProfiles@scag.ca.gov.

SCAG LOCAL PROFILES

WHAT ARE LOCAL PROFILES?

The Local Profiles are planning data reports prepared for each city, county unincorporated areas and each county within the SCAG Region. They provide current and historical demographic, socio-economic, housing, transportation and education data gathered from a variety of sources. The information is presented to demonstrate current trends that may assist local governments with community planning and outreach efforts; help companies with expansion or relocation decisions; help residents learn more about their communities; and to serve as a resource to academia. The current reports focus on changes that have occurred since 2000.

The profiles are a complimentary service provided to SCAG members, including 191 cities and 6 counties (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura).

BACKGROUND

The Local Profiles, which are developed with extensive input from member jurisdictions, were first released at the SCAG Regional Conference & General Assembly in May 2009, and have been updated every two years since. The Local Profiles provide a quick resource for local data and analysis. As part of the biennial update, the new 2015 Local Profiles reports, to be released at the General Assembly in May 2015, include updated information and data related to housing, employment, income and education.

WHAT ARE THE LOCAL PROFILES USED FOR?

The Local Profiles have served as an information and communication resource for elected officials, businesses and residents. Local government staff has used them to respond to various information inquiries regarding growth and change occurring within their jurisdictions. Local Profiles have also been used in community planning and outreach, visioning initiatives, economic development, grant applications and marketing and promotional materials.

HOW TO OBTAIN THE LOCAL PROFILES?

The 2015 Local Profiles reports are posted at www.scag.ca.gov/resources/profiles.htm.

AT A GLANCE

Categories

- ▼ **Population:** growth, age distribution, ethnic composition
- ▼ **Households:** household size, household income distribution
- ▼ **Housing:** home price, building permits
- ▼ **Transportation:** mode choice, commute time
- ▼ **Employment:** jobs by sector, average salary per job
- ▼ **Retail Sales:** retail sales per person
- ▼ **Education:** school enrollment

Data Sources

- ▼ California Department of Finance
- ▼ California Employment Development Department
- ▼ California State Board of Equalization
- ▼ Construction Industry Research Board
- ▼ MDA DataQuick
- ▼ Nielsen Company
- ▼ U.S. Census Bureau

DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Regional Council (RC)
Executive Administration Committee (EAC)
Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee
Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)
Transportation Committee (TC)

FROM: Hasan Ikhata, Executive Director, 213-236-1944, Ikhata@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: California Housing Summit: The Cost of Not Housing – Recap

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

For Information Only - No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

SCAG, in partnership with thirty-four (34) non-profit, private and public entities, held a Housing Summit on October 11, 2016 to address causes of California's housing crisis and offer solutions for more housing to be built. Approximately 400 people participated in the Summit, which featured over twenty-five (25) speakers. As part of the Summit, SCAG released a publication titled "Mission Impossible? Meeting California's Housing Challenge", which highlights the housing crisis and discusses strategies to address it. All event sessions and presentations will be posted soon at www.scag.ca.gov/housingsummit.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan; Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective A: Create and facilitate a collaborative and cooperative environment to produce forward thinking regional plans.

BACKGROUND:

SCAG, in partnership with over thirty-four (34) non-profit, private and public entities, held a Housing Summit on October 11, 2016 to address causes of California's housing crisis and offer solutions for more housing to be built. These thirty-four partners met over the course of several months to provide input for staff on key housing issues and recommendations for speakers and panels. Additionally, a discussion of the Housing Summit also occurred at the Executive Administrative Committee (EAC) Retreat on June 9, 2016. Similar to the Steering Committee meetings, attendees of the EAC Retreat voiced many opinions regarding the Housing Summit.

Based on the discussion at Steering Committee meetings and the EAC retreat, SCAG and its partners developed a Housing Policy Discussion Framework Proposal. The Proposal served as a blueprint to develop the Summit program (Attachment 1, Housing Summit Program) and the development of a publication that accompanied the Housing Summit.

REPORT

Over twenty-five speakers from throughout the State participated on the Summit's panels. The first panel, titled "Houston...I Mean... California? We Have a Problem!" focused on the causes and effects of the crisis, including the economic, environmental, and social costs to the State. To connect attendees with the personal impacts of the housing shortage, the panel also featured five (5) video clips of people personally affected by the crisis.

Following the morning session, three (3) concurrent breakout sessions were held. Breakout Session A, titled "Show Me the Money!" focused on funding opportunities created by State programs and the linkage between affordable housing and infrastructure. Key points outlined noted that there is a lack of ongoing strategies at the State and Federal levels to fund housing and that existing opportunities are underutilized.

Breakout Session B, "Integrate Preserve, Utilize, and Build", highlighted successful strategies and tools used by local agencies to promote housing development and preservation. Key points raised included aligning housing with amenities and infrastructure and including housing as part of all local plans.

Breakout Session C, "Breaking Down the Walls", focused on overcoming barriers to developing housing locally, such as California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) abuse and strong anti-growth sentiments, while remaining sensitive to community concerns. Highlights of the discussion included advocating for early and innovative partnerships with stakeholders, showcasing the benefits of residential projects to the community, and exploring other CEQA options. At the conclusion of the panels, the moderators of the panels held a summary session to recap their sessions and provide additional thoughts.

The Summit concluded with a call to action panel "Let's Say YES to Housing." This panel acted as an apex to the sessions of the Summit and was designed to draw upon the insights shared earlier and inspire action with leaders and decisionmakers. Participants were encouraged to take home strategies shared at the Summit and bring action to promote more housing in their local communities.

Summit materials, including the agenda, Highlights of the Crisis summary report, and full publication are available on the website at www.scag.ca.gov/housingsummit. All Summit sessions were filmed and will be posted on the Summit website in the coming weeks.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the Fiscal Year 2016-2017 Overall Work Program (WBS Number 17-080.SCG00153.04: Regional Assessment).

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Housing Summit Agenda
2. Highlights of the Housing Crisis handout



PROGRAM

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 2016

8:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

L.A. HOTEL

333 S. Figueroa Street

Los Angeles 90071

scag.ca.gov/housingsummit



8:30 AM

WELCOME

Hon. Michele Martinez, *President, SCAG*

Steve PonTell, *President and CEO, National CORE*; Summit Master of Ceremonies

9:00 AM

HOUSTON... I MEAN... CALIFORNIA? WE HAVE A PROBLEM!

Morning Panel (General Session)

The state of California is in a serious housing deficit—how did we get here? This panel looks at the housing shortage's root causes and its economic, environmental and social costs.

Moderator Steve PonTell, National CORE

Panelists

- >> Raphael Bostic, University of Southern California
- >> Alan Greenlee, Southern California Association of NonProfit Housing
- >> Ben Metcalf, California Department of Housing & Community Development
- >> Brian Uhler, California Legislative Analyst's Office

10:00 AM

BREAK

Program continued on second page

To register or for more information, visit www.scag.ca.gov/housingsummit
For additional questions, contact Ma'Ayn Johnson at johnson@scag.ca.gov

10:15 AM

SHOW ME THE MONEY!

Breakout Session A

The state plays a major role in affordable housing and infrastructure. This panel will identify funding resources such as the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program and fiscal tools such as the Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts and Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities to foster housing and infrastructure development throughout the state.

Moderator Fred Silva, California Forward

Panelists

- >> **Ken Kirkey**, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
- >> **Larry Kosmont**, Kosmont Companies
- >> **Kirk Stark**, University of California, Los Angeles

INTEGRATE, PRESERVE, UTILIZE AND BUILD

Breakout Session B

Expert panelists will explore strategies for integrating state, regional and local planning policies including Transit-Oriented Developments, Transit Ready Developments, housing preservation, anti-displacement, inclusionary zoning and more.

Moderator Rick Cole, City of Santa Monica

Panelists

- >> **Celeste Cantú**, Santa Ana Watershed Protection Authority
- >> **Hon. Vartan Gharpetian**, City of Glendale
- >> **Steven Kellenberg**, Irvine Company
- >> **Mike McKeever**, Sacramento Area Council of Governments
- >> **Patrick Tighe**, Patrick Tighe Architecture

BREAKING DOWN THE WALLS

Breakout Session C

Good projects are often held up by CEQA abuse and NIMBYism— how can we break down barriers to develop new housing while remaining sensitive to the concerns of the community? This panel busts myths about the negative impact of developing more housing, provides tools to engage communities and showcases projects that exemplify best practices for local leadership and moving the needle.

Moderator Lucy Dunn, Orange County Business Council

Panelists

- >> **Hon. Wendy Bucknum**, City of Mission Viejo
- >> **Gary Gallegos**, San Diego Association of Governments
- >> **Jennifer Hernandez**, Holland and Knight
- >> **Sonja Trauss**, San Francisco Bay Area Renters' Federation

11:30 AM

BUFFET LUNCH

12:15 PM

SUMMARY OF BREAKOUT SESSIONS

Panelists

- >> **Rick Cole**, City of Santa Monica
- >> **Lucy Dunn**, Orange County Business Council
- >> **Fred Silva**, California Forward

12:45 PM

LET'S SAY "YES" TO HOUSING

Call to Action Panel

This panel will synthesize the lessons of the day, illustrating the strategy of community involvement and stakeholder partnerships that will ultimately lead to "YES" to housing.

Moderator Hon. Frank V. Zerunyan, City of Rolling Hills Estates

Panelists

- >> **Randall Lewis**, Lewis Group of Companies
- >> **Hon. Michele Martinez**, City of Santa Ana
- >> **Deborah Ruane**, San Diego Housing Commission
- >> **Ann Sewill**, California Community Foundation

1:30 PM

CLOSING REMARKS

Hon. Michele Martinez, *President*, SCAG
Hasan Ikhata, *Executive Director*, SCAG

MISSION IMPOSSIBLE?

MEETING CALIFORNIA'S HOUSING CHALLENGE

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CRISIS


Download the full report at
www.scag.ca.gov/housingsummit

October/2016




WE HAVE A CRISIS STATEWIDE


The housing crisis in California is due to a combination of both a housing shortage and a lack of affordability, and the problem is not limited to housing for low-income families.



AFFORDABILITY IS A LOCAL AND REGIONAL PROBLEM



HOUSING SUPPLY HAS NOT KEPT UP WITH POPULATION GROWTH



IT'S COMPOUNDED BY A DEMOGRAPHIC SHIFT



WHAT'S HOLDING UP NEW HOUSING CONSTRUCTION?

01 LACK OF FUNDING OR FISCAL INCENTIVES

Many jurisdictions do not have permanent funding to build housing. Subsidized housing may not produce enough revenue and other forms of land use may be preferred.

02 REGULATORY BARRIERS

There are a number of regulatory requirements, such as CEQA, that can delay or kill residential projects. They can also add to the cost of a project.

03 LOCAL ZONING REQUIREMENTS

Local zoning requirements, such as parking, can restrict the number of units or render them unaffordable for many.

04 NOT IN MY BACK YARD (NIMBYism)

Misinformation and fear can lead to community opposition to residential projects.

THE COST OF NOT HOUSING

The higher the housing costs, the lower the amount a family can use toward other costs. This can impact future savings, particularly for families that are close to poverty. High housing costs also mean less money that could be spent on local businesses, personal health or recreation.



DISPLACEMENT



OVERCROWDING



OUTMIGRATION AND LOSS OF YOUNG TALENT

Due to stagnant wages or difficulties finding a secure entry-level or mid-level job, and rising costs in rent, millennials represent over half of the outmigration from the most expensive metro areas despite representing only a quarter of the population.



ECONOMIC IMPACTS

High housing costs also impact wider economic growth and are an increasing factor in decision-making for employers. A number of major employers are leaving the state or reducing operations, citing the lack of housing for their employees as one of the top reasons for leaving.



