EXECUTIVE/ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

In-Person & Remote Participation*
Wednesday, January 5, 2022
3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

*Public Participation: The SCAG offices are currently closed to members of the public. Please see next page for detailed instructions on how to participate in the meeting.

To Attend and Participate on Your Computer:
https://scag.zoom.us/j/889726747

To Attend and Participate by Phone:
Call-in Number: 1-669-900-6833
Meeting ID: 889 726 747

PUBLIC ADVISORY

Given the declared state of emergency (pursuant to State of Emergency Proclamation dated March 4, 2020) and local public health directives imposing and recommending social distancing measures due to the threat of COVID-19, and pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e)(1)(A), the meeting will be conducted in a hybrid manner (both in-person and remotely by telephonic and video conference); however, SCAG’s offices are currently closed to the general public and public participation will occur as described in the instructions below.

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Maggie Aguilar at (213) 630-1420 or via email at aguilarm@scag.ca.gov. Agendas & Minutes are also available at: www.scag.ca.gov/committees.

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) 630-1420. 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.
Instructions for Public Comments

You may submit public comments in two (2) ways:

1. **In Writing:** Submit written comments via email to: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov by 5pm on Tuesday, January 4, 2022. You are not required to submit public comments in writing or in advance of the meeting; this option is offered as a convenience should you desire not to provide comments in real time as described below.

   All written comments received after 5pm on Tuesday, January 4, 2022 will be announced and included as part of the official record of the meeting.

2. **In Real Time:** If participating in real time via Zoom or phone, during the Public Comment Period (Matters Not on the Agenda) or at the time the item on the agenda for which you wish to speak is called, use the “raise hand” function on your computer or *9 by phone and wait for SCAG staff to announce your name/phone number. SCAG staff will unmute your line when it is your turn to speak. Limit oral comments to 3 minutes, or as otherwise directed by the presiding officer. For purpose of providing public comment for items listed on the Consent Calendar, please indicate that you wish to speak when the Consent Calendar is called; items listed on the Consent Calendar will be acted on with one motion and there will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the legislative body so requests, in which event, the item will be considered separately.

   If unable to connect by Zoom or phone and you wish to make a comment, you may submit written comments via email to: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov.

*In accordance with SCAG’s Regional Council Policy, Article VI, Section H and California Government Code Section 54957.9, if a SCAG meeting is “willfully interrupted” and the “orderly conduct of the meeting” becomes unfeasible, the presiding officer or the Chair of the legislative body may order the removal of the individuals who are disrupting the meeting.*
Instructions for Participating in the Meeting

SCAG is providing multiple options to view or participate in the meeting:

To Participate and Provide Verbal Comments on Your Computer
1. Click the following link: https://scag.zoom.us/j/889726747.
2. If Zoom is not already installed on your computer, click “Download & Run Zoom” on the launch page and press “Run” when prompted by your browser. If Zoom has previously been installed on your computer, please allow a few moments for the application to launch automatically.
3. Select “Join Audio via Computer.”
4. The virtual conference room will open. If you receive a message reading, “Please wait for the host to start this meeting,” simply remain in the room until the meeting begins.
5. During the Public Comment Period (Matters Not on the Agenda) or at the time the item on the agenda for which you wish to speak is called (see note above regarding items on the Consent Calendar), use the “raise hand” function located in the participants’ window and wait for SCAG staff to announce your name. SCAG staff will unmute your line when it is your turn to speak. Each speaker is limited to oral comments totaling 3 minutes for all matters, or as otherwise directed by the presiding officer.

To Listen and Provide Verbal Comments by Phone
1. Call (669) 900-6833 to access the conference room. Given high call volumes recently experienced by Zoom, please continue dialing until you connect successfully.
2. Enter the Meeting ID: 889 726 747, followed by #.
3. Indicate that you are a participant by pressing # to continue.
4. You will hear audio of the meeting in progress. Remain on the line if the meeting has not yet started.
5. During the Public Comment Period (Matters Not on the Agenda) or at the time the item on the agenda for which you wish to speak is called (see note above regarding items on the Consent Calendar), press *9 to add yourself to the queue and wait for SCAG staff to announce your name/phone number. SCAG staff will unmute your line when it is your turn to speak. Each speaker is limited to oral comments totaling 3 minutes for all matters, or as otherwise directed by the presiding officer.
EAC - Executive/Administration Committee

Members – January 2022

1. **Hon. Clint Lorimore**  
   Chair, Eastvale, RC District 4

2. **Hon. Jan C. Harnik**  
   1st Vice Chair, RCTC Representative

3. **Sup. Carmen Ramirez**  
   2nd Vice Chair, Ventura County

4. **Hon. Rex Richardson**  
   Imm. Past President, Long Beach, RC District 29

5. **Hon. Jorge Marquez**  
   CEHD Chair, Covina, RC District 33

6. **Hon. Frank A. Yokoyama**  
   CEHD Vice Chair, Cerritos, RC District 23

7. **Hon. David Pollock**  
   EEC Chair, Moorpark, RC District 46

8. **Hon. Deborah Robertson**  
   EEC Vice Chair, Rialto, RC District 8

9. **Hon. Sean Ashton**  
   TC Chair, Downey, RC District 25

10. **Hon. Art Brown**  
    TC Vice Chair, Buena Park, RC District 21

11. **Hon. Alan Wapner**  
    LCMC Chair, SBCTA Representative

12. **Hon. Peggy Huang**  
    LCMC Vice Chair, TCA Representative

13. **Hon. Kathryn Barger**  
    Pres. Appt., Los Angeles County

14. **Hon. Larry McCallon**  
    Pres. Appt., Highland, RC District 7

15. **Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker**  
    Pres. Appt., El Centro, RC District 1
16. Sup. Donald Wagner  
    Pres. Appt., Orange County

17. Hon. Andrew Masiel  
    Tribal Govt Regl Planning Board Representative

18. Randall Lewis  
    Business Representative, Non-Voting Member
The Executive/Administration Committee may consider and act upon any of the items on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as Information or Action items.

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
(The Honorable Clint Lorimore, Chair)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD (Matters Not on the Agenda)
This is the time for persons to comment on any matter pertinent to SCAG’s jurisdiction that is not listed on the agenda. Although the committee may briefly respond to statements or questions, under state law, matters presented under this item cannot be discussed or acted upon at this time. Public comment for items listed on the agenda will be taken separately as further described below.

General information for all public comments: Members of the public are encouraged, but not required, to submit written comments by sending an email to: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov by 5pm on Tuesday, January 4, 2022. Such comments will be transmitted to members of the legislative body and posted on SCAG’s website prior to the meeting. Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Executive Administration Committee regarding any item on this agenda (other than writings legally exempt from public disclosure) are available at the Office of the Clerk, located at 900 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1700, Los Angeles, CA 90017 during normal business hours and/or by contacting the office by phone, (213) 630-1420, or email to aguilarm@scag.ca.gov. Written comments received after 5pm on Tuesday, January 4, 2022, will be announced and included as part of the official record of the meeting. Members of the public wishing to verbally address the Executive/Administration Committee in real time during the meeting will be allowed up to a total of 3 minutes to speak on items on the agenda, with the presiding officer retaining discretion to adjust time limits as necessary to ensure efficient and orderly conduct of the meeting. The presiding officer has the discretion to equally reduce the time limit of all speakers based upon the number of comments received. If you desire to speak on an item listed on the agenda, please wait for the chair to call the item and then indicate your interest in offering public comment by either using the “raise hand” function on your computer or pressing *9 on your telephone. For purpose of providing public comment for items listed on the Consent Calendar, please indicate that you wish to speak when the Consent Calendar is called; items listed on the Consent Calendar will be acted upon with one motion and there will be no separate discussion of these items unless a member of the legislative body so requests, in which event, the item will be considered separately.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

ACTION ITEMS

1. Findings to Continue Holding Virtual Regional Council and Committee Meetings Under AB 361
   (Ruben Duran, BB&K Board Counsel)
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
That the Executive/Administration Committee (EAC): (1) make the following findings required by Government Code Section 54953(e)(3) on the basis of the staff report, which is incorporated by this reference, that (i) a proclaimed state of emergency remains active in connection with the COVID-19 public health crisis, (ii) the EAC has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency and (iii) state and local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing in relation to the COVID-19 public health crisis and, further, (2) authorize all legislative bodies of the Southern California Association of Government (SCAG), including the EAC, RC and all committees and task forces established by the RC or SCAG’s Bylaws, to utilize remote teleconference meetings pursuant to and in compliance with Brown Act provisions contained in Government Code Section 54953(e).

2. Community Planning Voter Initiative
(Javiera Cartagena, Director of Government and Public Affairs)

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Support

3. SCAG-Sponsored Legislation
(Javiera Cartagena, Director of Government and Public Affairs)

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

4. Minutes of the Regular Meeting – December 1, 2021

5. Resolution No. 22-639-1 Authorizing Acceptance of One-Time Funds from Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) on Behalf of the California Energy Commission (CEC) in the Amount of $600,048 to Support SCAG’s Study of Supporting Infrastructure for Medium and Heavy Duty Zero Emission Trucks

6. Resolution No. 22-639-2 Authorizing Acceptance of One-Time Funds from the California Emerging Technology Fund to Support SCAG’s Broadband Program

7. Contracts $200,000 or Greater: Contract No. 21-020-C01 Go Human Safety Strategies

8. Contract Amendment Greater Than 30% of the Contract’s Original Value and $75,000 or Greater: Contract No. 22-005-C01, Gartner IT Leaders
9. Inclusion of Project Budget in Requests for Proposals

10. SCAG Memberships and Sponsorships
    Receive and File

11. Executive/Administration Committee Strategic Work Plan Progress Report Quarter Ending December 31, 2021

12. Purchase Orders $5,000 - $199,999; Contracts $25,000 - $199,999 and Amendments $5,000 - $74,999

13. CFO Monthly Report

INFORMATION ITEM

14. Update on 2022 RC/EAC/Committee Meeting Options
    (Michael Houston, Chief Counsel/Director of Legal Services)

CFO REPORT
    (Cindy Giraldo, Chief Financial Officer)

PRESIDENT’S REPORT
    (The Honorable Clint Lorimore, Chair)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT
    (Kome Ajise, Executive Director)

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

ADJOURNMENT
To: Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)  
   Regional Council (RC)

From: Michael Houston, Director of Legal Services/Chief Counsel  
(213) 630-1467, houston@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Findings to Continue Holding Virtual Regional Council and Committee Meetings Under AB 361

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EAC:
That the Executive/Administration Committee (EAC): (1) make the following findings required by Government Code Section 54953(e)(3) on the basis of the staff report, which is incorporated by this reference, that (i) a proclaimed state of emergency remains active in connection with the COVID-19 public health crisis, (ii) the EAC has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency and (iii) state and local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing in relation to the COVID-19 public health crisis and, further, (2) authorize all legislative bodies of the Southern California Association of Government (SCAG), including the EAC, RC and all committees and task forces established by the RC or SCAG’s Bylaws, to utilize remote teleconference meetings pursuant to and in compliance with Brown Act provisions contained in Government Code Section 54953(e).