To find out strategies and solutions to address California's housing challenge, download the full report at www.scag.ca.gov/housingsummit

DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Regional Council (RC)
Community, Economic and Human Development Committee (CEHD)
Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)
Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)
Transportation Committee (TC)

FROM: Jason Greenspan, Manager of Sustainability, greenspan@scag.ca.gov, (213) 236-1859

SUBJECT: Cap-and-Trade Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund: Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program and Award Update

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only - No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
On October 11, 2015, the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) finalized awards for the 2015-2016 Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program. Per SGC staff's recommendation released on September 30, 2016, seven (7) projects in the SCAG region were awarded for Round Two, totaling \$76,601,014 million. This amount represents a 53% success rate of full applications submitted from the SCAG region, after SCAG sent a letter strongly urging the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) to fully fund all the sixteen (16) AHSC grant applications in the SCAG region. As shown in the attached SCAG comment letter to SGC, dated October 10, 2016, SCAG continues to express disappointment with the inequitable allocation of AHSC funding recommendation considering SCAG region's size, overall air quality, and sheer number of disadvantaged communities and affected population. However, SCAG will continue to collaborate with the SGC and try to increase SCAG region's number and share of successful projects in the upcoming 2017 round of funding.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan, Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies: Objective a) Create and facilitate a collaborative and cooperative environment to produce forward thinking regional plans.

BACKGROUND:
The AHSC Program is a statewide competitive program to provide grants and loans for affordable housing, infill and compact transit-oriented development, and infrastructure connecting these projects to transit. This program is intended to further the regulatory purposes of AB 32 and SB 375 by investing ongoing Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) appropriations in projects that achieve GHG and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) reductions and increase accessibility of housing and key destinations. The Strategic Growth Council and Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) administer



REPORT

the program, including project evaluation and the approval of funding awards. For the 2015-2016 fiscal year, SGC and the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) announced that \$320 million of funding would be available for the AHSC program Statewide. This amount was reduced to \$289 million due to decreased Cap-and-Trade auction revenues.

2015-2016 AHSC Awards

Per SGC staff's recommendation released on September 30, 2015, 7 projects in the SCAG region are to be awarded funding for Round Two, totaling \$76,601,014 million, out of a total of 25 projects awarded statewide, totaling \$289,439,831. Of the funding awarded to projects in the SCAG region, 100% will provide benefits to Disadvantaged Communities, compared to 85% statewide.

As mentioned at the September 1, 2016 SCAG RC meeting, 16 project applicants from the SCAG region submitted full applications to SGC out of a total of 21 invited applicants. The SCAG region had the highest percentage of successful full applications submitted, receiving 53% of total funds requested. This represents 26.48% of total funding statewide. SCAG submitted an extensive comment letter to SCG regarding both the 7 SCAG region projects as well as the overall AHSC funding process (see attached).

Next Steps

SCAG staff will continue providing resources to cities and potential applicants in anticipation of future AHSC funding opportunities. SCAG's partnership with SGC on the 2016-17 Technical Assistance Pilot has availed the region to nearly \$200 thousand in State resources to build capacity for competitive projects in future rounds.

SCAG Staff will engage with the guideline update process to ensure revisions are made that help to encourage the development of strong applications from applicants in all of the counties in the SCAG region. Some key issues that should be addressed during the upcoming guideline revision process include (but are not limited to):

1. Improve the methodology for quantifying the benefits associated with existing and proposed active transportation infrastructure.
2. Support and incentivize the construction of senior affordable housing units to address the needs of an aging population with limited income.
3. Continue to support projects within and benefitting Disadvantaged Communities, and provide targeted pre-development project assistance to regional partners.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the current FY2016/17 Overall Work Program, 17-150.04094.02, Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund Technical Assistance.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. SGC AHSC Staff Report
2. SGC Full Application Scores
3. SGC Appendix B: Summary of AHSC 2015-16 Award Recommendations
4. SCAG Comment Letter to SGC, dated October 10, 2016



ACTION

October 11, 2016

Subject: Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program: 2016 Recommended Awards

Reporting Period: August – October 2016

Staff Lead: AHSC Program Staff

Recommended Action:

Approve staff recommendation of awarding \$289,439,831 in cap-and-trade funding for the 2015-16 Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program to 25 projects supporting greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions and related co-benefits.

Summary:

The Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program provides grants and loans for capital development projects, including affordable housing development and transportation improvements that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use resulting in fewer passenger vehicle miles travelled (VMT). Reduction of VMT in these projects will achieve GHG reductions and benefit Disadvantaged Communities. In FY 2015-16, \$289,439,831 is available to fund such projects. This staff report provides an overview of the AHSC Program, application process for the 2015-16 funding round, and summary of applications recommended for award.

Background:

The AHSC Program provides competitive grants and loans to projects that will achieve GHG reductions and benefit disadvantaged communities through the development of affordable housing and related infrastructure, and active transportation and transit improvements located near, connecting to, or including transit stations or stops. The AHSC program encourages partnerships between local municipalities, transit agencies and housing developers in order to achieve integration of affordable housing and transportation projects.

Per statute, a minimum of 50 percent of the total AHSC program dollars are dedicated to affordable housing, and 50 percent of AHSC funding must also be invested to benefit Disadvantaged Communities, as identified by the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 tool. These set-asides are not mutually exclusive.

AHSC Program guidelines for the Fiscal Year 2015-16, adopted by the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) in December 2015, considered three project types as seen in Figure 1 below. AHSC Program guidelines also established programmatic targets for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects, Integrated Connectivity Projects (ICP), and Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA) projects, which advise that at least 35 percent of funds to be invested in each of the TOD and ICP project types, and 10 percent be invested within the RIPA category.

Figure 1
2015-16 Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities Program
Eligible Project Types

TOD Transit Oriented Development	ICP Integrated Connectivity Project	RIPA Rural Innovation Project Area
Required: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Quality Transit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affordable Housing	Required: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualifying Transit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure	Required: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qualifying Transit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure
Required: At least one additional components from the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation Related Amenities <input type="checkbox"/> Programs	Required: At least one additional components from the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Affordable Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation Related Amenities <input type="checkbox"/> Programs	Required: At least one additional components from the following: <input type="checkbox"/> Affordable Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation Related Amenities <input type="checkbox"/> Programs

2016 Funding Round: Application Process:

As the implementing agency for the AHSC, the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issued a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for this round of funding on January 29, 2016. Applications were considered through a two-phase process: concept proposals and full applications.

Concept Application

The AHSC Program staff received 130 concept proposals requesting over \$1.1 billion for this highly competitive program by the March 16th, 2016 deadline. An AHSC Concept Proposal review team verified the eligibility of the submitted proposals in accordance with AHSC Guidelines, and used the Concept Proposal Filter per 2015-16 AHSC Guidelines to invite 86 concept proposals from 30 counties requesting \$792,774,734 to compete for the \$289,439,831 available in the Full Application phase.

- Full Application invites were given to 80 Concept Proposals whose combined requested AHSC funds and verified Enforceable Funding Commitments (EFCs) were equal or greater than 95 percent of their Total Development Costs (See AHSC Guidelines Section 105(c)(3)).
- In addition, to reflect AHSC’s commitment to geographic diversity and disadvantaged communities, a limited number of applications with a verified EFC Filter below 95 were also invited, including:
 - Four proposals in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region,
 - One from the Shasta Regional Transportation Agency (SRTA) region, and
 - One from the Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) Region.

The proposals represent a wide range of VMT reduction strategies and strong collaboration between housing and transportation. The full application invites are set in large urban centers, medium-sized cities, small towns and rural areas across the state. These invitations resulted in full application invites shown in the tables below.

TABLE 1		
Full Application Invites by Statutory Set-Aside		
Statutory Set-Aside	AHSC \$ Requested	# of Full Application Invites
Affordable Housing	\$ 705,677,381	72
Disadvantaged Community	\$ 527,588,821	54

TABLE 2		
Full Application Invites by Project Area Type		
Project Area Types	AHSC \$ Requested	# of Full Application Invites
Transit Oriented Development (TOD)	\$ 264,325,450	24
Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP)	\$ 414,583,357	45
Rural Innovation Project Area (RIPA)	\$ 113,865,927	17

Full Application

Of the invited 86 concept proposals to submit a full application, 74 applications were received by the June 20th 2016 deadline requesting a total of approximately \$691,116,629.

The full application review consisted of four simultaneous review processes of Full Applications: Interagency Policy Review, HCD Readiness and Financial Feasibility Review, ARB (Air Resources Board) GHG Quantification Methodology Review, and optional MPO reviews. Below is a breakdown of each review process:

- Interagency Policy Scoring Review
 - The Interagency Policy Review conducted the majority of the scoring portion of the full application review. Reviewers from various SGC represented agencies and departments formed into teams and were charged with identifying consensus scores for the policy criteria components of each application based on the scoring rubric provided within the application. Team leads then reviewed all scores to ensure consistent application of the scoring criteria. The participating agencies and departments included: HCD, Caltrans, California Natural Resources Agency, Air Resources Board, California Department of Public Health, California Government Operations Agency Ops, California High Speed Rail Authority, California State Transportation Agency, California Environmental Protection Agency, California Business Consumer Services and Housing Agency, and the Governor’s Office of Planning & Research..
- ARB GHG Quantification Methodology (QM) Review
 - ARB reviewed and verified the GHG Quantification Methodology scoring component of each applicant, to ensure appropriate application of the adopted GHG QM tools.
- HCD Feasibility and Readiness Review
 - HCD conducted a thorough review of project feasibility, as well as a confirmation of supporting documentation for threshold criteria related to project readiness (such as developer experience, environmental clearances, site control, etc). This team also reviewed the project leverage and depth and level of affordability scoring criteria.
- Optional MPO Rating and Ranking
 - Several MPOs participated in an optional review in which they provided recommendations to SGC on award priorities from their region as they relate to regional goals. Each participating MPO provided a methodology of how they evaluated the projects in their region.

Applicants received notification of initial scores from HCD prior to final score issuance; this provided an opportunity to clarify information submitted at full application. Final scores were based on the verified score awarded relative to the maximum eligible points for each application. The application score is calculated as a percentage of the application’s maximum eligible points. All final decisions regarding applications were made by the AHSC Staff Working group, which consists of a multi-agency team from SGC, HCD, and ARB, and vetted through SGC Key Staff.

Recommended 2015-16 Awards

Attachment A provides the staff recommendation for the FY 2015-16 AHSC Program awards, with \$289,439,831 available. The recommended list reflects the top projects within each project area type, based on the twelve GHG and policy scoring criteria adopted in the 2015-16 AHSC Guidelines. This year’s 25 recommended projects will approximately reduce an estimated 350,000 metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions. Per 2015-16 AHSC Guidelines (Section 105(d)(3)(C)), funding distribution was targeted by project area type:

- Transit Oriented Development Project Areas: 35% of total funds
- Integrated Connectivity Project Areas: 35% of total funds
- Rural Innovation Project Areas: 10% of total funds

For the remaining 20 percent of funds available, projects were re-ordered as a group, regardless of project area type, and GHG scores were re-binned, as outlined in the 2015-16 AHSC Guidelines Section 105(d)(4)(D). From that re-ordered list, and in consideration of disadvantaged communities as outlined in AHSC Guidelines Section 105(d)(4)(E), staff is recommending funding the highest rated projects from this list that benefit the most disadvantaged communities in the state (top 5% of CalEnviroScreen 2.0). The recommended awards meet all statutory and programmatic set-asides as outlined in Table 3 below.

TABLE 3			
Summary of AHSC Funding Recommended by Statutory Set-Aside			
<i>Note: Affordable Housing and Disadvantaged Community dollars are not mutually exclusive</i>			
	Number of Awards	Total \$	Percent of Total \$
Total Funding Recommended	25	\$289,439,831	100%
Affordable Housing*	25	\$232,036,394	80%
Disadvantaged Community	22	\$246,875,943	85%
Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Project Areas	9	\$120,218,952	41%
Affordable Housing*	9	\$34,007,458	
Disadvantaged Community	9	\$120,218,952	
Integrated Connectivity Project (ICP) Project Areas	12	\$129,736,223	45%
Affordable Housing*	12	\$101,367,704	
Disadvantaged Community	10	\$37,854,475	
Rural Innovation Project Areas (RIPA)	4	\$39,484,656	14%
Affordable Housing*	4	\$36,661,232	
Disadvantaged Community	3	\$28,802,516	

* Includes costs related to Affordable Housing Development and Housing-Related Infrastructure

Affordable Housing

Every project being recommended for an AHSC award will fund affordable housing development and related infrastructure. Approximately 80% of the total funds will go towards affordable housing and related infrastructure, exceeding statutory requirements to fund at least 50 percent of the total AHSC program for affordable housing. When completed, the recommended project areas will provide more than 2,260 units of affordable housing to a range of incomes. 21 of the 25 recommended affordable housing developments are 100 percent affordable projects.

TABLE 4		
Summary of Affordable Housing Units Funded by AHSC		
Recommended AHSC Awards with Affordable Housing	25	awards
Total Affordable Units Funded	2,260	units
Extremely Low Income (Less than 30% Area Median Income)		
Units Funded	1,503	units
Very Low Income (Between 30-50% Area Median Income)		
Units Funded	551	units
Low Income (50-80% Area Median Income)		
Units Funded	157	units

Disadvantaged Communities

85 percent, or more than \$246 million in AHSC funds recommended in this fiscal year will benefit Disadvantaged Communities. This amount well exceeds the statutory requirements of SB 857 to invest at least 50 percent of AHSC funding to benefit Disadvantaged Communities, as identified by the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 tool. The recommended projects reflect critical needs for affordable, compact development in close proximity to transit in our most impacted and disadvantaged communities. \$88.4 million of these AHSC funds will specifically go towards that benefit a disadvantaged community ranked in the top 5% percentile of CalEnviroScreen 2.0.

TABLE 5

Recommended AHSC Funding Providing Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities

	Number of Projects	Total Dollars Requested	Percentage of Total Requested
Total Projects	25	\$289,439,831	
Projects Providing Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities	22	\$246,875,943	85%
Located Within	19	\$214,144,023	73%
CalEnviroscreen 2.0 Score			
96-100	8	\$83,838,365	
91-95	3	\$33,538,094	
86-90	4	\$49,904,711	
81-85	3	\$34,772,140	
76-80	1	\$12,090,713	
Within 1/2 Mile Walkable	2	\$16,675,357	6%
CalEnviroscreen 2.0 Score			
96-100	1	\$4,646,731	
91-95	0	\$0	
86-90	1	\$12,028,626	
81-85	0	\$0	
76-80	0	\$0	
25% of Project Work Hours by Residents of a DAC	1	\$16,056,563	6%
CalEnviroscreen 2.0 Score			
96-100	0	\$0	
91-95	0	\$0	
86-90	1	\$16,056,563	
81-85	0	\$0	
76-80	0	\$0	
Not Providing Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities	3	\$42,563,888	15%

Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure and Transit Improvements

All projects recommended for funding also connect affordable housing and key destinations to transit – including bus, bus rapid transit, light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, and vanpool services with active transportation modes –predominantly bicycling and walking infrastructure. More than \$55.4 million in AHSC funding, or 20 percent of the total funding available, is being allocated for use on bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, transit station area improvements, transit service and Intelligent Transportation Systems, and other transportation improvements supporting critical connectivity between housing, key destinations, and transit. All of the projects being recommended for award include some form of transportation related investments.

Of the transportation investments, 87 percent of the investments will be in Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure (STI) rather than Transportation Related Amenities (TRA). This is a big shift in the types of transportation investments occurring through AHSC, which saw a majority of transportation dollars go towards amenities in Round 1. Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure investments are essential in increasing access through walking, biking, and transit, and are the transportation investments that are the most essential to encouraging mode shift. AHSC awards will also fund annual transit passes, other ridership programs, and active transportation education and outreach programs necessary to achieve transportation mode shift. Examples of extensive transportation investments by projects recommended for award include:

- The proposed Redding Downtown Loop and Affordable Housing Project converts portions of Market, Butte and Yuba streets to complete streets and constructs a protected bike lane connecting the historic Diestelhorst Bridge and Sacramento River Trail to Downtown Redding, where the housing development is located.
- The 7th & Witmer project in Los Angeles installs pedestrian lights; repairs and replaces street trees and sidewalks; builds curb extensions to calm traffic; and creates bus zones near its affordable housing development. A Metro Bike Share Station with 18 bicycles along with two years of startup operations and maintenance is another key aspect of the proposal.
- The Kings Canyon Connectivity Project in Southeast Fresno provides improved walking paths, dedicated bike paths and crosswalks, which connect residents to various amenities including retail, social services, education, employment opportunities and planned Bus Rapid Transit services.

Geographic Distribution of Awards

2015-16 AHSC award recommendations reflect a diversity of geographic locations throughout the State, reflecting regional priorities for both affordable housing development and transportation and transit investments. While the MTC region has the highest number and dollar value of awards recommended, at 33.69% of the total funds, the SCAG region has the highest success rate out of the applications competing in the full application process, with 53.46% of their full applications being awarded. Ten of the twelve regions competing within the full application round are being recommended for awards. These numbers are a significant improvement in geographic disbursement statewide in comparison to Round 1 of AHSC funding.

However, the Staff recognizes that many challenges still remain to ensuring a more equitable disbursement of awards statewide. AHSC program staff have been proactive in addressing geographic distribution concerns from Round 2 since the Concept Phase. Beginning in March of this year, SGC has been implementing a statewide outreach strategy focused on the San Joaquin Valley and Southern California. This outreach focuses on the following efforts:

- Informing local jurisdictions about the opportunities AHSC offers,

- Providing proactive consultation and technical assistance to future applicants.

Specific outreach efforts include one-on-one site visits and capacity building workshops in dozens of local jurisdictions throughout the State to help prepare applicants for Round 3. These workshops are adapted according to the nature of the information presented and the stakeholders in attendance, having been carried out in locations including Tulare, Merced, Fresno, Riverside, Imperial, San Bernardino, Orange, and Ventura counties.

As a result of outreach thus far, AHSC Program Staff developed a tracking process for potential AHSC projects, focusing on areas where we have seen less participation and a high concentration of disadvantaged communities. Additionally, AHSC outreach has created a mechanism to build new relationships with stakeholders and potential applicants in communities new to AHSC. ASHC Staff plan to continue tracking projects and working with partners to ensure these projects continue to develop into strong opportunities for AHSC to benefit our state’s most disadvantaged communities.

TABLE 6		
2015-16 AHSC Applications by Region		
Metropolitan Planning Organization	# of Concept Apps Submitted	# of Apps Invited to Full App Round
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	40	28
Southern California Association of Governments	37	21
San Diego Association of Governments	6	6
Sacramento Area Council of Governments	8	6
Fresno Council of Governments	7	4
Kern Council of Governments	6	4
Association of Monterey Bay Area of Governments	4	2
Tulare Council of Governments	4	2
San Joaquin Council of Governments	2	1
Butte County Association of Governments	1	1
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments	1	1
Shasta Regional Transportation Agency	1	1
Stanislaus County of Governments	1	1

Multi-MPO	1	1
Non-MPO	9	7
TOTAL:	130	86

Table 7 Geographic Breakdown of Applications and Awards						
	Full Applications Submitted (Excludes 4 Ineligible Applications)		Full Applications Recommended for Funding			
MPO	Dollars Requested	Applications submitted	Total Awards	Total Dollars	Percentage of Total Funding	% of Requested Dollars Awarded
MTC	\$244,897,668	23	7	\$97,460,507	33.69%	39.80%
SCAG	\$143,295,596	16	7	\$76,601,014	26.48%	53.46%
SACOG	\$30,527,608	5	1	\$11,881,748	4.11%	38.92%
SANDAG	\$51,521,375	5	1	\$12,090,173	4.18%	23.47%
FRESNO	\$21,318,156	2	2	\$21,318,156	7.37%	100.00%
Kern	\$35,195,054	4	1	\$18,637,432	6.44%	52.95%
SJCOG	\$8,941,370	1	1	\$8,941,370	3.09%	100.00%
Tulare	\$10,165,084	2	2	\$10,165,084	3.51%	100.00%
StanCOG	\$7,474,676	1	*1	\$1,661,667	0.57%	22.23%
SHASTA	\$20,000,000	1	1	\$20,000,000	6.91%	100.00%
AMBAG	\$5,497,119	1	0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
SBCAG	\$8,989,608	1	0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
Merced	\$0	0	0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
Madera	\$0	0	0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
Butte	\$0	0	0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
Non-MPO	\$24,539,240	5	1	\$10,682,140	3.69%	27.39%
Multi -MPO	\$3,300,000	1	0	\$0	0.00%	0.00%
TOTAL		69	25	\$289,439,831	100.00%	

*The StanCOG application is receiving partial funding, due to the limitation of funds available.

Key Policy Issues for Consideration in Future Funding Rounds

Through the application process, including staff review, applicant consultation, and appeal processes, several issues of concern were identified which shall be considered in future guidelines. Through future updates to the program, the SGC strives to create stronger and more inclusive metrics in order to better quantify and capture the various impacts of a project.

- **GHG Reductions Associated with Senior Housing Projects.** Several projects were affected by how greenhouse gas reductions were considered for senior projects. The AHSC GHG Quantification Methodology applied the residential land use subtype classification of “retirement community” for proposed senior housing projects. The classification determination was made by AHSC staff based on trip generation assumptions that are more closely aligned with senior living than other subtypes. Staff intends to further explore the availability of research into passenger vehicle trip rates for various types of senior housing projects.
- **Lack of Data Availability for Bike Infrastructure Scoring Criteria.** As part of the policy scoring criteria related to location efficiency and bicycle infrastructure, the 2015-16 AHSC Guidelines apply data provided in walkscore.com, a privately developed metric for existing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure (WalkScore and BikeScore). Many projects did not have a BikeScore for their project. While AHSC staff believes there is a strong correlation between projects that lack a BikeScore and poor bike infrastructure in the area, AHSC staff understands that this may not be true for all projects, and some projects may be adversely impacted due to the lack of an available score. Alternatives to BikeScore to achieve similar location efficiency objectives will be explored in Round 3.
- **Clarity and Streamlining Information Provided through Guidelines and Application Process.** In the second year of the AHSC program, significant progress has been made to enhance the quality and detail of communications prior to application submittal and during the application review process. We hope to continue improving our efforts to provide clear and useful guidance and feedback, which translates across disciplines and documents, in the next round of AHSC Program activities.

Technical Assistance

The Budget Act of 2015 (Chapter 321, Statutes of 2015) appropriated \$500,000 in Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund monies for a pilot technical assistance program for the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program. Administered by the Strategic Growth Council, the program aims to maximize GHG reductions for projects located in disadvantaged communities. SGC staff has worked alongside three contracted technical assistance teams to provide direct application assistance to select applicants for the current 2015-2016 AHSC cycle.

For the purposes of the Pilot, SGC-sponsored technical assistance (TA) was available for applicants whose projects were located in disadvantaged communities that were unsuccessful in securing funding during the 2014-2015 funding cycle. TA was available for both Concept and Full Application phases, with the TA Providers also charged with performing capacity-building activities for their respective regions.

Approximately half of the applicants that were eligible to participate in the Pilot submitted Concept Proposals in this Round (30 out of 62), with approximately half of those that applied subsequently invited to submit a Full Application (17 out of 30). Of the 17 that submitted Full Applications, five (5) are

represented in the staff recommendations for funding. This represents 20% of the total AHSC awards for 2015-2016.

SGC has contracted UC Davis researchers to conduct a third-party evaluation of our Pilot TA program, including feedback on program structure, TA recipient experience, TA provider expertise, and success of the program. The evaluation will include recommendations to SGC for future technical assistance opportunities, and can help inform outreach and assistance across a variety of GGRF programs.

Next Steps and Timeline

Updates to Round 3 Guidelines

AHSC Program Staff have been gathering informal and anecdotal feedback throughout the year on potential improvements and changes to the AHSC guidelines, as well as to the AHSC application process. Now with the results of the second round of funds, AHSC Program Staff plans to conduct more formal listening sessions to gather specific feedback on aspects of the AHSC program as part of a thorough effort to make meaningful improvements to the program.

AHSC will be scheduling informal lessons-learned workshops based on AHSC Round 2 experiences in the remaining months of 2016. These sessions will address a variety of aspects of the program, including but not limited to the following specific topics:

- Definitions of “Qualifying Transit” and “High Quality Transit”
- Transportation Readiness Requirements
- Housing Density
- GHG Reduction Quantification Methodology
- Joint and Several Liability Provisions
- Workforce Development
- Anti-Displacement Provisions
- Bike Infrastructure Data as a replacement metric for WalkScore/BikeScore
- Geographic and/or Regional Targets

Following these listening sessions, AHSC Program Staff will revise the AHSC guidelines based on the gathered feedback and release Round 3 draft program guidelines in Winter 2017. Additional workshops will be conducted regarding those revisions and an open comment period will allow stakeholders to submit more suggestions and feedback. AHSC Program Staff anticipates Council approval of revised Year 3 guidelines in the spring of 2017.