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:
That the Regional Council (RC): (1) ratify the prior actions of the Executive/Administration Committee taken at its December 1, 2021 and January 5, 2022 meetings relating to findings made pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e)(3); (2) make the following findings required by Government Code Section 54953(e)(3) on the basis of the staff report, which is incorporated by this reference, that (i) a proclaimed state of emergency remains active in connection with the COVID-19 public health crisis, (ii) the RC has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency and (iii) state and local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing in relation to the COVID-19 public health crisis and, further, (3) authorize all legislative bodies of the Southern California Association of Government (SCAG), including the RC, EAC and all committees and task forces established by the RC or SCAG’s Bylaws, to utilize remote teleconference meetings pursuant to and in compliance with Brown Act provisions contained in Government Code Section 54953(e).
STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
On March 4, 2020, Governor Newsom issued a Proclamation of State of Emergency pursuant to Government Code Section 8625 in relation to the COVID-19 public health crisis. Urgency legislation was enacted in October amending the Brown Act to add Government Code section 54953(e) (hereafter, “Section 54953(e)”). Section 54953(e) allows legislative bodies to conduct remote/teleconferenced meetings without posting the location of teleconferenced meeting sites or making such sites available to the public (as is required by Section 54953(b)(3)), provided that certain conditions facilitating “real time” public participation and other requirements are satisfied. SCAG’s Regional Council Policy Manual permits the holding of remote and teleconferenced meetings in the manner permitted by Section 54953(e).

Since the enactment of Section 54953(e), the EAC, SCAG’s Policy Committees, its other committees and the RC have been meeting pursuant to Section 54953(e), subdivision (1)(A). SCAG’s legislative bodies may continue meeting pursuant to Section 54953(e) provided that certain findings are made to continue doing so. Further, to continue meeting in such manner, the meetings must be held pursuant to the requirements of subdivision (e) of Section 54953.

This staff report includes findings that the EAC and RC can make to continue meeting remotely. Action by the EAC and RC will facilitate and authorize all of SCAG’s legislative bodies (the RC, EAC, Policy Committees, other committees and task forces) to continue utilizing teleconference/videoconference meetings for a thirty-day period. Further continuation of this practice would require the EAC and/or RC to reconsider the then-current circumstances and make findings accordingly.

BACKGROUND:
As has been previously reported in prior staff reports, on January 31, 2020, the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services declared a public health emergency based on the threat cause by COVID-19. The President of the United States issued a Proclamation Declaring a National State of Emergency Concerning COVID-19 beginning March 1, 2020. Thereafter, in response to COVID-19, the Governor of California issued a Proclamation of State of Emergency pursuant to Government Code Section 8625 in relation to the COVID-19 public health crisis on March 4, 2020. This proclamation has not been repealed or rescinded and a state of emergency continues to be declared in California with respect to COVID-19.

Following the March 2020 state of emergency declaration, Governor Newsom issued Executive Orders N-29-20 and N-08-21. These executive orders suspended specific provisions in the Brown Act relating to teleconferencing/videoconferencing and provided flexibility to public agencies as a
means of protecting the public from transmission of the virus, while maintaining openness and transparency. These Executive Orders expired on September 30, 2021. In October, the Governor signed urgency legislation, Assembly Bill 361 (AB 361), to amend the Brown Act’s teleconferencing provisions. AB 361 adds Section 54953(e).

As previously summarized, Section 54953(e) allows legislative bodies to meet virtually without posting the remote meeting locations and without providing public access at such locations (as is generally required by section 54953(b)(3)), provided there is a state of emergency, and either (1) state or local officials have imposed or recommended measures to promote social distancing or (2) the legislative body determines by majority vote that meeting in person would present imminent risks to the health and safety of attendees. Additionally, Section 54953(e) imposes transparency requirements to the management of remote and teleconference public meetings held under this section. Specifically, Section 54953(e) imposes two new requirements for remote public meetings:

1. Public agencies hosting teleconference meetings pursuant to Section 54953(e) in lieu of traditional in-person or teleconferenced meetings must permit direct “real time” public comment during the teleconference and must leave open the opportunity for public comment until the comment period is closed during the ordinary course of the meeting. The opportunity to make public comment must be of a sufficient duration to allow actual public participation.

2. Any action by the governing body during a public teleconference meeting held under Section 54953(e) must occur while the agency is actively and successfully broadcasting to members of the public through a call-in option or an internet-based service option. If a technical disruption within the agency’s control prevents members of the public from either viewing the meeting of the public agency, or prevents members of the public from offering public comment, the agency must cease all action on the meeting agenda until the disruption ends and the broadcast is restored.

SCAG has implemented the requirements for conducting public meetings in compliance with the prior executive orders and Section 54953(e). Teleconference accessibility via call-in option or an internet-based service option (via the Zoom Webinars platform) is listed on the published agenda for each meeting of SCAG legislative bodies, and on SCAG’s website. Further, SCAG provides access for public comment opportunities in real time at the time noted on the agenda. The holding of remote meetings in compliance with Section 54953(e) promotes the public interests of facilitating robust public participation on a remote platform and, further, protecting the public, SCAG’s members and its employees during the winter season when congregation indoors and newly identified variants (including Omnicron) pose health risk.
Since the enactment of Section 54953(e), the EAC, SCAG’s Policy Committees, its other committees and the RC have been meeting pursuant to provisions in Government Code section 54953(e)(1)(A) because a declared state of emergency exists and County of Los Angeles Public Health Department currently imposes or recommends a variety of social distancing measures (including the recommendation to avoid crowded indoor spaces and to maintain six feet of social distancing, especially in cases where, as is the case here, the vaccination status of persons outside your household is unknown).

SCAG’s legislative bodies may continue meeting pursuant to Section 54953(e) if certain findings are periodically made and provided, further, that such meetings continue to be held pursuant to the requirements of subdivision (e) of Section 54953. The required findings include: (1) the legislative body has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency and (2) that either (i) state or local officials continue to recommend measures to promote social distancing or (ii) an in-person meeting would constitute an imminent risk to the safety of attendees.

SCAG’s Regional Policy Manual permits holding teleconference/videoconference meetings and permits the President to waive certain requirements in the Policy Manual where state law permits such waiver. Likewise, SCAG’s Bylaws authorize the EAC to make decisions and take actions binding on SCAG if such decisions or actions are necessary prior to the next regular meeting of the Regional Council. (Art. V.C(3)(a).) Given the Regional Council’s regular meeting on January 6th will occur following the meetings of the Policy meetings held earlier that day, SCAG’s Bylaws authorize the EAC to make the findings contained in this staff report.

If the findings below are made by the EAC, all SCAG legislative bodies (i.e., the RC, EAC, Policy Committees and other SCAG committees and task forces) are authorized to meet pursuant to Section 54953(e) for thirty days. Further continuation beyond this period would require the EAC and/or RC to reconsider the then-current circumstances.

FINDINGS:

The recommendations in this staff report are based on the following facts and findings, made pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e)(3), which are incorporated into the recommended action taken by the EAC and RC, as noted above:

1. The EAC and RC have reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency initially declared by the Governor on March 4, 2020, pursuant to section 8625 of the California Emergency Services Act, relating to the COVID-19 public health crisis and find that the declaration remains in effect. The continuation of virtual meetings will allow for full participation by members of the public, while social distancing recommendations remain in effect, and will facilitate the purposes of such social distancing recommendations by
preventing large crowds from congregating at indoor facilities for extended periods of time. Given that the vaccination status of meeting participants (including members of the public) is not known, colder wintertime weather leads to more congregation indoors, and recent variants of concern (including Omicron) have been identified that are being studied, it is prudent to use caution in protecting the health of the public, SCAG’s employees and its membership where, as here, adequate virtual means exist to permit the meeting to occur by teleconference/videoconference with the public being afforded the ability to comment in real time.

2. The EAC and RC find that state and local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing. The Department of Industrial Relations’ issuance of COVID-19 Prevention regulations through Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations, section 3205 et seq., includes informing employees that masking and social distancing in the workplace are most effective when used in combination because particles containing the virus can travel more than six feet. Further the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health continues to recommend measures to promote social distancing, including recommendations to avoid crowded indoor spaces and to maintain six feet of social distancing, especially in cases where the vaccination status of persons outside a person’s household is unknown. Because colder weather tends to increase congregating indoors, it is prudent for SCAG to do its part to provide flexibility to meet remotely where possible. Finally, SCAG’s primary offices and its regional offices remain closed to the public in relation to the COVID-19 emergency declaration.

CONCLUSION:
Staff recommends the actions described above be taken based on the findings contained in this staff report. Should further remote meetings pursuant to Section 54953(e) be warranted, the EAC and/or RC are required to reconsider the circumstances and make findings to continue holding meetings in this manner.

FISCAL IMPACT:
None.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Support

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
At its November 16, 2021, meeting, Members of the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) received an informational update on the proposed “Community Planning Voter Initiative” that may appear on the November 8, 2022, General Election ballot. After robust discussion, Members of the LCMC voted to forward a “support” position on the Community Planning Voter Initiative to the Regional Council (RC) by a vote of 13 to two with one abstention.

BACKGROUND:
On August 25, 2021, proponents of the Community Planning Voter Initiative submitted the draft text for a proposed measure and filing fee to the Attorney General of California, kicking off the ballot initiative process. The initiative was then posted for 30 days to allow for public comment. That period concluded on September 27, 2021.