AHSC Program Staff anticipates a summer 2017 release of the Round 3 application, which is later than the previous year. This schedule will accommodate several moving pieces:

- Allow for a robust feedback process to make meaningful changes to the AHSC guidelines
- Consider changes to the application process and applicant experience
- Allow for at least three (3) quarterly Cap and Trade auctions to occur in order to have an accurate assessment of available funds for 2016-2017 FY
- Proactive technical assistance and consultation with prospective applicants, with an emphasis on Disadvantaged Communities

Figure 2: Tentative Schedule for AHSC Round 3

<i>Quarterly Cap & Trade Auction</i>	<i>November 2016</i>
Listening Sessions on Lessons Learned in AHSC Round 2	Fall 2016
Release of Round 3 Draft Program Guidelines	Winter 2017
Stakeholder Meetings/Comments on Draft Guidelines	Winter 2017
<i>Quarterly Cap & Trade Auction</i>	<i>February 2017</i>
<i>TCAC Applications Due</i>	<i>Early March 2017</i>
Final Guidelines to Council for Approval	Spring 2017
<i>Quarterly Cap & Trade Auction</i>	<i>May 2017</i>
<i>TCAC Applications Due</i>	<i>Late June 2017</i>
Release of Round 3 Application	Summer 2017

Council Approval

Staff recommends Council approve the staff recommendation, as reflected in Appendix A of this staff report. This recommended list identifies a total of 25 projects, representing \$289,439,831 in GGRF funds, and would reduce approximately 350,000 metric tons. In the case that an awarded project does not satisfy conditions for receiving its award, or an awarded project decides to forego an award, staff will use the same methodology presented in this report to award the next highest ranking project in the respective category (TOD, ICP, RIPA, and most disadvantaged).

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix A (Tables 1-3)

- FY2015-16 AHSC Funding Recommendations
- AHSC Full Application Submittals Not Recommended for Award
- AHSC Full Application Invites Not Considered for Full Application Scoring

Appendix B: Summary of FY2015-16 AHSC Recommended Projects

Appendix C: Map of FY2015-16 AHSC Recommended Projects

Table 1: Staff Recommendations: AHSC 2015-16 Awards

	PIN	Project	Applicant	Project Location	Project Area Type	DAC Eligibility	DAC %	% of Total AHSC Funds Available	Final % Score	Total AHSC Requested
Transit Oriented Development - 35%	35258	Six Four Nine Lofts	Skid Row Housing Trust	Los Angeles	TOD	Located Within	96-100%	1.8%	94.50%	\$5,315,000
	35213	Lakehouse Connections	East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation	Oakland	TOD	Located Within	81-85%	6.3%	94.00%	\$18,127,203
	35347	Empyrean & Harrison Hotel Housing and Transportation Improvements	Resources for Community Development	Oakland	TOD	Located Within	86-90%	5.8%	92.75%	\$16,807,556
	34781	Rolland Curtis West	Abode Communities	Los Angeles	TOD	Located Within	91-95%	2.0%	90.25%	\$5,668,074
	34767	St. James Station TOD	First Community Housing	San Jose	TOD	Located Within	81-85%	4.5%	90.00%	\$12,889,611
	34708	7th & Witmer	Deep Green Housing & Community Development	Los Angeles	TOD	Located Within	91-95%	5.8%	85.00%	\$16,760,000
	35538	Coliseum Connections	UrbanCore Development, LLC	Oakland	TOD	Located Within	96-100%	5.1%	81.75%	\$14,844,762
	35254	455 Fell	Mercy Housing California	San Francisco	TOD	25% of Project w/ hrs	86-90%	5.5%	79.25%	\$16,056,563
Subtotal TOD Projects										\$106,468,769
Integrated Connectivity Project - 35%	35326	Hunter Street Housing	Visionary Homebuilders of California, Inc.	Stockton	ICP	Located Within	86-90%	3.1%	90.50%	\$8,941,370
	34818	Renascent San Jose	Charities Housing	San Jose	ICP	Located Within	96-100%	5.2%	89.00%	\$14,979,486
	34845	MDC Jordan Downs	The Michaels Development Company I, LP	Los Angeles	ICP	Located Within	96-100%	4.1%	88.00%	\$11,969,111
	34786	Grayson Street Apartments	Satellite Affordable Housing Associates	Berkeley	ICP	Located Within	81-85%	1.3%	87.00%	\$3,755,326
	35241	Santa Ana Arts Collective	Meta Housing Corporation	Santa Ana	ICP	Within an ½ mile	86-90%	4.2%	85.41%	\$12,028,626
	34866	Creekside Affordable Housing	Neighborhood Partners, LLC	Davis	ICP	N/A	N/A	4.1%	84.25%	\$11,881,748
	35198	Cornerstone Place	Domus Development, LLC	El Cajon	ICP	Located Within	76-80%	4.2%	83.50%	\$12,090,713
	34713	Sun Valley Senior Veterans Apts & Sheldon Street Pedestrian Improvement	East LA Community Corporation	Sun Valley	ICP	Located Within	91-95%	3.8%	80.25%	\$11,110,020
	34761	Redding Downtown Loop and Affordable Housing Project	City of Redding	Redding	ICP	N/A	N/A	6.9%	78.25%	\$20,000,000
Subtotal ICP Projects										\$106,756,400
Rural Innovation Project Area - 10%	34874	Coldstream Mixed Use Village - RIPA app	StoneBridge Properties	Truckee	RIPA	N/A	N/A	3.7%	85.50%	\$10,682,140
	35378	Lindsay Village Affordable Housing & Transportation Improvement Project	Self Help Enterprises	Lindsay	RIPA	Located Within	86-90%	1.9%	85.00%	\$5,518,353
	34791	Wasco Farmworker Housing Relocation Project	Wasco Affordable Housing, Inc.	Wasco	RIPA	Located Within	86-90%	6.4%	84.00%	\$18,637,432
Subtotal RIPA Projects										\$34,837,925
Disadvantaged Cmty (96-100%) - 20%	34720	PATH Metro Villas Phase 2	PATH Ventures	Los Angeles	TOD	Located Within	96-100%	4.8%	76.00%	\$13,750,183
	35348	Sierra Village Affordable Housing & Transportation Improvement Project	Self Help Enterprises	Dinuba	RIPA	within an ½ mile	96-100%	1.6%	80.25%	\$4,646,731
	34886	Kings Canyon Connectivity Project - (Kings Canyon)	Cesar Chavez Foundation	Fresno	ICP	Located Within	96-100%	5.4%	77.50%	\$15,579,426
	34771	South Stadium Phase I TOD	City of Fresno	Fresno	ICP	Located Within	96-100%	2.0%	74.00%	\$5,738,730
	35219	Avena Bella (Phase 2)**	EAH Inc.	Turlock	ICP	Located Within	96-100%	2.6%	64.15%	\$1,661,667
Subtotal DAC (96-100%) Projects										\$41,376,737

** Reduced funding award because of availability of funds in this NOFA. Original request was \$7,474,676 (\$6,862,451 in AHD and \$612,225 in STI).

Table 2: Full Application Submittals Not Recommended for Award

	PIN	Project	Applicant	Project Location	Project Area Type	DAC Eligibility	DAC %	Final % Score	Total AHSC Requested
Transit Oriented Development	35465	Yosemite Apartments	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corp.	San Francisco	TOD	within an ½ mile	76-80%	76.50%	\$5,092,303
	35445	Go by Bike to The Lofts at Normal Heights	Chelsea Investment Corporation	San Diego	TOD	N/A	N/A	74.75%	\$11,500,000
	34795	Uptown Oakland Housing and Transportation Collaborative/Embarck Apar	Resources for Community Development	Oakland	TOD	Located Within	76-80%	74.00%	\$15,982,964
	35233	Metro @ Western	Meta Housing Corporation	Los Angeles	TOD	Located Within	81-85%	70.25%	\$7,365,144
	35371	St. Paul's Commons & Trinity Ave. Complete Streets	Resources for Community Development	Walnut Creek	TOD	N/A	N/A	69.75%	\$7,679,331
	34775	Lavender Courtyard by Mutual Housing TOD	Mutual Housing California	Sacramento	TOD	within an ½ mile	81-85%	65.75%	\$5,623,287
	35447	Dunleavy Plaza Apartments	Mission Housing Development Corporation	San Francisco	TOD	N/A	N/A	65.25%	\$2,821,572
	34758	Beacon Pointe	Century Affordable Development Inc	Long Beach	TOD	within an ½ mile	86-90%	64.25%	\$17,723,734
	34764	Edwina Benner Plaza	MidPen Housing Corporation	Sunnyvale	TOD	N/A	N/A	62.50%	\$9,606,560
	35461	Horizons at New Rancho	Urban Housing Communities, LLC	Rancho Cordova	TOD	within an ½ mile	76-80%	62.25%	\$5,965,068
35289	Bartlett Hill Manor	LINC Housing Corporation	Los Angeles	TOD	Located Within	91-95%	56.65%	\$4,700,000	
Rural Innovation Project Area	34734	Esparto Phase IIB	Mercy Housing California	Esparto	RIPA	N/A	N/A	76.25%	\$3,941,321
	35206	Arcata Affordable Housing Related Infrastructure/Community Connectivity	Danco Communities	Arcata	RIPA	N/A	N/A	73.25%	\$1,970,800
	35438	Orr Creek Commons	Rural Communities Housing Development Corp	Ukiah	RIPA	N/A	N/A	73.25%	\$14,416,614
	35204	Blue Mountain Terrace	Domus Development, LLC	Winters	RIPA	N/A	N/A	71.75%	\$2,846,184
	35381	Lamont AHSC Project	Housing Authority of the County of Kern	Lamont	RIPA	Located Within	86-90%	64.75%	\$6,164,522
	35452	Crescent City Senior Housing and Community Connectivity Project	Danco Communities	Crescent City	RIPA	N/A	N/A	62.75%	\$2,139,760
	35492	Valley Vista Senior Apartments	Valley Vista LLC	Jamestown	RIPA	N/A	N/A	62.25%	\$8,800,000
	34796	The Village Apartments	Cabrillo Economic Development Corporation	Buellton	RIPA	N/A	N/A	56.25%	\$8,989,608
	35462	Eureka Waterfront Multi-Modal Connectivity Project	City of Eureka	Eureka	RIPA	N/A	N/A	48.78%	\$946,540
34890	Complete Streets to Transit and Employment: Pedestrian/Bicycle Improve	City of McFarland	McFarland	RIPA	Located Within	91-95%	33.61%	\$1,856,100	
Integrated Connectivity Project	35253	Creekvie Terrace	Domus Development, LLC	San Pablo	ICP	within an ½ mile	81-85%	78.00%	\$10,867,494
	35212	Potrero Block X	BRIDGE Housing Corporation	San Francisco	ICP	N/A	N/A	77.25%	\$9,250,000
	34766	Heritage Point Affordable Housing/Retail Development	Community Housing Development Corporation	Richmond	ICP	Located Within	81-85%	76.75%	\$10,204,875
	35327	Veterans Square	Domus Development, LLC	Pittsburg	ICP	Located Within	76-80%	75.75%	\$5,387,619
	34751	The Monterey Senior Housing, Bike, & Pedestrian Improvements Project	Mid-Peninsula The Farm, Inc	Monterey	ICP	N/A	N/A	72.00%	\$5,497,119
	35243	El Dorado II Apartments	C&C Development	San Diego	ICP	N/A	N/A	70.00%	\$15,800,776
	35418	Lincoln Park Apartments	Affirmed Housing Group, Inc.	San Diego	ICP	within an ½ mile	81-85%	67.95%	\$7,009,886
	35420	Villages at Westview Phase II	Housing Authority of the City of San Buenaventura	Ventura	ICP	N/A	N/A	67.00%	\$9,382,434
	34885	South San Francisco Senior Affordable Housing/Connections to Caltrain	City of South San Francisco	South San Franc	ICP	N/A	N/A	65.00%	\$8,875,280
	35299	Alameda Site A Family Apartments	Eden Housing, Inc.	Alameda	ICP	N/A	N/A	63.75%	\$12,870,620
	35380	MetroLink Station Bike/Ped Access Project	San Bernardino Associated Governments	Montclair	ICP	Located Within	96-100%	63.33%	\$6,598,973
	35450	Countryside II Connect	Chelsea Investment Corporation	El Centro	ICP	Located Within	76-80%	62.00%	\$7,041,500
	35554	Treasure Island Intermodal Transit Hub - Phase 1	Treasure Island Community Development (TICD)	San Francisco	ICP	10% of Project work	76-80%	60.28%	\$12,055,858
	35458	Public Market Sustainable Transportation Project	City Center RealtyPartners, L.P.	San Francisco	ICP	N/A	N/A	59.72%	\$15,483,984
	34726	CalVans Vanpool Expansion Project	California Vanpool Authority	Hanford	ICP	Located Within	96-100%	59.48%	\$3,300,000
	34760	Alameda Site A Senior Apartments	Eden Housing, Inc.	Alameda	ICP	N/A	N/A	57.25%	\$10,870,983
	34888	Candlestick Point	Law Office of Patrick R. Sabelhaus	San Francisco	ICP	10% of Project work	76-80%	53.89%	\$5,000,000
	34880	Connecting Vista: Bike, Walk, SPRINT	San Diego Association of Governments	Vista	ICP	within an ½ mile	76-80%	51.39%	\$5,120,000
	35535	South Gate Regional Bikeway Connectivity Project	City of South Gate	South Gate	ICP	Located Within	96-100%	50.56%	\$2,570,520
	34754	Windsor Transit Center Corridor and Intersection Improvements Project	Town of Windsor	Windsor	ICP	N/A	N/A	48.61%	\$5,387,718
34878	J Street Greenway Trail & Complete Streets	City of Oxnard	Oxnard	ICP	within an ½ mile	91-95%	46.11%	\$6,748,276	
34879	Downtown Oxnard Transit Corridor Improvement Project	City of Oxnard	Oxnard	ICP	within an ½ mile	91-95%	46.11%	\$4,564,001	
35220	Rexland Acres Community Sidewalk Project	Kern County	Bakersfield	ICP	Located Within	91-95%	45.56%	\$8,537,000	