On November 1, 2021, the Attorney General issued the official title and summary for the proposed initiative. The title reads, “Provides that local land-use and zoning laws override conflicting state laws.” The Community Planning Voter Initiative would amend California’s Constitution in a manner that specifies that city and county land-use and zoning laws override all conflicting State laws. It provides exceptions in certain circumstances related to three areas of statewide concern: (1) coastal land-use regulations, (2) siting of power plants of a certain capacity, and (3) development of water, communication, or transportation infrastructure projects. Furthermore, it prevents the Legislature and local legislative bodies from passing laws invalidating voter-approved local land-use
or zoning initiatives. Lastly, the proposed measure would prohibit the State from changing, granting, or denying funding to local governments based on their implementation of this measure.

Now that the title and summary have been prepared, proponents have 180 days to gather sufficient signatures from registered voters to qualify the initiative. For measures proposing a constitutional amendment, like the Community Planning Voter Initiative, the number of signatures must be equal to at least eight percent of the total votes cast for the office of Governor at the last gubernatorial election. In this case, proponents will need to collect 997,139 signatures. Signatures will then be verified by county election officials, and the initiative will either qualify or be failed by the Secretary of State. If proponents collect the requisite number of valid signatures, California voters will then vote on the ballot initiative at the November 8, 2022, General Election.

Action by the League of California Cities (Cal Cities)

The League of California Cities Board of Directors met over a two-day period starting on December 2, 2021, to adopt the organization’s 2022 Action Plan and 2022 Budget and considered positions on potential ballot initiatives that would impact cities. During the meeting, the board voted unanimously, with one abstention, to take no position—or remain neutral—for the time being on the pending Community Planning Voter Initiative and Assembly Constitutional Amendment (ACA) 7, which is a similar measure that was introduced in the California State Assembly by Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi (D-Torrance) on March 16, 2021. ACA 7 would provide that with regard to the zoning or use of land within the boundaries of a county or general law or charter city, local ordinances, regulations, or charter provisions would prevail over state law if a conflict exists.

The discussions included that further review of the initiative may raise questions regarding the potential for unintended or other consequences of the proposed measure on other areas of State law. Planning and Zoning Law requires the legislative body of a city or county to adopt a comprehensive, long-term General Plan that includes various elements like a Safety Element and Environmental Justice Element. Some commentators asserted that passage of the initiative may result in communities addressing in different ways the Safety Element and management of potential natural disasters, such as seismic hazards, wildland and urban fires, and floods. Furthermore, some commentators have indicated the proposed initiative could also impact the Environmental Justice Element, efforts that seek to mitigate health risks, and other issues in disadvantaged communities.

The proposed initiative may also impact the development of the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), which is mandated by State Housing Law as part of the periodic process of updating local housing elements of the General Plan. RHNA quantifies the need for housing within each jurisdiction during specified planning periods. Communities use RHNA in land-use planning and prioritizing local resource allocation.
In the end, Cal Cities’ Board of Directors reaffirmed its strong desire to protect local decision-making authority over land-use, housing, and zoning. It further directed its staff to develop a menu of near-, mid-, and long-term strategies to reform state housing laws and to bring recommendations to the Board of Directors for consideration in spring 2022.

The Cal Cities’ board’s action was informed by the work of the organization’s ACA 7 Working Group. After review, the working group raised concerns that the measures may have significant unintended consequences, including pitting local jurisdictions against each other, and that additional feedback from cities is needed prior to taking a position.

**Prior Committee Action**

At its September 21, 2021, meeting, Members of the LCMC received a written report and verbal update on the Community Planning Voter Initiative. The committee unanimously voted to forward the report to share information about the proposed initiative with the Regional Council and other policy committees at their meetings on October 7, 2021.

Subsequently, the Attorney General released the title and summary to the proposed initiative, so SCAG staff presented an informational report on the latest actions to the LCMC at its meeting on November 16, 2021. Members of the LCMC had a robust discussion and subsequently voted to forward a “support” recommendation on the proposed initiative to the Regional Council by a vote of 13-2-1.

Should a support position be taken by the RC, as required by state law, no public funds would be spent by SCAG to advocate for the passage of this measure.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Work associated with the staff report on the Community Planning Voter Initiative is contained in the Indirect Cost budget, Legislation 810-0120.10.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**

1. Community Planning Voter Initiative Language
2. Community Planning Voter Initiative AG Title and Summary
SECTION 1. The people of the State of California find and declare all of the following:

(a) The circumstances and environmental impacts of local land use decisions vary greatly across the state from locality to locality.

(b) The infrastructure required to maintain appropriate levels of public services, including police and fire services, parklands and public open spaces, transportation, water supply, schools, and sewers varies greatly across the state from locality to locality.

(c) Land use decisions made by local officials must balance development with public facilities and services while addressing the economic, environmental, and social needs of the particular communities served by those local officials.

(d) Thus, it is in the best interests of the state and local communities for these complex decisions to be made at the local level to ensure that the specific, unique characteristics, constraints, and needs of those communities are properly analyzed and addressed.

(e) Gentrification of housing adjacent to public transportation will reduce or eliminate the availability of low or very low income housing near public transit, resulting in the loss of access by low or very low income persons to public transit, declines in public transit ridership, and increases in vehicle miles travelled.

(f) The State Legislature cannot properly assess the impacts upon each community of sweeping centralized and rigid state land use rules and zoning regulations that apply across the state without regard to community impacts and, as a result, statewide land use and zoning will do great harm to local communities with differing circumstances and concerns.

(g) Community development should not be controlled by state planners, but by local governments that know and can address the needs of, and the impacts upon, local communities. Local initiatives approved by voters pertaining to land use and zoning restrictions should not be nullified or superseded by the actions of any local or state legislative body.

(h) Numerous state laws that target communities for elimination of zoning standards have been enacted, and continue to be proposed, that eliminate or erode local control over local development and circumvent the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), creating the potential for harmful environmental impacts to occur.

(i) The purpose of this measure is to ensure that all decisions regarding local land use controls, including zoning law and regulations, are made by the affected communities in accordance with applicable law, including but not limited to CEQA (Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq.), the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (Government Code §§ 12900 – 12996), prohibitions against discrimination (Government Code § 65008), and affirmatively furthering fair housing (Government Code § 8899.50). This constitutional amendment would continue to provide for state control in the coastal zone, the siting of a power plant that can generate more than 50 megawatts of electricity, or the development or construction of water, communication or transportation infrastructure projects which the Legislature declares are matters of statewide concern and are in the best interests of the state. For purposes of this measure, it is the intent that a transportation infrastructure project shall not include a transit-oriented development project that is residential, commercial, or mixed-use.
SECTION 2. Section 4.5 is added to Article XI of the California Constitution, to read:

SEC. 4.5. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), in the event of a conflict with a state statute, a county charter provision, general plan, specific plan, ordinance or a regulation adopted pursuant to a county charter, that regulates the zoning, development or use of land within the boundaries of an unincorporated area of the county shall be deemed a county affair within the meaning of Section 4 and shall prevail over a conflicting state statute. No voter approved local initiative that regulates the zoning, development or use of land within the boundaries of any county shall be overturned or otherwise nullified by any legislative body.

(b) A county charter provision, general plan, specific plan, ordinance or a regulation adopted and applicable to an unincorporated area within a county, may be determined only by a court of competent jurisdiction, in accordance with Section 4, to address either a matter of statewide concern or a county affair if that provision, ordinance, or regulation conflicts with a state statute with regard to only the following:

(1) The California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code), or a successor statute.

(2) The siting of a power generating facility capable of generating more than 50 megawatts of electricity and the California Public Utilities Commission has determined that a need exists at that location that is a matter of statewide concern.

(3) The development or construction of a water, communication or transportation infrastructure project for which the Legislature has declared in statute the reasons why the project addresses a matter of statewide concern and is in the best interests of the state. For purposes of this paragraph, a transportation infrastructure project does not include a transit-oriented development project, whether residential, commercial, or mixed-use.

(c) No modification to appropriations for state funded programs shall occur, and no state grant applications or funding shall be denied as a result of the application of this section. No benefit or preference in state appropriations or grants shall be given to an entity that opts not to utilize the provisions of this section.

(d) The provisions of this section are severable. If any provision of this section or its application is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.

SECTION 3. Section 5.5 is added to Article XI of the California Constitution, to read:

SEC. 5.5. (a) Except as provided in subdivision (b), in the event of a conflict with a state statute, a city charter provision, general plan, specific plan, ordinance or a regulation adopted pursuant to a city charter, that establishes land use policies or regulates zoning or development standards within the boundaries of the city shall be deemed a municipal affair within the meaning of Section 5 and shall prevail over a conflicting state statute. No voter approved local initiative that regulates the zoning, development or use of land within the boundaries of any city shall be overturned or otherwise nullified by any legislative body.

(b) A city charter provision, general plan, specific plan, ordinance or a regulation adopted pursuant to a city charter, may be determined only by a court of competent jurisdiction, in accordance with Section 5, to address either a matter of statewide concern or a municipal affair.
if that provision, ordinance, or regulation conflicts with a state statute with regard to only the following:

(1) The California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code), or a successor statute.

(2) The siting of a power generating facility capable of generating more than 50 megawatts of electricity and the California Public Utilities Commission has determined that a need exists at that location that is a matter of statewide concern.

(3) The development or construction of a water, communication or transportation infrastructure project for which the Legislature has declared in statute the reasons why the project addresses a matter of statewide concern and is in the best interests of the state. For purposes of this paragraph, a transportation infrastructure project does not include a transit-oriented development project, whether residential, commercial, or mixed-use.

(c) No modification to appropriations for state funded programs shall occur, and no state grant applications or funding shall be denied as a result of the application of this section. No benefit or preference in state appropriations or grants shall be given to an entity that opts not to utilize the provisions of this section.

(d) The provisions of this section are severable. If any provision of this section or its application is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.

SECTION 4. Section 7 of Article XI of the California Constitution is amended to read:

SEC. 7. (a) A county or city may make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary, and other ordinances and regulations not that are not, except as provided in subdivision (b), in conflict with general laws. A county or city may not supersede or otherwise interfere with any voter approved local initiative pertaining to land use or zoning restrictions.

(b) A county or city general plan, specific plan, ordinance or regulation that regulates the zoning, development or use of land within the boundaries of the county or city shall prevail over conflicting general laws, except for only the following:

(A) A coastal land use plan, ordinance or regulation that conflicts with the California Coastal Act of 1976 (Division 20 (commencing with Section 30000) of the Public Resources Code), or a successor statute.

(B) An ordinance or regulation that addresses the siting of a power generating facility capable of generating more than 50 megawatts of electricity and the California Public Utilities Commission has determined that a need exists at that location that is a matter of statewide concern.

(C) An ordinance or regulation that addresses the development or construction of a water, communication or transportation infrastructure project for which the Legislature has declared in statute the reasons why the project addresses a matter of statewide concern and is in the best interests of the state. For purposes of this subparagraph, a transportation infrastructure project does not include a transit-oriented development project, whether residential, commercial, or mixed-use.
(c) No modification to appropriations for state funded programs shall occur, and no state grant applications or funding shall be denied as a result of the application of this section. No benefit or preference in state appropriations or grants shall be given to an entity that opts not to utilize the provisions of this section.

(d) The provisions of this subdivision are severable. If any provision of this subdivision or its application is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.
The Attorney General of California has prepared the following title and summary of the chief purpose and points of the proposed measure:

**PROVIDES THAT LOCAL LAND-USE AND ZONING LAWS OVERRIDE CONFLICTING STATE LAWS. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**

Provides that city and county land-use and zoning laws (including local housing laws) override all conflicting state laws, except in certain circumstances related to three areas of statewide concern: (1) the California Coastal Act of 1976; (2) siting of power plants; or (3) development of water, communication, or transportation infrastructure projects. Prevents state legislature and local legislative bodies from passing laws invalidating voter-approved local land-use or zoning initiatives. Prohibits state from changing, granting, or denying funding to local governments based on their implementation of this measure. Summary of estimate by Legislative Analyst and Director of Finance of fiscal impact on state and local governments: **Fiscal effects of the measure depend on future decisions by the cities and counties and therefore are unknown.**

(21-0016A1.)
October 15, 2021

Hon. Rob Bonta
Attorney General
1300 I Street, 17th Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

Attention: Ms. Anabel Renteria
Initiative Coordinator

Dear Attorney General Bonta:

Pursuant to Elections Code Section 9005, we have reviewed the proposed initiative regarding local land use (A.G. File No. 21-0016, Amendment #1).

Background

State-Local Responsibilities. The state, counties, and cities generally have different responsibilities, and fund and administer different services. Cities are responsible for local needs, such as planning, to accommodate needed housing, police and fire protection, and local roads. Counties provide similar services in areas outside of cities—unincorporated areas. Counties also administer countywide services on behalf of the state, such as health and human services programs, jails, and elections. Cities and counties provide these services using a combination of local, state, and federal funding. In some cases, such as for many human services programs operated by counties, the state provides certain revenue sources to local governments. In other cases, such as some housing programs, the state sets aside grant funding for cities and counties based on varying programmatic requirements.

Local Initiatives. Local voters generally have the authority to enact initiatives that override laws passed by local legislative bodies—city councils or boards of supervisors. Laws enacted by voters through a local initiative can only be modified by subsequent voter approved local initiatives, except if the initiative allows otherwise. Although local initiatives can override laws passed by local legislative bodies, they do not override state laws.

Authority of General Law and Charter Cities and Counties. The State Constitution allows for city and county local affairs to be governed under either the general laws of the state or under a charter adopted by local voters. Charter cities for local matters generally, and charter counties only for certain local matters, have authority to adopt their own laws which generally supersede state law. Although the State Constitution does not define local affairs, case law suggests that they include local elections, and local government contracting and employees. Despite a charter, cities and counties are subject to the U.S. Constitution, federal laws, the California Constitution, and state laws regarding matters of statewide concern. In contrast, general law cities and counties have less
authority to act locally as local actions must be consistent with state law. Of California’s 58 counties, 14 currently are charter counties. Of California’s 482 cities, 121 are charter cities.

**Zoning, Land Use, and Housing.** Both general law and charter cities and counties in California make most decisions about when, where, and what type of housing will be built. Cities and counties enact zoning ordinances to set property-specific land use requirements. A community’s zoning ordinance typically defines how each property can be used and its form. Use dictates the category of development that is permitted on the property—such as single-family residential, multifamily residential, or commercial. Form dictates building height and width, the share of land covered by buildings, and the distance of buildings from neighboring properties and roads. Rules about use and form effectively determine how many housing units can be built on a particular site. A site with one- or two-story height limits and requirements for large distances from surrounding properties typically can accommodate only single-family homes. Conversely, a site with height limits over 100 feet and relatively smaller required distances between properties can accommodate higher-density housing such as multistory apartments. By dictating how many sites housing can be built on and at what densities, zoning controls how much housing a community can accommodate.

**State Has Special Jurisdiction Over Land Use Decisions in Areas of Statewide Concern.** Currently, the local affairs rule does not prohibit the state from regulating zoning or land use when necessary to address a statewide concern. For example, state law requires cities and counties to carry out certain planning exercises that attempt to ensure they can accommodate needed home building. In addition, recent housing legislation requires, in some limited cases, local governments to streamline housing approvals and build more dense housing. This legislation declares that ensuring access to affordable housing is a matter of statewide concern and not a local affair. In recent years, the state increasingly has seen issues of zoning and land use as matters of statewide concern. Nevertheless, local governments retain significant control over zoning, land use, and housing.

**Proposal**

**Specifies Local Laws Related to Zoning or Land Use Generally Prevail Over Conflicting State Laws.** This measure would amend the California Constitution to specify that actions by a charter city or county related to zoning, development, or land use—hereafter referred to as local laws—would be a local affair and prevail over conflicting state laws. The measure also specifies that zoning and land use laws in general law cities and counties would prevail over conflicting state general law.

Consequently, under the measure, local laws that currently conflict with state law generally would become enforceable. Moreover, local initiatives related to zoning or land use not only would prevail over laws passed by local governing bodies but also state law. While the state could continue to enact legislation related to local zoning and land use, rather than follow state law, cities and counties could enact conflicting laws. These local laws generally would prevail over state law.

**Identifies Areas of Statewide Concern Where State Law Could Continue to Prevail.** The measure identifies certain areas in which courts could determine whether state laws could continue to prevail over local laws. This authority extends to zoning or land use in: (1) the coastal zone; (2) the siting of a power plant that can generate more than 50 megawatts of electricity; or (3) the development of water, communications, or transportation infrastructure projects that the state declares are matters of statewide concern. These same exemptions apply to general law cities and counties, although no court ruling is necessary.
**Limits State’s Discretion When Appropriating State Funds.** The measure amends the California Constitution to specify that the state could not modify how it appropriates state funding as a result of this measure. Specifically, the state could not deny funding to cities or counties that opt to enact zoning or land use laws that conflict with state law. Furthermore, the state could not provide a preference in appropriating state funding to local governments that choose to conform with state law related to zoning or land use.

**Major Fiscal Effects**

**Some Existing State Allocations to Local Governments Likely Would Need to Change.** Some funding provided by the state to local governments is based on local governments’ progress toward meeting state goals for housing. Because the measure could restrict the state’s ability to distribute funds in this manner, the state likely would need to reallocate funding among local governments differently.

**Broader Fiscal Effects of the Measure Unknown.** The measure would make significant changes to state and local authority over zoning and land use decisions. In some cases, previously unenforceable laws could become operative at the local level immediately. In other cases, local governments could enact new laws. If cities and counties adopt zoning and land use laws that restrict housing development, housing costs could increase and potentially constrain economic growth. Alternatively, if cities and counties adopt laws that spur housing development, economic growth could accelerate. The ultimate fiscal effects of the measure on the state and local governments will depend on decisions by the state’s 482 cities and 58 counties.

**Summary of Fiscal Effects.** We estimate that this measure would have the following major fiscal effects.

- Fiscal effects of the measure depend on future decisions by the cities and counties and therefore are unknown.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

for Gabriel Petek
Legislative Analyst

[Signature]

for Keely Martin Bosler
Director of Finance
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Yes, 21, 2021 meeting, the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) voted to forward a recommendation to the Regional Council (RC) that the agency proceed with a first and second choice concept for a SCAG-sponsored legislative bill for the 2022 state legislative session. The LCMC recommends sponsoring legislation that would expand the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program as its first-choice legislative proposal and the legislation creating incentives to produce RHNA housing units and its second choice. Additionally, the Committee recommends that the agency pursue a long-term legislative goal of serving as a leader and convener of an effort to modernize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

BACKGROUND:

The Process and Concept Selection:

During a strategic work plan discussion led by President Lorimore on June 24, 2021, members of the SCAG Executive Administration Committee (EAC) expressed a desire to increase the agency’s leadership and legislative advocacy on important policy issues in Sacramento, including the possible sponsorship of a legislative bill. As part of this effort, President Lorimore subsequently tasked members of the LCMC with discussing and making a recommendation to the RC on a concept for potential legislative sponsorship.
The LCMC discussed this topic in depth at its September 21, 2021 meeting and members of the Committee were asked to return to the November 16, 2021 meeting with their ideas. In the fall, staff conducted outreach to committee members to understand their policy interests and legislative needs. From those outreach conversations, staff identified several recurring themes and unique ideas which were then presented and discussed at the November 16, 2021 meeting. It worth noting that almost half of the responses from LCMC members expressed support for funding tools to help cities implement their local housing programs.

At the November 16, 2021 meeting, LCMC members discussed the presented ideas, however, due to time constraints the committee did not achieve consensus on a path forward. At the conclusion of the agenda item, the Chair advised that the December 21, 2021 meeting would be used to evaluate legislative proposals and provide specific direction to staff on how to proceed.

In consultation with the Chair, staff developed five concepts for the LCMC to consider. At the December 21, 2021 meeting, LCMC members received a report on those concepts with a recommendation to select a first and second choice. The report included an overview of the following five concepts:

1) Transportation Consistency Legislation;
2) Infill Infrastructure Grant Program Expansion;
3) Fixing Tax Increment Financing Tools;
4) CEQA Reform; and
5) Incentives for RHNA production.