Table 3: AHSC Round 2 Projects Not Considered for Full Application Scoring

Project	Primary Applicant	Issue	MPO	County	Project Type	Amount Requested
Putting Down Routes: Connecting East Oakland	Satellite Affordable Housing Associates	Did not meet threshold	ABAG/MTC	Alameda	ICP	\$ 6,205,125
Rosefield Village Redevelopment and Atlantic Avenue Connectivity Project	Housing Authority of the City of Alameda	Did not submit full	ABAG/MTC	Alameda	TOD	\$ 6,518,156
Warehouse 48 at Star Harbor	TL Partners 1 LP	Did not submit full	ABAG/MTC	Alameda	ICP	\$ 5,296,029
Morgan Hill Family-Scattered Site	EAH Inc.	Did not submit full	ABAG/MTC	Santa Clara	ICP	\$ 9,489,122
Millbrae Transit Village	Republic Millbrae LLC	Did not submit full	ABAG/MTC	San Mateo	TOD	\$ 14,563,865
Junsay Oaks Apartments	Chispa, Inc.	Did not meet threshold	AMBAG	Monterey	ICP	\$ 6,904,121
Jamboree Oroville Family Apartments	Jamboree Housing Corporation	Did not meet threshold	BCAG	Butte	RIPA	\$ 8,296,906
Americana Community Apartments Huron	Huron City	Did not meet threshold	FRESNO	Fresno	RIPA	\$ 9,601,559
Van Ness Apartments	Dominus Consortium, LLC	Incomplete application	FRESNO	Fresno	ICP	\$ 10,197,237
Mount Shasta Greenway Trail and Affordable HRI Project	Danco Communities	Did not submit full	N/A	Siskiyou	RIPA	\$ 2,237,000
623 Vernon Street Apartments & Downtown Pedestrian Bridge	Mercy Housing California	Did not submit full	SACOG	Placer	ICP	\$ 8,023,759
Villa Encantada	AMCAL Multi-Housing Two, LLC	Did not submit full	SANDAG	San Diego	TOD	\$ 4,690,321
Walnut Street Family Apartments	Many Mansions	Did not submit full	SCAG	Ventura	ICP	\$ 3,721,717
Calexico Intermodal Transportation Center (ITC)	Imperial County Transportation Commission	Did not submit full	SCAG	Imperial	ICP	\$ 8,925,383
Courson Arts Colony East and West	Meta Housing Corporation	Did not submit full	SCAG	Los Angeles	ICP	\$ 12,632,161
Loma Linda Veterans Village	Meta Housing Corporation	Did not submit full	SCAG	San Bernardino	ICP	\$ 15,012,642

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

2015-16 AHSC Award Project Summaries

Project Title:	455 Fell				
Project Location:	San Francisco				
Applicant Name:	Mercy Housing California				
Project Type:	TOD	Disadvantaged Community:	86-90 percent	MPO:	MTC
Project Description:					Total Award: \$16,056,563
<p>With 108 units of affordable housing and an ambitious complete streets scope, the proposed 455 Fell project provides homes for a vulnerable population in an area that is both walkable and high in amenities. At the same time, it makes the pedestrian and biking experience safer for the entire community by implementing sidewalk and street improvements identified during an extensive community outreach process. The project would be GreenPoint rated and would contain a 1,700 square foot community garden run by the nonprofit Community Grows. The project will also relocate and preserve a popular mural.</p>					

Project Title:	7th & Witmer				
Project Location:	Los Angeles				
Applicant Name:	Deep Green Housing & Community Development				
Project Type:	TOD	Disadvantaged Community:	91-95 percent	MPO:	SCAG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$16,760,000
<p>The 7th & Witmer project proposes 76 permanent supportive housing units in a transit-oriented neighborhood of Los Angeles. The project would improve the walking and biking infrastructure surrounding the site by installing pedestrian lights, repairing and replacing street trees and sidewalk, building curb extensions to calm traffic and creating bus zones. A Metro Bike Share Station with 18 bicycles along with two years of startup operations and maintenance for the station is another key aspect of the proposal.</p>					

Project Title:	Avena Bella (Phase 2) [proposed for partial funding]				
Project Location:	Turlock				
Applicant Name:	EAH Inc.				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	96-100 percent	MPO:	STANCOG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$1,500,000
<p>Avena Bella 2 is a 100 percent affordable housing project consisting of 61 single- and double-story units. The proposed site is 2.54 acres and is situated between W. Linwood Avenue and Highway 99 in Turlock in Stanislaus County. The project helps fulfill the goals of the city's proposed Short Range Transit Plan by purchasing an additional bus that would improve the frequency of transit service to the site.</p>					

Project Title:	Coldstream Mixed Use Village - RIPA app				
Project Location:	Truckee				
Applicant Name:	StoneBridge Properties				
Project Type:	RIPA	Disadvantaged Community:	N/A	MPO:	
Project Description:					Total Award: \$10,682,140
<p>Coldstream Mixed Use Village proposes 48 multi-family units and 50 unrestricted units in a mixed-use village center served by Truckee Transit bus service. The project, which repurposes a former mining property in Truckee, relocates and improves a bus stop served by Truckee Transit and provides approximately 2 miles of Class I bike paths, 30,000 square feet of commercial space and a roundabout which is part of the town's capital improvement plan. Overall, the project would implement a specific development contemplated in Truckee's General Plan and satisfy substantial mixed-income housing needs through a higher-density, environmentally sensitive project served by transit and a comprehensive multi-modal trail system.</p>					

Project Title:	Coliseum Connections				
Project Location:	Oakland				
Applicant Name:	UrbanCore Development, LLC				
Project Type:	TOD	Disadvantaged Community:	96-100 percent	MPO:	MTC
Project Description:					Total Award: \$14,844,762
<p>The proposed Coliseum Connections is a 110-unit, mixed-income, multi-family residential project located adjacent to the Coliseum BART station in Oakland. The housing development would repurpose an existing BART-owned parking lot. Half of the units would be below market rate, with the remaining ones providing workforce housing for families earning between 60-100 percent area median income.</p>					

Project Title:	Cornerstone Place				
Project Location:	El Cajon				
Applicant Name:	Domus Development, LLC				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	76-80 percent	MPO:	SANDAG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$12,090,713
<p>Located in the City of El Cajon in San Diego County, Cornerstone Place would provide 70 new units of affordable housing for families and veteran households. The proposed development features 48 one-bedroom units, 22 three-bedroom units, and strives to achieve LEED Silver design through the use of energy efficient systems and a variety of sustainability features. The project also proposes to expand Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Routes 815 and 816, which connect the project location with both Downtown El Cajon and the El Cajon Transit Center.</p>					

Project Title:	Creekside Affordable Housing				
Project Location:	Davis				
Applicant Name:	Neighborhood Partners, LLC				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	N/A	MPO:	SACOG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$11,881,748
<p>Creekside is a 90-unit affordable housing project composed of 89 one-bedroom units, an on-site manager's unit and a community building that provides gathering spaces for residents. The project would be composed of extremely low-income units (40 percent of total units), very low-income units (25 percent) and lower-income units (35 percent). The target resident population includes disabled individuals, homeless individuals and other households in need of affordable housing. All of the resident units would be handicap-accessible, providing elevators, roll-in showers, accessible sinks, countertops and electrical switches.</p>					

Project Title:	Empyrean & Harrison Hotel Housing and Transportation Improvements				
Project Location:	Oakland				
Applicant Name:	Resources for Community Development				
Project Type:	TOD	Disadvantaged Community:	86-90 percent	MPO:	MTC
Project Description:					Total Award: \$16,807,556
<p>The Empyrean & Harrison Hotel Housing and Transportation Improvements project proposes to rehabilitate and preserve two historic SROs, providing 100 percent affordable housing developments in a rapidly gentrifying transit-oriented development location. The project would also provide residents of these buildings and of downtown Oakland generally with enhanced bike infrastructure in the form of new bike lanes and a new bike share station. AC Transit is a partner in the purchase of a new hybrid bus as part of the system's service expansion plan. These infrastructure projects are complemented with programs to encourage and facilitate easier access to biking and bus use.</p>					



Project Title:	Grayson Street Apartments				
Project Location:	Berkeley				
Applicant Name:	Satellite Affordable Housing Associates				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	81-85 percent	MPO:	ABAG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$3,755,326
<p>The Gray Street Apartments project proposes the construction of a new mixed-use infill development on San Pablo Avenue in Berkeley. It would include more than 2,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial space as well as 23 affordable apartments consisting of nine units for youth transitioning out of the foster system and three units for people living with HIV/AIDS. The project also includes the purchase of a new 40-foot hybrid bus to support the increased service levels of AC Transit's adopted Service Expansion Plan. This bus would support increased service levels for 88 bus route, one of AC Transit's high-frequency routes and improve headway frequencies from 20 minutes to 15. The project also includes transit passes and a bike education program for its residents.</p>					

Project Title:	Hunter Street Housing				
Project Location:	Stockton				
Applicant Name:	Visionary Homebuilders of California, Inc.				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	86-90 percent	MPO:	SJCOG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$8,941,370
<p>The proposed Hunter Street Housing is a public-private partnership that would include a mixed-use development built adjacent to a road diet project that encourages active transportation and connects housing to transit and amenities. The project would be located in downtown Stockton, home to several Disadvantaged Community census tracts with some of the highest scores on the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 scale. The development would include office space for the Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) program and 74 residential units affordable to low-income, very low-income, and extremely low-income households. The residential development would be built to maximum heights allowable under code (45 feet), and features a density of 41 dwelling units per acre.</p>					

Project Title:	Kings Canyon Connectivity Project - (Kings Canyon)				
Project Location:	Fresno				
Applicant Name:	Cesar Chavez Foundation				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	96-100 percent	MPO:	FRESNO
Project Description:					Total Award: \$15,579,426
<p>The Kings Canyon Connectivity Project consists of a 135-unit affordable multi-family development composed of 89 family units and 46 senior units. The proposed project also provides improved walking paths and dedicated bike paths and crosswalks, which connect residents to various amenities including retail, social services, education, employment opportunities and planned Bus Rapid Transit services. It also contains a workforce training and employment strategies program which will offer construction apprenticeships in addition to a career training and placement program targeting renewable energy industry opportunities.</p>					