After robust discussion on the five proposals, information from SCAG staff, and feedback from SCAG’s state lobbyists, LCMC members recommended an Infill Infrastructure Grant Program Expansion as its first-choice legislative proposal and the creation of Incentives for RHNA production as its second choice. Additionally, the Committee recommended that the agency pursue a long-term legislative goal of serving as a leader and convener to modernize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The Selected Legislative Concepts:

At its December 21, 2021 meeting, the LCMC made a recommendation to the EAC and RC to direct staff to pursue opportunities to introduce “Infill Infrastructure Grant Program Expansion” as its first-ranked concept for a SCAG-sponsored legislative bill and “Incentives for RHNA Production” as its second choice.
(2) **Infill Infrastructure Grant Program Expansion** – Advocate for a major expansion and investment in the existing Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG) Program to provide state funding for infrastructure improvements that support infill housing development.

The Health and Safety Code establishes the Infill Incentive Grant Program to promote infill housing development by providing financial assistance for capital investment, such as rehabilitation, demolition, relocation, preservation, and acquisition of infrastructure necessary to facilitate the development of infill housing. From time to time, the Legislature and Governor allocate funding toward this program. The IIG program received a $250 million allocation in the Fiscal Year 2021-22 Budget Act, however, the program does not always receive funding on an annual basis.

Under the program, grants are available as gap funding for infrastructure improvements necessary for specific residential or mixed-use infill development projects or areas. Both infill projects and areas must have either been previously developed or be largely surrounded by development. Eligible improvements include development or reconstruction of parks or open space, water, sewer or other utility service improvements, streets, roads, parking structures, transit linkages, transit shelters, traffic mitigation features, sidewalks, and streetscape improvements. Cities, counties, housing authorities, non-profit and for-profit housing developers, and redevelopment successor agencies are eligible entities.

In the absence or redevelopment, this existing program is a promising option to provide funding to local governments to address their infrastructure needs in areas that have been prioritized for housing development – namely infill locations. A sizeable budget expansion is a responsible use of a one-time budget surplus. Additionally, the program could be reformed to promote geographic equity targets, allow transportation agencies to apply, and more.

(5) **Incentives for RHNA Production** – Support the establishment of new incentives that serve as a motivating force for local communities to approve new housing development in the face of “not in my back yard” or “NIMBY” opposition.

Recently, Governor Newsom announced the creation of a new Housing Accountability Unit (HAU) at the Department of Housing and Community Development. The goal of the new unit is to work with cities and counties to provide technical assistance to jurisdictions to aid their efforts to comply with state legislation mandating housing development, including rezoning and permitting. The HAU will also be authorized to take enforcement steps to bring municipalities into compliance with their RHNA goals in the event of persistent non-compliance. To complement this “stick” approach to housing development, the state should also consider a suite of carrots to assist municipalities in approving development, especially those that may elicit some community opposition.
Ideas could include focusing the tax increment (or the incremental growth in property tax revenues) gained from new housing development to local government, the creation of a one-time financial grant for the first cities in each region to meet housing production associated with their RHNA allocations, or other ideas.

If the first-ranked concept proves infeasible, redundant with existing law, or fails to attract legislative support, staff would pursue the second-ranked concept, though members of the LCMC were also open to the idea of using the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program as a RHNA production incentive.

Furthermore, the Committee recommended that the agency pursue a long-term legislative goal of serving as a leader and convener to modernize CEQA.

(4) CEQA Reform — Support modernization of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that would both expedite and streamline project development and delivery, especially for infill, transit-oriented, and housing projects.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was signed into law by Governor Ronald Reagan in 1970 and since that time the law has had no major reform. Moreover, CEQA has not been modernized to account for the hundreds of other environmental laws passed since then, including SB 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, which requires SCAG and other Metropolitan Planning Organizations in California to prepare regional Sustainable Communities Strategies that are additionally environmentally reviewed.

Petitioners or those using CEQA to challenge projects often do not identify the true social, economic or business interests that are behind a CEQA challenge. Over the decades, CEQA has become a tool for organizations to threaten, halt, or indefinitely stop responsible community improvements, such as housing, public transit, infill development, renewable energy, and other crucial projects throughout California. These projects benefit both the environment and the economy and are precisely the types of projects that must be built if the state is to achieve its climate goals.

For several years, the SCAG legislative platform has expressed support for modernizing CEQA to preserve the original intent of the law—environmental protection and public participation—while limiting CEQA abuses. Governor Newsom recognizes this problem and has supported a categorical exemption to CEQA for activities funded by Project Homekey and an exemption for Low Barrier Navigation Centers. These actions may be the entry point
to explore additional types of projects that should be considered for CEQA exemption or streamlining.

Such an effort would not be without its challenges and would likely require a multi-year and extensive engagement process with environmental, labor, business and housing, and other stakeholders.

Next Steps:

Upon EAC’s and RC’s approval of the LCMC’s recommendation, staff will pursue opportunities to introduce the first-ranked concept as a legislative bill. Regular updates on the progress of this effort will be shared at future LCMC meetings.

Last, it is important to keep in mind the following legislative deadlines:

- January 3, 2022 – The Legislature reconvenes for the second year of the 2021-22 Legislative Session.
- January 31, 2022 – Deadline for a two-year bill to advance from its house of origin.
- February 18, 2022 – Bill introduction deadline.

Prior Committee Action:
At the December 21, 2021 LCMC meeting, the Committee voted to forward a recommendation to the EAC and RC, as follows:

(1) Approve “Infill Infrastructure Grant Program Expansion” and “Incentives for RHNA Production” as first and second choice concepts, respectively, for a SCAG sponsored legislative bill for the 2022 state legislative year.

(2) Direct staff to pursue opportunities to introduce the first-ranked concept as a legislative bill; and, to pursue opportunities to introduce the second-ranked concept as a legislative bill if the first-ranked concept proves infeasible, redundant with existing law, or fails to attract legislative support.

(3) Pursue a long-term legislative goal of serving as a leader and convener to modernize the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

(4) Direct staff to provide regular updates to the LCMC on the progress of the legislative concept and advise on partnership, coalition building, and advocacy opportunities and efforts.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with the “Legislative Bill Concepts” staff report is contained in the General Fund budget, Legislation 800-0160.02.
AGENDA ITEM 4
REPORT
Southern California Association of Governments
Hybrid (In-Person and Remote Participation)
January 5, 2022

NO. 638
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
EXECUTIVE/ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE (EAC)
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2021


The Executive/Administration Committee (EAC) of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) held its regular meeting both in person and virtually (telephonically and electronically), given the declared state of emergency (pursuant to State of Emergency Proclamation dated March 4, 2020) and local public health directives imposing and recommending social distancing measures due to the threat of COVID-19, and pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e)(1)(A). A quorum was present.

Members Present
Hon. Clint Lorimore, President
Eastvale
District 4
RCTC
Ventura County
Hon. Jan Harnik, 1st Vice President
Hon. Carmen Ramirez, 2nd Vice President
Hon. Frank Yokoyama, Vice Chair, CEHD
Hon. David Pollock, Chair, EEC
Hon. Sean Ashton, Chair, TC
Hon. Art Brown, Vice Chair, TC
Hon. Kathryn Barger, President’s Appt.
Hon. Alan D. Wapner, Chair, LCMC
Hon. Peggy Huang, Vice Chair, LCMC
Hon. Larry McCallon, President’s Appt.
Hon. Donald P. Wagner, President’s Appt.
Mr. Randall Lewis, Ex-officio
Hon. Deborah Robertson, Vice Chair, EEC

Members Not Present
Hon. Rex Richardson, Imm. Past President
Long Beach
District 29
TGRPB Representative
Hon. Andrew Masiel, Sr.
Pechanga Dev. Corp.
District 1
Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, President’s Appt.
El Centro
Staff Present
Kome Ajise, Executive Director
Darin Chidsey, Chief Operating Officer
Debbi Dillon, Chief Strategy Officer
Cindy Giraldo, Chief Financial Officer
Sarah Jepson, Director of Planning
Carmen Fujimori, Human Resources Director
Javiera Cartagena, Director of Government and Public Affairs
Julie Shroyer, Chief Information Officer
Michael Houston, Chief Counsel, Director of Legal Services
Jeffery Elder, Deputy Legal Counsel
Ruben Duran, Board Counsel
Maggie Aguilar, Clerk of the Board
Cecilia Pulido, Deputy Clerk of the Board

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Clint Lorimore called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. President Lorimore asked Alan Wapner, SBCTA, to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Given the declared state of emergency (pursuant to State of Emergency Proclamation dated March 4, 2020) and local public health directives imposing and recommending social distancing measures due to the threat of COVID-19, and pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(e)(1)(A), President Lorimore announced the meeting was being held both in person and virtually (telephonically and electronically).

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

President Lorimore opened the Public Comment Period and outlined instructions for public comments. He noted this was the time for persons to comment on any matter pertinent to SCAG’s jurisdiction that were not listed on the agenda.

He reminded the public to submit comments via email to ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov. Board Counsel Ruben Duran acknowledged there were no written public comments received by email before or after the deadline.

Seeing no public comment speakers, President Lorimore closed the Public Comment Period.
REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

There was no prioritization of agenda items.

ACTION ITEM

1. Findings to Continue Holding Virtual Regional Council and Committee Meetings under AB 361

President Lorimore opened the Public Comment Period.

Seeing no public comment speakers, President Lorimore closed the Public Comment Period.

Board Counsel Duran reported this was a request that the EAC make findings (the staff report outlines the necessary findings) as required by AB 361 that would allow that body to continue to meet remotely while there was an ongoing pandemic. He reported these findings had to be made every 30 days by each legislative body in California.

Vice President Harnik asked if this could be done within the Consent Calendar.

Board Counsel Duran stated it was something they could look into.

A MOTION was made (Brown) that the Executive Administration Committee (EAC), acting on behalf of the Regional Council (RC): (1) make the following findings required by Government Code Section 54953(e)(3) on the basis of the staff report, which is incorporated by this reference, that (i) a proclaimed state of emergency remains active in connection with the COVID-19 public health crisis, (ii) the EAC has reconsidered the circumstances of the state of emergency and (iii) state and local officials continue to impose or recommend measures to promote social distancing in relation to the COVID-19 public health crisis and, further, (2) authorize all legislative bodies of the Southern California Association of Government (SCAG), including the EAC, RC and all committees and task forces established by the RC or SCAG’s Bylaws, to utilize remote teleconference meetings for a period of thirty (30) days pursuant to and in compliance with Brown Act provisions contained in Government Code Section 54953(e). Motion was SECONDED (Barger) and passed by the following votes:

AYES: Ashton, Barger, Brown, Harnik, Huang, Lorimore, McCallon, Pollock, Ramirez, Robertson, Wagner, Wapner and Yokoyama (13)

NOES: None (0)

ABSTAIN: None (0)
ACTION ITEM

2. Resolution No. 21-638-1 Approving Amendment 2 to the FY 2021-22 Overall Work Program Budget, the Indirect Cost Budget and TDA Capital Budget

President Lorimore opened the Public Comment Period.

Seeing no public comment speakers, President Lorimore closed the Public Comment Period.

Cindy Giraldo, Chief Financial Officer (CFO), provided a brief report on the amendments to the Fiscal Year 2021-22 (FY22) Overall Work Program (OWP) budget, the Indirect Cost Budget and Transportation Development Act (TDA) Capital Budget, and indicated this was outlined in detail in the staff report.

Second Vice President Ramirez, Ventura, asked the CFO to expand on staffing capacity issues she had mentioned. Ms. Giraldo explained the need for staffing increases to help manage the workload that was on the horizon successfully.

Supervisor Barger, President’s Appointment, Los Angeles County, asked questions regarding SCAG’s guidelines for telework, technology allowance, and one-time stipend to purchase needed office furniture or equipment for remote office set-up. Ms. Giraldo addressed the questions.

A MOTION was made (Ramirez) that the EAC, acting on behalf of the Regional Council to 1) approve Resolution No. 21-638-1 adopting amendments to the Fiscal Year 2021-22 (FY22) Overall Work Program (OWP) budget, the Indirect Cost Budget and TDA Capital Budget, and authorizing such other matters as contained in and provided by said resolution; 2) authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, to submit the Amendment 2 to the FY22 OWP to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); and 3) authorize the Executive Director, of his designee, to submit the revised FY22 Indirect Cost Rate Proposal (ICRP) and the FY22 Fringe Benefits Cost Rate Proposal to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Motion was SECONDED (Pollock) and passed by the following votes:

AYES: Ashton, Barger, Brown, Harnik, Huang, Lorimore, McCallon, Pollock, Ramirez, Robertson, Wagner, Wapner and Yokoyama (13)

NOES: None (0)

ABSTAIN: None (0)
CONSENT CALENDAR

President Lorimore opened the Public Comment Period.

Seeing no public comment speakers, President Lorimore closed the Public Comment Period.

Approval Items

3. Minutes of the Regular Meeting – November 3, 2021

4. Approval for Additional Stipend Payments

5. Contract Amendment Greater Than 30% of the Contract’s Original Value: Contract No. 17-026-C1 Amendment 8, Professional Auditing Services

6. SCAG Memberships and Sponsorships

Receive and File

7. Purchase Orders $5,000 - $199,999; Contracts $25,000 - $199,999 and Amendments $5,000 - $74,999

8. CFO Monthly Report

A MOTION was made (Barger) to approve Consent Calendar, Items 2 through 7; Receive and File Item 8 through 10. Motion was SECONDED (Harnik) and passed by the following votes:

AYES: Ashton, Barger, Brown, Harnik, Huang, Lorimore, McCallon, Pollock, Ramirez, Robertson, Wagner, Wapner and Yokoyama (13)

NOES: None (0)

ABSTAIN: None (0)

CFO REPORT

Cindy Giraldo, Chief Financial Officer reported the Finance Department would be focusing on the development of the Fiscal Year 2023 budget. She also reported that their business process improvement work would continue into January and indicated they would be bringing to this Committee a change in policy on budget disclosure with Request for Proposals.
President Lorimore opened the Public Comment Period.

Seeing no public comment speakers, President Lorimore closed the Public Comment Period.

**PRESIDENT’S REPORT**

President Lorimore reported on several events he attended or participated in during the month which included the Ontario Airport State of the Airport, a visit to the City of Brea’s Tracks project, meetings with Representative Jay Obernolte from Big Bear Lake and Representative Young Kim from Fullerton, and the Orange County Council of Government (OCCOG) General Assembly meeting. Lastly, he reported that the next EAC meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, December 1, 2022, at 3:00 p.m.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Executive Director Ajise provided a reminder on the Economic Summit that would take place the following day, December 2, 2021. He shared that prior to the start of the event at 9:00 a.m. there would be a registration and networking hour at 8:00 a.m. He provided additional details on the summit.

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Mayor Robertson, Rialto, District 8, requested that SCAG investigate how they could assist smaller communities to get some of their projects shovel ready to be competitive for grant funding. Executive Director Ajise addressed Mayor Robertson’s request.

Second Vice President Ramirez requested an update on what was going on with funding for transit.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

President Lorimore wished everyone Happy Holidays.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, President Lorimore adjourned the Regular Meeting of the Executive Administration Committee at 3:39 p.m.

[MINUTES ARE UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE EAC]

//
### Executive / Administration Committee Attendance Report

#### 2021-22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>JUN</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEP</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>JAN</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>Total Atten To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Clint Lorimore, President</td>
<td>Eastvale</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jan Harnik, Chair, 1st Vice Chair</td>
<td>RCTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Carmen Ramirez, 2nd Vice Chair</td>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Rex Richardson, Imm. Past President</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>District 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jorge Marquez, Chair, CEHD</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>District 33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Frank Yokoyama, Vice Chair, CEHD</td>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>District 23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. David Pollock, Chair, EEC</td>
<td>Moorpark</td>
<td>District 46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Deborah Roberston, Vice Chair, EEC</td>
<td>Rialto</td>
<td>District 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Sean Ashton, Chair, TC</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>District 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Art Brown, Vice Chair, TC</td>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td>District 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Alan Wapner, Chair, LCMC</td>
<td>SBCTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Peggy Huang, Vice Chair, LCMC</td>
<td>TCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Kathryn Barger, President's Appt.</td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Larry McCallon, President's Appt.</td>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, President's Appt.</td>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Donald P. Wagner, President's Appt.</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Andrew Masiel, Sr.</td>
<td>Pechanga Dev. Corporation</td>
<td>Tribal Government Regional Planning Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Randall Lewis, Ex-Officio Member</td>
<td>Lewis Group of Companies</td>
<td>Business Representative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment:** EAC Attendance Sheet 2021-22 (Minutes of the Meeting - December 1, 2021)
RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EAC:
That the Regional Council approve Resolution No. 22-639-1 authorizing SCAG to accept one-time grant funds from Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) on behalf of the California Energy Commission (CEC) in the amount of $600,048.00 to support SCAG’s study of Supporting Infrastructure for Medium and Heavy Duty Zero Emission Trucks.

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:
Approve Resolution No. 22-639-1 authorizing SCAG to accept one-time grant funds from EPRI on behalf of the CEC in the amount of $600,048.00 to support SCAG’s study of Supporting Infrastructure for Medium and Heavy Duty Zero Emission Trucks.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Connect SoCal, SCAG’s adopted 2020 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), includes a technology advancement plan for the regional goods movement system, as well as action steps to be taken by SCAG and its regional partners. This includes a focus on the long-term goal of a zero emission goods movement system where technically feasible and economically viable, while also integrating near-zero emissions technologies that serve as bridging options to continue to reduce emissions below current levels.

SCAG is a sub-recipient of the CEC Research Hub for Electric Technologies in Truck Applications (RHETTA) Grant, for which EPRI is the lead grant recipient. This grant was designed by the CEC to
fund applied research and development (AR&D) and technology demonstration and deployment (TD&D) activities through the creation of a Research Hub for Electric Technologies in Truck Applications. Specifically, the grant funds in the amount of $600,048 will be applied to support SCAG’s study of Supporting Infrastructure for Medium and Heavy Duty Zero Emission Trucks, which was approved under Contract 21-017-C01 with Gladstein, Neandross & Associates, LLC by the Regional Council on July 1, 2021. Through this contract, SCAG will develop a zero emission charging and fueling infrastructure plan for medium and heavy duty trucks.

BACKGROUND:
SCAG is about to initiate a planning study to help envision a regional network of zero emission charging and fueling infrastructure. This study will create a phased blueprint and action plan towards realizing this goal, and answer key questions about how stations in the region may operate to serve different truck markets and business functions. Though convened by SCAG, this study will be guided by a Technical Advisory Committee of key stakeholders, who will ultimately be instrumental in implementing this plan. Details related to the quantity, distribution and characteristics of charging and fueling stations will be quantified to the extent possible to help visualize and plan for infrastructure needs and investments.

This study will support the development of this infrastructure by helping to better understand what is needed, where, how to go about it, the roles of critical stakeholders, and to create a regional action plan to develop it. Up to 10 sites will be selected to provide a closer look at the needs of deploying an individual station.

To better support this work, SCAG applied for and received a CEC RHETTA grant as a sub-recipient to EPRI. The larger grant effort was designed to fund applied research and development (AR&D) and technology demonstration and deployment (TD&D) activities through the creation of a Research Hub for Electric Technologies in Truck Applications. The larger study will demonstrate and evaluate corridor based charging strategies for zero emission truck solutions. Phase 1 of the larger project has been funded for $13,000,000. Of this, SCAG will receive $600,048 associated with its study of supporting infrastructure for medium and heavy duty zero emission trucks. EPRI may authorize SCAG to proceed with limited pre-award project management and outreach/engagement related tasks in support of the EPRI-CEC scope of work and in accordance with all applicable terms, pending final execution of the grant agreement.

The benefits and key deliverables of this study include, but are not limited to:

1. Determining the demand for stations based on truck market operational characteristics and travel behavior and assessing the potential supply of land for stations;

2. Planning the distribution of future stations throughout the region based on a variety of factors, (travel demand, need for public, private, and privately accessible stations, power
and fueling supply, potential impacts to surrounding communities, and other factors to yet to be determined); 

3. A micro-level site assessment for roughly 10 stations to understand the factors to get one up and running; and 

4. A regional action plan supported by participating stakeholders showing the extent of the needed infrastructure and a sequence for phased development and recommendations that partners can take to facilitate the goal of a regional charging and fueling network 

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

If approved by the Regional Council, SCAG will receive $600,048 in one-time grant funds from EPRI on behalf of the CEC. The funds will be programmed in a future amendment of the FY 2021-22 Overall Work Program (OWP).