Project Title:	Lakehouse Connections				
Project Location:	Oakland				
Applicant Name:	East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation				
Project Type:	TOD	Disadvantaged Community:	81-85 percent	MPO:	MTC
Project Description:					Total Award: \$18,127,203
<p>Developer partners EBALDC and UrbanCore have joined forces with the City of Oakland and local transit partners AC Transit, BART and Motivate to propose a housing and transportation project that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions through sustainable design. The Lakehouse Connections project would include a 91-unit affordable housing development in addition to new bus, bike and pedestrian networks that connect the project to downtown, uptown and East Oakland, CA. Thus, the project would join affordable housing with four sustainable transportation improvement projects, and a robust collection of active transportation amenities and programs.</p>					



Project Title:	Lindsay Village Affordable Housing & Transportation Improvement Project				
Project Location:	Lindsay				
Applicant Name:	Self Help Enterprises				
Project Type:	RIPA	Disadvantaged Community:	86-90 percent	MPO:	TCAG (Tulare)
Project Description:					Total Award: \$5,518,353
<p>The Lindsay Village project consists of 49 affordable rental units and one manager's unit, including a mix of one-, two- and three-bedroom units. The proposed project includes a vanpool and a public transit ridership program for residents in addition to active transportation improvements such as sidewalks, bike lanes, and traffic calming measures. The project would also include 100 percent solar PV to offset common area and resident loads and a gray water recycling system.</p>					

Project Title:	MDC Jordan Downs				
Project Location:	Los Angeles				
Applicant Name:	The Michaels Development Company I, LP				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	96-100 percent	MPO:	SCAG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$11,969,111
<p>The proposed MDC Jordan Downs is a new LEED-Gold rated infill development consisting of 135 apartments within the Jordan Downs master planned community. The project would improve site accessibility by extending Century Boulevard through the existing Jordan Downs housing project, opening up the 100-acre community to bikes, pedestrians, and cars. In order to facilitate active transportation, Century Boulevard would be built as a complete street, with traffic calming, wide sidewalks, bike lanes, shade trees, and a re-routed bus line.</p>					

Project Title:	PATH Metro Villas Phase 2				
Project Location:	Los Angeles				
Applicant Name:	PATH Ventures				
Project Type:	TOD	Disadvantaged Community:	96-100 percent	MPO:	SCAG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$13,750,183
<p>The second phase of the PATH Metro Villas project proposes the construction of 122 units of LEED-gold rated affordable housing in a High Quality Transit area that is well connected to jobs, services, and amenities. It would provide permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless living with multiple chronic health conditions, a well-documented need in the area. The project also connects the Beverly/Vermont Metro Red Line subway station with the proposed Virgil Avenue bike lane through sidewalk improvements and the conversion of Oakwood Avenue to a bike enhanced network street.</p>					

Project Title:	Redding Downtown Loop and Affordable Housing Project				
Project Location:	Redding				
Applicant Name:	City of Redding				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	N/A	MPO:	SRTA (Shasta)
Project Description:					Total Award: \$20,000,000
<p>The Redding Downtown Loop and Affordable Housing Project integrates affordable housing with sustainable transportation infrastructure to transform downtown Redding into a more walkable and bikeable community. The proposed project would redevelop an existing commercial building into a mixed-use space with a total of 79 housing units near the Redding Downtown Loop, an active transportation network currently under development. It would also convert Market, Butte and Yuba streets to complete streets and construct a protected bike lane connecting the historic Diestelhorst Bridge and Sacramento River Trail to the new development. A program of bus pass subsidies will also be provided to affordable housing tenants.</p>					



Project Title:	Renasant San Jose				
Project Location:	San Jose				
Applicant Name:	Charities Housing				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	96-100 percent	MPO:	MTC
Project Description:					Total Award: \$14,979,486
<p>The Renasant San Jose project is a joint application between the City of San Jose and Charities Housing, a nonprofit housing development corporation. The project integrates affordable housing and active transportation infrastructure through the construction of a 160-unit infill development and 2 miles of bike/pedestrian trails and street trees. The proposed residence would serve as permanent supportive housing for the chronically homeless and include programs such as free bus passes for residents and free bicycle repair and training in addition to employing rangers for the trails.</p>					

Project Title:	Rolland Curtis West				
Project Location:	Los Angeles				
Applicant Name:	Abode Communities				
Project Type:	TOD	Disadvantaged Community:	91-95 percent	MPO:	SCAG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$5,668,074
<p>The Rolland Curtis West (RCW) project proposes an integrated affordable housing and neighborhood connectivity project in South Los Angeles, a community experiencing a high rate of displacement. RCW would provide 70 units of housing as part of a three-phased, mixed-use development project, in addition to low-stress bicycle and pedestrian enhancements along a north-south neighborhood corridor. This infill project would deliver much needed affordable housing at 60 percent area median income and below, and would be adjacent to the University of Southern California, one of the largest private employers in the city. The project also includes a community outreach program to promote the new active transportation corridor, which fulfills the region's 2035 Mobility Plan.</p>					

Project Title:	Santa Ana Arts Collective				
Project Location:	Santa Ana				
Applicant Name:	Meta Housing Corporation				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	86-90 percent	MPO:	SCAG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$12,028,626
<p>Located in a jobs- and transit-rich area of Orange County, the proposed Santa Ana Arts Collective (SAAC) repurposes a 1968 commercial building into 58 units of affordable housing. It would also convert Bush Street, one block from SAAC, into a bike- and pedestrian-enhanced street that provides a safer route to the Santa Ana Civic Center. The project caters to artists and families earning 30 percent to 60 percent of area median income.</p>					

Project Title:	Sierra Village Affordable Housing & Transportation Improvement Project				
Project Location:	Dinuba				
Applicant Name:	Self Help Enterprises				
Project Type:	RIPA	Disadvantaged Community:	96-100 percent	MPO:	TCAG (Tulare)
Project Description:					Total Award: \$4,646,731
<p>The proposed Sierra Village consists of 43 affordable rental units, one managers unit and a 3,265 square foot community center. The development would be comprised of a mix of one-, two- and three-bedroom units and the community center will include a full service kitchen, computer lab, and common laundry room. It would also include 100 percent solar PV to offset common area and resident loads and water conservation/efficiency measures. The project would also provide an on-site vanpool program and other transportation improvements which include sidewalks and bike lanes.</p>					

Project Title:	Six Four Nine Lofts				
Project Location:	Los Angeles				
Applicant Name:	Skid Row Housing Trust				
Project Type:	TOD	Disadvantaged Community:	96-100 percent	MPO:	SCAG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$5,315,000
<p>The proposed Six Four Nine Lofts is a 55-unit new construction project serving households with incomes below 50 percent of area median income. The proposed project is designed for households experiencing homelessness and/or with physical or developmental special needs and provides multiple services to meet the needs of the target population. Housing units would be located within a multi-use seven-story building that also contains a three-story federally-qualified health clinic owned by Los Angeles Christian Health Centers (LACHC). The LACHC clinic would be a separate legal parcel, financed with different sources, and will have different ownership than the residential component.</p>					

Project Title:	South Stadium Phase I TOD				
Project Location:	Fresno				
Applicant Name:	City of Fresno				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	96-100 percent	MPO:	FRESNO
Project Description:					Total Award: \$5,738,730
<p>Phase I of the proposed South Stadium TOD project consists of a five-story, mixed-use structure with 51 residential apartment units and approximately 10,000 square feet of retail/office space in downtown Fresno. 20 percent of the residential units would be rent-restricted to households making 50 percent of area median income. The infill project also includes significant streetscape improvements near the project site, including wider sidewalks, Class II and Class IV bike lanes, and additional pedestrian-oriented lighting and smart meters. It also creates a green alley along Home Run Alley and provides pedestrian and bicycle-oriented wayfinding signage.</p>					

Project Title:	St. James Station TOD				
Project Location:	San Jose				
Applicant Name:	First Community Housing				
Project Type:	TOD	Disadvantaged Community:	81-85 percent	MPO:	MTC/ABAG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$12,889,611
<p>The St. James Station TOD project integrates affordable housing and public connectivity projects in downtown San Jose. The proposed project would join the construction of First Community Housing's North San Pedro Apartments, a 135-unit affordable housing development, with active transportation infrastructure and urban greening programs designed by cross-departmental teams from the City of San Jose. The project would provide pedestrians, cyclists and transit users with well-designed and safe connections to the downtown core, high-quality transit, recently redeveloped parks and paseos, and key amenities within the commercial business district.</p>					

Project Title:	Sun Valley Senior Veterans Apts & Sheldon Street Pedestrian Improvements				
Project Location:	Sun Valley				
Applicant Name:	East LA Community Corporation				
Project Type:	ICP	Disadvantaged Community:	91-95 percent	MPO:	SCAG
Project Description:					Total Award: \$11,110,020
<p>This proposed infill project constructs 96 housing units for senior veterans in addition to a variety of transit and pedestrian infrastructure improvements. Sun Valley Senior Veterans Apartments would provide various amenities to facilitate community building, such as a library, a recreation room, a fitness center, a media room, and a computer lab. New Directions for Veterans will provide on-site supportive services to the senior veterans. Sheldon Street Pedestrian Improvements would also encourage residents to engage in active transportation through the construction of new sidewalks, ADA ramps, continental crosswalks, curb extensions, and improved lighting. The project also includes a new bike lane and a Transit Connect Program that would transport residents to transit stations.</p>					



Project Title:	Wasco Farmworker Housing Relocation Project				
Project Location:	Wasco				
Applicant Name:	Wasco Affordable Housing, Inc.				
Project Type:	RIPA	Disadvantaged Community:	86-90 percent	MPO:	Kern COG
Project Description:				Total Award:	\$18,637,432
<p>The proposed Wasco Farmworker Housing Relocation Project will move 160 farmworker families from a disconnected, industrially-zoned location to a new sustainable GreenPoint rated residence that is located closer to a variety of basic amenities. The site is situated adjacent to a day care, a medical clinic and a planned elementary school and would also features shuttle bus transit service that connects residents to shopping, a regional transit stop and an Amtrak station. In order to encourage active transportation, the project includes a covered and secured bicycle storage as well as the installation of sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes.</p>					

This Page Intentionally Left Blank



October 10, 2016

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
T: (213) 236-1800
F: (213) 236-1825
www.scag.ca.gov

Strategic Growth Council
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Subject: **Comment Letter to Recommended Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program Awards - 2016**

REGIONAL COUNCIL OFFICERS

President
Michele Martinez, Santa Ana

First Vice President
Margaret E. Finlay, Duarte

Second Vice President
Alan Wapner, Ontario

Immediate Past President
Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Executive/Administration
Michele Martinez, Santa Ana

Community, Economic &
Human Development
Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake

Energy & Environment
Carmen Ramirez, Oxnard

Transportation
Barbara Messina, Alhambra

Dear Members of the Strategic Growth Council:

First, I want to express our appreciation for approving over \$76 million in funding for seven new affordable housing projects in the SCAG region through the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) program. Construction of over 600 urgently needed affordable housing units and essential transportation infrastructure is consistent with the region's recently adopted Sustainable Communities Strategy, and will help reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Having said that we remain frustrated with the inequitable allocation recommendation considering the SCAG region's size, overall air quality, and sheer number of disadvantaged communities and affected population. SCAG is home to over 48% of the state's population and 67% of its disadvantaged communities yet, regional project applications received 26% of awarded funding. This follows approximately 22% of awarded funding in Round 1. We must do better. The SCAG region has by far the greatest population impacted by harmful emissions and the greatest aggregate need for investment in the kinds of projects the AHSC program funds. We remain concerned that the program does not fully recognize this important fundamental reality.

As you know, demand for affordable housing and sustainable transportation infrastructure in the region far exceeds available resources. SCAG has expended significant effort, in partnership with the Strategic Growth Council, providing technical assistance and capacity building workshops, and the results show that not all SCAG counties are benefitting from the AHSC program. As we have expressed to SGC and OPR staff at numerous meetings and via correspondence, additional state commitment is needed to ensure that housing opportunities are provided throughout the diversity of the State's suburban, urban, and rural settings. This can be achieved by maintaining a more transparent application process and through reforming program guidelines. We plan to engage our local housing community to submit comments and recommendations to the Council during your guideline revision process in the upcoming months, with the intention of developing guidelines that encourage more applications from all areas of the SCAG region and to hopefully yield an increase of project awards to applicants from and throughout the region.

Subject: Comment Letter to Recommended Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Program Awards - 2016

Again, we want to thank you for incorporating some of the suggestions we have offered in previous guideline updates and in providing the Round 2 funding for the 7 successful applicants from the SCAG region. We look forward to our continued collaboration and to growing that number for the SCAG region in the upcoming 2017 round of funding.