**ATTACHMENT(S):**

1. Resolution No. 22-639-1 - Supporting Infrastructure for Medium and Heavy Duty Zero Emission Trucks
RESOLUTION NO. 22-639-1

A RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG) AUTHORIZING SCAG TO ACCEPT CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION ONE TIME GRANT FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF $600,048 TO SUPPORT SCAG’S STUDY OF SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE FOR MEDIUM AND HEAVY DUTY ZERO EMISSION TRUCKS

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;

WHEREAS, Connect SoCal, SCAG’s adopted 2020 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), includes a technology advancement plan for the regional goods movement system, as well as action steps to be taken by SCAG and its regional partners;

WHEREAS, Connect SoCal includes a focus on the long-term goal of a zero emission goods movement system where technically feasible and economically viable;

WHEREAS, SCAG was awarded one-time grant funds in the amount of $600,048 (“Funds”) through the California Energy Commission’s (CEC) Research Hub for Electric Technologies in Truck Applications (RHETTA) Solicitation as a sub-recipient to the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI); and

WHEREAS, the Funds will be used to advance regional zero emission goods movement strategies in Connect SoCal, which will involve consulting services to study supporting infrastructure for medium and heavy duty zero emission trucks.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Regional Council that SCAG is authorized to accept and administer the Funds to support SCAG’s study of Supporting Infrastructure for Medium and Heavy Duty Zero Emission Trucks.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

1. The Regional Council hereby authorizes SCAG to accept funds in the amount of $600,048 to support SCAG’s study of Supporting Infrastructure for Medium and Heavy Duty Zero Emission Trucks; and

2. SCAG’s Executive Director or his designee is hereby designated and authorized by the Regional Council to execute all necessary agreements and other documents on behalf of the Regional Council as they relate to implementing the activities funded through the Funds. This includes agreements with EPRI,
Consultants, and/or the CEC related to this contract, inclusive of any work that may be preauthorized by EPRI, consistent with the grant scope of work and prior to January 6, 2022.

**PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED** by the Regional Council of the Southern California Association of Governments at its regular meeting this 6th day of January, 2022.

______________________________
Clint Lorimore
President, SCAG
Mayor Pro Tem, Eastvale

Attested by:

______________________________
Kome Ajise
Executive Director

Approved as to Form:

______________________________
Michael R.W. Houston
Chief Counsel
RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EAC:
That the Regional Council approve Resolution No. 22-639-2 to accept one-time funds from the CETF in the amount of $250,000 for overall general support for SCAG’s Broadband Program.

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:
Approve Resolution No. 22-639-2 to accept one-time funds from the CETF in the amount of $250,000 for overall general support for SCAG’s Broadband Program.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians. 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy. 3: Be the foremost data information hub for the region. 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies’ planning and operations and promote regional collaboration. 5: Recruit, support, and develop a world-class workforce and be the workplace of choice. 6: Deploy strategic communications to further agency priorities and foster public understanding of long-range regional planning. 7: Secure funding to support agency priorities to effectively and efficiently deliver work products.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
On February 2, 2021, SCAG’s Regional Council adopted Resolution No. 21-629-2, which pledges SCAG to assist in bridging the digital divide in underserved communities. To support this endeavor, the CETF has provided a grant of $250,000 for overall general support for SCAG’s Broadband Program. Funding would assist in the procurement and development of general broadband strategic services and technical studies to develop solutions to assist in rapid deployment of broadband infrastructure and technology.
BACKGROUND:

On February 2, 2021, SCAG’s Regional Council adopted Resolution No. 21-629-2, which pledges SCAG to assist in bridging the digital divide in underserved communities. To support this work, SCAG received a grant from the CETF for overall general support for SCAG to promote Digital Inclusion among the Local Government Members, including participation in the Southern California Transformation Initiative, and to achieve Digital Equity in the SCAG Region with a focus on deliverables set forth in the Scope of Work to serve as models for other regional organizations throughout the state. CETF will provide one-time grant funds of $250,000 to implement the following scope of work and deliverables set forth under Resolution No. 21-629-2.

- Assist in securing funding for local jurisdictions and ISPs to invest in broadband infrastructure in underserved communities.

- Conduct studies to develop solutions and strategies to assist in rapid deployment of broadband technology

Grant funding would support the following key deliverables:

- Strategic advisory services for SCAG’s “Request for Qualifications of Broadband Partnerships” - which would serve as a potential vehicle to engage with internet providers, both public and private, as funding opportunities arise.

- Technical Business Partnership Report – which will provide strategic advisory services regarding recommended approaches to partnerships between public and private entities to facilitate broadband deployment and bridge the digital divide.

- Permit Streamlining Report – which develops solutions to lower the cost of entry and operation of broadband systems, reduce the risk of delays during the planning, permitting and construction phases, provides opportunities for increasing revenue, and creating new avenues for competitive entries.

SCAG’s scope of work listed above will fulfill CETF’s objectives and deliverables set forth under the grant agreement:

- Completion of the Request for Qualifications for Prospective Partnership process, including analysis of the proposals and exploratory conversations with responders to develop concept designs for specific projects.

- Development of a model policy and process for streamlining broadband project approvals and permitting.
• Promotion of the Local Government Best Practices Check List among the SCAG Members, including 6 Counties and the 191 Cities.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
If approved by the Regional Council, SCAG will receive $250,000 in one-time funds from the California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF). The funds will be programmed in a future amendment of the FY-2021-22 Overall Work Program (OWP).

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. Resolution 22-639-2 - California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF) to Support SCAG’s Broadband Program
RESOLUTION NO. 22-639-2

A RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SCAG)
AUTHORIZING ACCEPTANCE OF ONE-TIME GRANT FUNDS FROM THE CALIFORNIA EMERGING TECHNOLOGY FUND IN THE AMOUNT OF $250,000 FOR OVERALL GENERAL SUPPORT FOR SCAG’s BROADBAND PROGRAM

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;

WHEREAS, On February 2, 2021, SCAG’s Regional Council adopted Resolution No. 21-629-2, which pledges SCAG to assist in bridging the digital divide in underserved communities;

WHEREAS, SCAG was awarded one-time funding in the amount of $250,000 (funds) from the California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF) for overall general support for SCAG’s broadband program;

WHEREAS, grant funding would assist in securing funding for local jurisdictions and ISPs to invest in broadband infrastructure in underserved communities, and conduct studies to develop solutions and strategies to assist in rapid deployment of broadband infrastructure and technologies;

WHEREAS, grant funding would support the following key deliverables: strategic advisory services, technical business partnership report, and permit streamlining report; and

WHEREAS, SCAG’s scope of work will fulfill CETF’s objectives and deliverables set forth under the grant agreement: completion of the request for qualifications for prospective partnership process, development of model policies and process for broadband streamlining, and promotion of local government best practices checklist.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Regional Council that SCAG is authorized to accept funds in the amount of $250,000 to support SCAG’s Broadband Program;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

1. SCAG’s Executive Director or his designee is hereby designated and authorized by the Regional Council to execute all necessary agreements and other documents on behalf of the Regional Council as they relate to implementing activities through the funds.
PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Regional Council of the Southern California Association of Governments at its regular meeting this 6th day of January, 2022.

Clint Lorimore  
President, SCAG  
Mayor Pro Tem, Eastvale

Attested by:

Kome Ajise  
Executive Director

Approved as to Form:

Michael R.W. Houston  
Chief Counsel
AGENDA ITEM 7
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
Hybrid (In-Person and Remote Participation)
January 5, 2022

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

From: Cindy Giraldo, Chief Financial Officer
(213) 630-1413, giraldo@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Contracts $200,000 or Greater: Contract No. 21-020-C01 Go Human Safety Strategies

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve Contract No. 22-020-C01 in an amount not to exceed $869,857(subject to negotiation) with Toole Design Group, LLC implement traffic safety strategies for SCAG’s Go Human Active Transportation Safety and Encouragement Campaign. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, pursuant to legal counsel review, to execute the contract amendment on behalf of SCAG.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The consultant will implement traffic safety strategies for SCAG’s Go Human Active Transportation Safety and Encouragement Campaign. The consultant will implement four (4) strategies that in summary are designed to help promote traffic safety in the region.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant/Contract #</th>
<th>Contract Purpose</th>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toole Design Group. (22-020-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant shall provide implement traffic safety strategies for SCAG’s Go Human Active Transportation Safety and Encouragement Campaign.</td>
<td>$869,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT:
Funding of $869,857 is available in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2022 Overall Work Program (OWP) in Project Number 225-3564.17.
ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Contract Summary 22-020-C01
2. Contract Summary 22-020-C01 COI
Recommended Consultant: Toole Design Group, LLC

Background & Scope of Work: Consistent with the requirements of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program grant from the California Office of Traffic Safety, the consultant shall provide SCAG with the implementation of traffic safety strategies for SCAG’s Go Human Active Transportation Safety and Encouragement Campaign. The consultant will implement four (4) strategies.

1) The consultant shall develop and implement Communications Campaign & Storytelling Strategies. This shall include creative, dynamic tactics to promote Go Human activities throughout the region.
2) The Consultant shall administer Community Funding Opportunities, which comprises the distribution of funding to community-based organizations, non-profit organizations that work with community members, and social enterprises to perform work that advances traffic safety.
3) The consultant shall coordinate up to six (6) deployments of the Go Human Kit of Parts to provide temporary traffic safety demonstrations in local jurisdictions.
4) The Consultant shall implement the Go Human Advertisement Campaign. It shall produce and distribute co-branded Go Human safety advertisements for local jurisdictions and coordinate media buys of Go Human advertisements.

This project supports a regional transportation nexus by implementing neighborhood- and community-level engagement strategies focused on traffic safety.

Project’s Benefits & Key Deliverables: The project’s benefits and key deliverables include, but are not limited to:
- Communication Plan for six (6) counties (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura);
- Final reports and documentation for at least twenty-five (25) projects funded through the Community Streets Mini-Grants Program;
- Coordination for six (6) deployments of the Go Human Kit of Parts to support temporary demonstrations of traffic safety infrastructure;
- Co-branded safety advertisements for a minimum of twenty-five (25) partners; and
- Draft and final report.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

Contract Amount: Total not to exceed $869,857
Toole Design Group, LLC (prime consultant) $668,700
Dakota Communications (subconsultant) $83,522
City Fabrick (subconsultant) $77,480
Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership(subconsultant) $40,155

Note: The not to exceed amount of $869,857 is subject final negotiation.
**Contract Period:** Notice to Proceed through September 30, 2022

**Project Number(s):** 225-3564.17 $869,857

Funding source(s): Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program Grant from California Office Transportation Safety (OTS)

Funding of $869,857 is available in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2021-2022 Overall Work Program (OWP) in Project Number 225-3564.17.