Sincerely,



Hasan Ikhata
Executive Director

DATE: November 3, 2016

TO: Regional Council (RC)
Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)
Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee
Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)
Transportation Committee (TC)

FROM: Frank Wen, Manager Research & Analysis Department, 213-236-1854,
wen@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: SB 375 Target Setting Stress Test Status Report

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Receive and File

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

At the September 29, 2016 RC and Policy Committee meetings, staff reported that the California Air Resources Board (ARB) is preparing to update the regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets for the years 2020 and 2035 for each MPO. ARB is proposing to release draft preliminary target recommendations in spring 2017, and adopt final targets in summer 2017. Accordingly, the four (4) major MPOs in California have each decided to conduct a technical "Stress Test" aimed to test GHG reduction strategies that would yield the most ambitious yet achievable GHG emission reductions. Staff has worked on the Stress Test for the SCAG region since August, and completed the potential GHG reduction assessment. This staff report provides an overview of the technical analysis and off-model assessment of potential additional GHG emission reductions from strategies included in the Stress Test. Staff also shared the Stress Test results with Technical Working Group (TWG), CEO Sustainability Working Group, and several environmental stakeholders. These Stress Test results will be used to form the technical basis for SCAG's 2020 and 2035 target recommendation to ARB immediately after the Regional Council meeting in January 2017, per agreement of MPOs and ARB target setting process and schedule.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

This item supports Strategic Plan Goal 2. Obtain Regional Transportation Infrastructure Funding and Promote Legislative Solutions for Regional Planning Priorities. a. Develop, monitor, or support state legislation that promotes increased investment in transportation programs in Southern California.

BACKGROUND:

SB 375 requires that each MPO adopt, as part of its regional transportation plan, a "Sustainable Communities Strategy" that sets forth plans to meet regional GHG emission reduction targets set by ARB. SB 375 also requires that ARB update the regional targets at least every eight years. In 2010, ARB established the GHG emissions reduction targets for the SCAG region, respectively at 8% and 13% below per capita GHG emissions recorded in 2005 for the years 2020 and 2035. SCAG has



REPORT

prepared two Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) plans, (in 2012 and 2016) that meet or exceed the required ARB targets for 2020 and 2035.

OVERVIEW OF ARB SB 375 TARGET SETTING PROCESS:

ARB is preparing to update the regional SB 375 GHG emission reduction targets for each MPO and is proposing to release draft preliminary target recommendations in spring 2017, and adopt final targets in summer 2017. The new ARB targets for the years 2020 and 2035 will be required to be met by each MPO in the next round of RTP/SCS plans, which for SCAG will be the 2020 RTP/SCS.

The SB 375 Target Setting Process is informed by a suite of concurrent planning activities and technical exercises. Among them, the ARB AB 32 and SB 32 Scoping Plan Update, the ARB Mobile Source Strategy, and the MPO Stress Test. It is anticipated that the forthcoming revised GHG emissions reduction targets adopted by ARB will be much higher than current targets for all MPOs issued by ARB in 2010.

PURPOSES OF ARB/MPO STRESS TEST:

As reported at the September 29, 2016 meeting, the four major MPOs in California have collaborated and each decided to conduct a technical “Stress Test” aimed to test GHG emission reduction strategies that would yield the most ambitious yet achievable GHG emission reductions. The purpose of the Stress Test is to quantify potential additional GHG emission reductions that would result from deployment of various land use and transportation strategies, such as rapid deployment of zero emission vehicles. These Stress Test results will be used to form the technical basis for SCAG’s 2020 and 2035 target recommendation to ARB immediately after the Regional Council meeting in January 2017, per agreement of MPOs and ARB target setting process and schedule.

It is important to the MPOs that the ultimate SB 375 targets continue to be set at levels that MPOs can meet with an SCS, not an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS), and take into account federal requirements the MPOs must meet for financial and land use constraint. To that end, the MPOs in coordination with ARB are working on a process to update SB 375 targets. To implement the State's climate goals, participating MPOs will work with each other, and ARB staff, to conduct a more visionary, “less” constrained form of Scenario Planning—the “stress test scenarios”, to determine what kinds of: a) land use and transportation measures; b) more aggressive implementation of technology solutions (e.g. electric vehicles, autonomous vehicles, etc.) and c) changes to external factors (e.g. millennial driving patterns, gas prices, etc.) might be needed to create the greater GHG reductions needed to meet ARB’s Mobile Source Strategy goals.

MPO staff agreed to assess further GHG reduction potentials in the following six (6) strategy buckets:

1. Land Use
2. Active Transportation (AT)
3. Pricing
4. Transit

5. Greater penetration of zero emission vehicles (ZEVs)
6. Enhanced Mobility/Mobility Innovations
 - a. Car sharing
 - b. Ride sourcing/Transportation Network Companies
 - c. Connected and Autonomous Vehicles

SCAG STRESS TEST:

Since SCAG has already adopted very ambitious strategies in land use, pricing, and transit investment in both the 2012 and 2016 RTP/SCS, staff focused the agency's "Stress Test" and potential additional GHG emissions reductions in three strategy buckets: AT, ZEVs and Mobility Enhancement and Innovations. In addition, more advanced researches and information has become available, enabling staff to conduct more robust assessment of potential additional GHG reductions from enhanced mobility and innovations, including connected and autonomous vehicles, car sharing, ride sourcing and transportation network companies.

With all strategies, programs, and investment in the 2016 RTP/SCS by 2035, the region demonstrated a reduction of per capita GHG emissions by 18% below 2005 level in 2035 (five percent above the regional target of 13%). SCAG's Stress Test results indicate that about 2 to 2.5 percent (2.0%-2.5%) of per capita GHG emissions could be reduced further above the 18% in 2035--through additional AT programs, investment, and more refined off-model assessment of enhanced mobility and innovations.

Results from the hypothetical scenarios or stress tests described above are not fiscally constrained or otherwise limited by any regional, state or federal rules or guidance, and market feasibility is not assessed. They are intended to build knowledge about the connections between land use, transportation and GHG emissions reduction, and, for SCAG staff to form a technical basis for target recommendations. For example, SCAG staff estimate that it will cost roughly \$10 billion dollars for additional investment and programs called for by strategy buckets included in the stress tests, and the cost is not within the financial constraint of the 2016 RTP/SCS financial plan.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Work associated with this item is included in the Fiscal Year 16/17 Overall Work Program (17-080.SCG00153.04: Regional Assessment).

ATTACHMENT:

None

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

DATE: November 3, 2016
TO: Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)
Regional Council (RC)
FROM: Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer, panas@scag.ca.gov (213) 236-1817
SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget Development Schedule

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only – No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Each year, SCAG prepares a Comprehensive Budget including the General Fund budget and the Overall Work Program (OWP) that reflects the agency's priorities.

The FY 2017-18 Budget Development Schedule is provided for your information.

November – December 2016	Set budget priorities.
January – February 2017	Allocate funding and develop the Draft Budget.
March 2, 2017	Present the FY 2017-18 Draft Comprehensive Budget and release the Draft Overall Work Program (OWP) for public comment.
April 3, 2017	Close the public comment period for the FY 2017-18 Draft OWP.
May 4, 2017	Present the FY 2017-18 Final Comprehensive Budget and OWP to the RC for adoption; submit OWP to Caltrans, FHWA and FTA.
May 4, 2017	Present the FY 2017-18 General Fund Budget to the General Assembly for adoption.
May – June 2017	Caltrans, FHWA and FTA review the FY 2017-18 OWP
June 30, 2017	Expected approval by Caltrans, FHWA and FTA

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan Goal 3: Enhance the Agency's Long-term Financial Stability and Fiscal Management.



REPORT

BACKGROUND:

The proposed schedule for the FY 2017-18 Budget Process is consistent with past years. Board action will be requested in March 2017 for the Draft Comprehensive Budget and Overall Work Plan and in May 2017 for Final Budget adoption at SCAG's Regional Conference and General Assembly. Finally, approval of the FY 2017-18 Overall Work Plan from Caltrans, FHWA and FTA is expected by June 30, 2017.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None

ATTACHMENT:

None



2017 MEETING SCHEDULE REGIONAL COUNCIL AND POLICY COMMITTEES

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
T: (213) 236-1800
F: (213) 236-1825
www.scag.ca.gov

All Regular Meetings are scheduled on the 1 st Thursday of each month (Approved by the Regional Council 09-01-16)	
Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)	9:00 AM – 10:00 AM
Community, Economic and Human Development Committee (CEHD)	10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)	10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Transportation Committee (TC)	10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Regional Council (RC)	12:15 PM – 2:00 PM

REGIONAL COUNCIL OFFICERS

President
Michele Martinez, Santa Ana

First Vice President
Margaret E. Finlay, Duarte

Second Vice President
Alan Wapner, Ontario

Immediate Past President
Cheryl Vlegas-Walker, El Centro

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Executive/Administration
Michele Martinez, Santa Ana

Community, Economic &
Human Development
Bill Jahn, Big Bear Lake

Energy & Environment
Carmen Ramirez, Oxnard

Transportation
Barbara Messina, Alhambra

January 5, 2017

February 2, 2017

March 2, 2017

April 6, 2017

May 4 – 5, 2017
(SCAG Regional Conference and General Assembly, JW Marriott Desert Springs)

June 1, 2017

July 6, 2017

August 3, 2017 (DARK)

September 7, 2017

(Note: League of California Cities Annual Conference, Sacramento, CA; Sep. 13 - 15)

October 5, 2017

November 2, 2017

December 7, 2017

(SCAG 8th Annual Economic Summit --- in lieu of the regularly scheduled Regional Council and Policy Committees' Meetings)

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

DATE: November 3, 2016
TO: Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)
Regional Council (RC)
FROM: Basil Panas, Chief Financial Officer; (213) 236-1817; panas@scag.ca.gov
SUBJECT: CFO Monthly Report

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only – No Action Required.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan Goal, 3: Enhance the Agency's Long Term Financial Stability and Fiscal Management.

MEMBERSHIP DUES
Second request invoices were mailed to the 39 agencies that, as of October 1, 2016, have not renewed their FY17 memberships with SCAG. We are continuing our efforts to recruit the two (2) cities in the SCAG area who are not yet SCAG members.

AUDITS
SCAG's outside independent auditors, Vasquez & Co., LLP, are continuing with their fieldwork. They will present their preliminary audit findings to the Audit Committee at its November 29, 2016 meeting. The Caltrans incurred cost audit continues but staff is not aware of when those auditors will return to SCAG.

BUDGET & GRANTS (B&G):
B&G staff in collaboration with the Planning departments collected 162 work products for 77 project tasks in the FY 2015-16 Overall Work Program (OWP) and submitted them to Caltrans on September 20, 2016.

Staff submitted the FY 2015-16 OWP 4th Quarter Progress Report with final expenditures to Caltrans on September 20, 2016.

On September 29, 2016, the first amendment to the FY 2016-17 OWP was approved by the EAC and RC, which included include adding prior year's unspent funds to projects to meet contractual obligations and adding funds for new grant projects. The amended OWP was submitted to Caltrans for review and approval on October 7, 2016.



REPORT

The internal deadline for the FY 2017-18 Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant program was set for October 7, 2016. SCAG received a total of nine applications, three in the Strategic Partnerships Category and six in the Sustainable Communities Category. SCAG and Caltrans will review the applications and provide technical assistance to the sub-applicants before submitting the final applications on November 4, 2016.

CONTRACTS:

In September 2016, the Contracts Department issued six (6) Requests for Proposal (RFP); awarded one (1) contract; issued twenty (20) contract amendments; and processed sixty (60) Purchase Orders to support ongoing business and enterprise operations. Contracts staff continued to negotiate better pricing to reduce costs for services.

ATTACHMENT:

September 2016 CFO Monthly Status Report



Office of the Chief Financial Officer

Monthly Status Report

SEPTEMBER 2016


OVERVIEW


As of October 17, 2016, 168 cities and counties had renewed their memberships. Twenty-seven cities had yet to renew, and there were two cities in the SCAG region still being recruited for membership.

SUMMARY

FY17 Membership Dues	<u><u>\$1,947,180.67</u></u>
Total Collected	<u><u>\$1,448,392.00</u></u>
Percentage Collected	<u><u>74.38%</u></u>

FY17 Membership Dues Collected





OVERVIEW


Actual interest income is plotted against the target amount. The amount earned through August was \$11,896. The LA County Pool earned 0.96% in August.

SUMMARY

The amount projected for FY17 is \$71,376, which is \$11,376 more than the target.



FY17 INDIRECT COST & RECOVERY



OVERVIEW

A comparison of Indirect Cost (IC), incurred by SCAG vs. IC recovered from SCAG's grants.


SUMMARY

Through September 2016, SCAG was under-recovered by \$326,537 because Caltrans has not yet authorized the use of our FY17 ICAP rate. That authorization is expected shortly and the difference will be recaptured.

Office of the CFO
Invoice Aging



INVOICE AGING



OVERVIEW

The percent of total invoices paid within 30 days. The target is to pay 95% of all invoices within 30 days. This goal was met.

SUMMARY

98.80% of September 2016's payments were made within 30 days of invoice receipt.
At month-end, 44 invoices remained unpaid less than 30 days.

Actual


OVERVIEW

The percent of total invoices paid within 60 and 90 days. The target is to pay 98% of invoices within 60 days and 100% within 90 days.

SUMMARY

These goals were met during this period.

100.00% of September 2016's payments were within 60 days of invoice receipt and 100.00% within 90 days. Invoices unpaid 30-60 days totaled 9; 60-90 days: 0; >90 days: 0.





Office of the CFO
Consolidated Balance Sheet

	8/31/2016	9/30/2016	Incr (decr) to equity	COMMENTS
Cash at Bank of the West	\$ 1,894,355	\$ 1,668,678		
LA County Investment Pool	\$ 12,163,549	\$ 11,228,559		
Cash & Investments	\$ 14,057,903	\$ 12,897,237	\$ (1,160,666)	Needed to finance an AR increase of \$775K and a payables decrease of \$268K
Accounts Receivable	\$ 6,744,501	\$ 7,519,149	\$ 774,648	Amount due from Caltrans increased
Other Current Liabilities	\$ 1,126,575	\$ 765,627	\$ (360,948)	FY16 prepaid expenses were expensed in FY17
Fixed Assets - Net Book Value	\$ 1,626,539	\$ 1,626,539	\$ -	No change (balance shown is as of previous year-end as full fixed asset accounting is done annually)
Total Assets	\$ 23,555,518	\$ 22,808,552	\$ (746,966)	
Accounts Payable	\$ (354,154)	\$ (86,191)	\$ 267,964	Invoice backlog was reduced
Employee-related Liabilities	\$ (495,138)	\$ (605,586)	\$ (110,448)	Aug had eight unpaid workdays, Sep had ten
Deferred Revenue	\$ (184,496)	\$ (184,496)	\$ -	No change
Total Liabilities and Deferred Revenue	\$ (1,033,788)	\$ (876,273)	\$ 157,515	
Fund Balance	\$ 22,521,730	\$ 21,932,279	\$ (589,450)	
			-	
WORKING CAPITAL				
	8/31/2016	9/30/2016	Incr (decr) to working capital	
Cash	\$ 14,057,903	\$ 12,897,237	\$ (1,160,666)	
Accounts Receivable	\$ 6,744,501	\$ 7,519,149	\$ 774,648	
Accounts Payable	\$ (354,154)	\$ (86,191)	\$ 267,964	
Employee-related Liabilities	\$ (495,138)	\$ (605,586)	\$ (110,448)	
Working Capital	\$ 19,953,112	\$ 19,724,610	\$ (228,502)	



Office of the CFO
Fiscal Year-To-Date Expenditure Report Through September 30, 2016

COMPREHENSIVE BUDGET

		Adopted Budget	Amended Budget	Expenditures	Commitments	Budget Balance	% Budget Spent
1	Staff & Allocated Fringe Benefits	158,335	158,335	39,684		118,651	25.1%
2	51001 Allocated Indirect Costs	125,937	125,937	28,251		97,686	22.4%
3	54300 SCAG Consultants	414,000	374,000	64,500	134,054	175,446	17.2%
4	54340 Legal costs	120,000	120,000	42,914	77,086	0	35.8%
6	55441 Payroll, bank fees	15,000	15,000	2,417		12,583	16.1%
7	55510 Office Supplies	25,000	25,000	2,417	22,583	0	9.7%
8	55600 SCAG Memberships	21,250	21,250	5,462		15,788	25.7%
9	55610 Professional Membership	15,000	15,000	3,917	1,043	10,040	26.1%
10	55730 Capital Outlay	1,355,619	1,355,619	-		1,355,619	0.0%
11	55830 Conference - Registration	15,000	15,000	6,684		8,316	44.6%
12	55860 Scholarships	32,000	32,000	-		32,000	0.0%
13	55910 RC/Committee Mtgs	25,000	25,000	2,453	2,989	19,558	9.8%
14	55912 RC Retreat	5,000	5,000			5,000	0.0%
15	55914 RC General Assembly	500,000	500,000	65,000		435,000	13.0%
17	55915 Demographic Workshop	18,000	18,000	-		18,000	0.0%
18	55916 Economic Summit	80,000	80,000	5,000	30,001	44,999	6.3%
19	55918 Housing Summit	-	30,000	11,826	18,174	-	39.4%
20	55919 Go Human	-	10,000	8,100		1,900	81.0%
21	55920 Other Meeting Expense	45,000	45,000	23,023	20,691	1,286	51.2%
22	55930 Miscellaneous other	12,000	12,000	5,664	1,210	5,126	47.2%
23	55940 Stipend - RC Meetings	220,752	220,752	34,420	0	186,332	15.6%
24	56100 Printing	12,500	12,500	-		12,500	0.0%
25	58100 Travel - outside SCAG region	55,000	54,500	17,547	0	36,953	32.2%
26	58101 Travel - local	26,000	26,000	5,570	0	20,430	21.4%
27	58110 Mileage - local	23,500	23,500	2,725	0	20,775	11.6%
28	58200 Travel - Reg Fees	1,000	1,500	1,110		390	74.0%
29	58800 RC Sponsorships	135,000	135,000	20,000	39,500	75,500	14.8%
30	Total General Fund	3,455,893	3,455,893	398,681	347,331	2,709,881	11.5%
31				-			
32	Staff & Fringe Benefits	15,468,852	15,468,852	3,472,870		11,995,982	22.5%
33	51001 Allocated Indirect Costs	12,303,677	12,303,677	2,472,336		9,831,341	20.1%
34	54300 SCAG Consultants	9,421,216	9,421,216	223,645	9,197,571	0	2.4%
35	54360 Pass-through Payments	23,368,912	23,368,912	-		23,368,912	0.0%
36	55210 Software Support	247,231	247,231	227,423		19,808	92.0%
37	55280 Third Party Contribution	3,651,163	3,651,163	-		3,651,163	0.0%
38	55620 Resource Materials - subscrib	910,000	910,000	115,815	203,145	591,040	12.7%
39	55810 Public Notices	30,000	30,000	75		29,925	0.3%
40	55830 Conference - Registration	50,000	50,000	25		49,975	0.1%
41	55920 Other Meeting Expense	70,000	70,000	618		69,382	0.9%
42	55930 Miscellaneous - other	108,108	108,108	1,714		106,394	1.6%
43	56100 Printing	60,000	60,000	-		60,000	0.0%
44	58100 Travel	330,800	330,800	21,110		309,690	6.4%
45	Total OWP	66,019,959	66,019,959	6,535,632	9,400,716	50,083,611	9.9%
46				-			
47	Comprehensive Budget	69,475,852	69,475,852	6,934,312	9,748,048	52,793,492	10.0%




Office of the CFO
Fiscal Year-To-Date Expenditure Report Through September 30, 2016

INDIRECT COST EXPENDITURES

			Adopted Budget	Amended Budget	Expenditures	Commitments	Budget Balance	% Budget Spent
1	50010	Regular Staff	3,729,813	3,729,813	936,961		2,792,852	25.1%
2	50013	Regular OT	-	1,000	411		589	41.1%
3	50014	Interns, Temps, Annuity	169,202	168,202	30,165		138,037	17.9%
5	51000	Allocated Fringe Benefits	2,792,611	2,792,611	732,774		2,059,837	26.2%
6	54300	SCAG Consultants	200,000	200,000	-	200,000	0	0.0%
7	54301	Consultants - Other	1,313,016	1,298,016	128,881	1,153,365	15,770	9.9%
8	54340	Legal	200,000	200,000	2,665	62,514	134,821	1.3%
10	55210	Software Support	497,337	497,337	162,578	82,194	252,566	32.7%
11	55220	Hardware Supp	64,320	64,320	37,714	10,230	16,377	58.6%
12	55240	Repair & Maint Non-IT	27,450	27,450	11,720	15,730	0	42.7%
14	55400	Office Rent 818 Offices	1,660,000	1,660,000	382,055	1,088,232	189,713	23.0%
15	55410	Office Rent Satellite	245,883	245,883	40,796	173,257	31,829	16.6%
16	55420	Equip Leases	124,500	124,500	20,862	67,625	36,013	16.8%
17	55430	Equip Repairs & Maint	11,323	11,323	7,395	3,928	0	65.3%
18	55435	Security Services	100,000	100,000	19,763	45,238	35,000	19.8%
19	55440	Insurance	154,999	154,999	42,892		112,107	27.7%
20	55441	Payroll / Bank Fees	20,000	20,000	3,589		16,411	17.9%
21	55445	Taxes	6,200	6,200	-		6,200	0.0%
22	55460	Mater & Equip < \$5,000	17,500	17,500	2,141	15,359	0	12.2%
23	55510	Office Supplies	73,800	73,800	6,155	66,457	1,188	8.3%
24	55520	Graphic Supplies	2,000	2,000	732		1,268	36.6%
25	55530	Telephone	175,000	175,000	47,643	127,357	0	27.2%
26	55540	Postage	10,000	10,000	14	9,986	0	0.1%
27	55550	Delivery Services	6,250	6,250	1,752	4,498	0	28.0%
28	55600	SCAG Memberships	189,575	189,575	98,990		90,585	52.2%
30	55620	Res Mats/Subscrip	54,205	54,205	43,982		10,223	81.1%
31	55700	Deprec - Furn & Fixt	40,000	40,000	-		40,000	0.0%
32	55710	Deprec - Computer Equipment	70,000	70,000	-		70,000	0.0%
33	55715	Amortiz - Software	173,140	173,140	-		173,140	0.0%
34	55720	Amortiz - Leasehold Improvements	8,000	8,000	-		8,000	0.0%
35	55800	Recruitment Notices	50,000	50,000	-		50,000	0.0%
36	55801	Recruitment - other	25,000	25,000	2,697	22,303	0	10.8%
37	55810	Public Notices	5,000	20,000	19,638	0	362	98.2%
38	55820	Training	81,500	51,500	-		51,500	0.0%
39	55830	Conference/workshops	21,350	21,350	9,502	795	11,053	44.5%
40	55920	Other Mtg Exp	3,200	3,200	-		3,200	0.0%
41	55930	Miscellaneous - other	5,000	5,000	621	10	4,369	12.4%
42	55950	Temp Help	38,500	38,500	717	12,803	24,980	1.9%
43	56100	Printing	50,500	50,500	-	1,000	49,500	0.0%
44	58100	Travel - Outside	106,400	106,400	2,088		104,312	2.0%
45	58101	Travel - Local	14,150	14,150	2,135		12,015	15.1%
46	58110	Mileage - Local	46,825	46,825	2,401		44,424	5.1%
47	58200	Travel - Reg Fees	-	30,000	24,696	0	5,304	82.3%
50		Total Indirect Cost	12,583,549	12,583,549	2,827,124	3,162,879	6,593,546	22.5%

SCAG Contracts (Year to Date)



Office of the CFO
Staffing Report as of October 1, 2016



GROUPS	Authorized Positions	Filled Positions	Vacant Positions
Executive	5	4	1
Legal	3	2	1
Strategy, Policy & Public Affairs	20	18	2
Administration	44	42	2
Planning & Programs	69	65	4
Total	141	131	10

OTHER POSITIONS

GROUPS	Limited Term Positions	Interns or Volunteers	Temp Positions	Agency Temps
Executive	0	0	0	0
Legal	0	0	0	0
Strategy, Policy & Public Affairs	1	0	0	0
Administration	5	7	1	0
Planning & Programs	3	22	0	0
Total	9	29	1	0