**Request for Proposal (RFP):** SCAG staff notified 1,923 firms of the release of RFP 22-020-C01 via SCAG’s Solicitation Management System website. A total of 38 firms downloaded the RFP. SCAG received the one (1) proposal in response to the solicitation:

**Toole Design Group, LLC (3 subconsultants) $869,857**

After receiving only one (1) proposal, staff surveyed 38 firms that downloaded the RFP to determine why each did not submit a proposal. Four (4) firms responded to staff’s inquiry, which disclosed the main reason these firms did not respond was scope of work was not a good fit the firms. Although staff only received 1 proposal, staff proceeded with the evaluation process given:

- The solicitation process and requirements were not overly restrictive;
- We adequately advertised the procurement. RFP was advertised for 6 weeks; and
- The one (1) firm that responded was capable of performing the scope of work.

Staff believes that resoliciting was not likely to yield a different result and needed to maintain the project’s schedule and therefore proceed to evaluate the one offer received.

**Selection Process:** The Proposal Review Committee (PRC) evaluated the 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 proposal, the PRC did not conduct interviews because the proposals contained sufficient information on which to base a contract award and the consultant has previous experience with SCAG.

The PRC consisted of the following individuals:

Andres Carrasquillo, Community Engagement Specialist, SCAG
Alina Borja, Junior Planner, SCAG
Julia Lippe-Klein, Program Manager I, SCA
Dorothy Le Suchkova, Senior Regional Planner, SCAG

**Basis for Selection:** The PRC recommended Toole Design Group, LLC for the contract award because the consultant:

- Demonstrated an excellent understanding of the project, specifically regarding execution of tasks and deliverables, as well as the regional context and the project’s intent to reach and serve impacted communities;
• Provided a good technical approach, for example, they propose utilizing the activities of the project to build long-term partnerships and trust between local organizations and SCAG; and

• Detailed creative innovations to enhance the project, for example they propose to create a “how-to” video to complement the existing SCAG Kit of Parts Playbook;
Approve Contract No. 22-020-C01 in an amount not to exceed $869,857(subject to negotiation) with Toole Design Group, LLC to implement traffic safety strategies for SCAG’s Go Human Active Transportation Safety and Encouragement Campaign. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, pursuant to legal counsel review, to execute the contract amendment on behalf of SCAG.

The consultant team for this contract includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Name</th>
<th>Did the consultant disclose a conflict in the Conflict of Interest Form they submitted with its original proposal (Yes or No)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toole Design Group, LLC (prime consultant)</td>
<td>Yes - form attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Communications (subconsultant)</td>
<td>No - form attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Fabrick (subconsultant)</td>
<td>No - form attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes National Partnership (subconsultant)</td>
<td>No - form attached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 22-020

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 https://scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under “GET INVOLVED”, then “Contract & Vendor Opportunities” and scroll down under the “Vendor Contracts Documents” tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under “ABOUT US” then “OUR TEAM” then “Employee Directory”; and Regional Council members can be found under “MEETINGS”, then scroll down to “LEADERSHIP” then select “REGIONAL COUNCIL” on the left side of the page and click on “Regional Council Officers and Member List.”

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG’s Legal Division, 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: Toole Design Group, LLC

Name of Preparer: Lauren Feit

Project Title: Human Go Safety Strategies

RFP Number: No. 22-020 Date Submitted: 10.27.2021

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nature of Financial Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment: Contract Summary 22-020-C01 COI (Contracts $200,000 or Greater: 22-020C01, Go Human Safety Strategies)
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dollar Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mike Bonin</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Eric Garcetti</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* a hired manager of a local office made these contributions prior to employment at Toole Design, this person is no longer employed at Toole Design.

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) Brooke DuBose, AICP, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Director of Operations, Western U.S. of (firm name) Toole Design Group, 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 October 27, 2021 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]

October 27, 2021

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. 22-020

RFP No./Contract No. 22-020

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 https://scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under “GET INVOLVED”, then “Contract & Vendor Opportunities” and scroll down under the “Vendor Contracts Documents” tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under “ABOUT US” then “OUR TEAM” then “Employee Directory”; and Regional Council members can be found under “MEETINGS”, then scroll down to “LEADERSHIP” then select "REGIONAL COUNCIL" on the left side of the page and click on “Regional Council Officers and Member List.”

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG’s Legal Division, 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: Safe Routes to School National Partnership

Name of Preparer: Cassandra Isidro

Project Title: Go Human Safety Strategies

RFP Number: 22-020 Date Submitted: October 28, 2021

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nature of Financial Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment: Contract Summary 22-020-C01 COI (Contracts $200,000 or Greater: 22-020C01, Go Human Safety Strategies)
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dollar Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) Cassandra Isidro, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Executive Director of (firm name) Safe Routes to School National Partnership, 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 10/15/2021 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)]  [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. 22-020

RFP No./Contract No. 22-020

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 https://scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under “GET INVOLVED”, then “Contract & Vendor Opportunities” and scroll down under the “Vendor Contracts Documents” tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under “ABOUT US” then “OUR TEAM” then “Employee Directory”; and Regional Council members can be found under “MEETINGS”, then scroll down to “LEADERSHIP” then select ”REGIONAL COUNCIL” on the left side of the page and click on “Regional Council Officers and Member List.”

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG’s Legal Division, 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: City Fabrick
Name of Preparer: Brian Ulaszewski
Project Title: Community First Engagement
RFP Number: 22-020 Date Submitted: 10/14/2021

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nature of Financial Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment: Contract Summary 22-020-C01 COI (Contracts $200,000 or Greater: 22-020C01, Go Human Safety Strategies)
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dollar Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) Brian Ulaszewski, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Executive Director/Principal of (firm name) City Fabrick, 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 10/14/2021 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) 10/14/2021 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. 22-020

RFP No./Contract No. 22-020 Go Human Safety Strategies

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 https://scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under “GET INVOLVED”, then “Contract & Vendor Opportunities” and scroll down under the “Vendor Contracts Documents” tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under “ABOUT US” then “OUR TEAM” then “Employee Directory”; and Regional Council members can be found under “MEETINGS”, then scroll down to “LEADERSHIP” then select "REGIONAL COUNCIL" on the left side of the page and click on “Regional Council Officers and Member List.”

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG’s Legal Division, 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: Dakota Communications

Name of Preparer: Kerman Maddox

Project Title: Go Human Safety Strategies

RFP Number: No. 22-020 Date Submitted: 10/28/2021

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nature of Financial Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dollar Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) Kerman Maddox
Managing Partner of (firm name) Dakota Communications,
hereby declare that I am the (position or title)
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 10/28/2021 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  October 28, 2021
(原始签名 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.
To: Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)  
Regional Council (RC)

From: Cindy Giraldo, Chief Financial Officer  
(213) 630-1413, giraldo@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Contract Amendment Greater Than 30% of the Contract’s Original Value and $75,000 or Greater: Contract No. 22-005-C01, Gartner IT Leaders

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve Amendment No. 1 to Contract No. 22-005-C01, with Gartner, Inc., in an amount not-to-exceed $158,237, increasing the contract value from $257,738 to $415,975, to provide access to Gartner Research and Research Experts in an advisory service to directly support SCAG’s Project Management Office. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, pursuant to legal counsel review, to execute the contract amendment on behalf of SCAG.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
On September 2, 2021, SCAG awarded Contract 22-005-C01 to Gartner, Inc. to provide Enterprise IT leaders Research and Advisory Services support. Under this agreement, Gartner, Inc. provides additional capacity, best practice knowledge, and depth to guide SCAG’s processes and support SCAG’s evolving IT environment.

This increase is due to the addition of two (2) team member licenses. These licenses enable SCAG to access Gartner Research and Research Experts to directly support SCAG’s Project Management Office.

This amendment exceeds $75,000, as well as 30% of the contract’s original value. Therefore, in accordance with the SCAG Procurement Manual (January 2021) Section 9.3, it requires the Regional Council’s approval.
BACKGROUND:

Staff recommends executing the following amendment greater than 30% of the contract’s original value:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant/Contract #</th>
<th>Contract Purpose</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gartner, Inc. (22-005-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant shall provide Enterprise IT leaders Research and Advisory Services as well as Gartner Research and Research Expert support to provide additional capacity, best practice knowledge, and depth to guide SCAG’s process, support SCAG’s evolving IT environment and Project Management Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$158,237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT:
Funding of $38,467 is available in the FY 2021-22 Overall Work Program (OWP) in Project Numbers 811-1163.08. The remaining $119,770 is expected to be available in FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-34. Specifically, $59,144 is expected to be available in the FY 2022-23 budget in Project Number 811-1163.08, and $60,626 is expected to be available in the FY 2023-24 budget in Project Number 811-1163.08, subject to budget availability.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Contract Summary 22-005-C01 Amendment No. 1
2. Contract Summary 22-005-C01 Amendment No. 1 COI
Recommended Consultant: Gartner, Inc.

Background & Scope of Work: On September 2, 2021 SCAG awarded Contract 22-005-C01 to Gartner, Inc. to provide Enterprise IT leaders Research and Advisory Services support. Under this agreement, Gartner, Inc. provides additional capacity, best practice knowledge, and depth to guide SCAG’s processes and support SCAG’s evolving IT environment.

This amendment also increases the contract value from $257,738 to $415,975 ($158,237).

This increase is due to the addition of two (2) team member licenses. These licenses enable SCAG to access Gartner Research and Research Experts to directly support implementation of SCAG’s Enterprise Project Management Office.

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

- Consultant providing industry leading research and advisory services;
- Tools and Templates;
- Peer & Practitioner Research; and
- Knowledgebase.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 3: Be the foremost data information hub for the region. Model best practices by prioritizing continuous improvement and technical innovations through the adoption of interactive, automated, and state-of-the-art information tools and technologies.

Contract Amount: Amendment 1 $158,237
Original contract value $257,738
Total contract value is not to exceed $415,975

This amendment exceeds $75,000, as well as 30% of the contract’s original value. Therefore, in accordance with the SCAG Procurement Manual (January 2021) Section 9.3, it requires the Regional Council’s approval.

Contract Period: September 2, 2021 through August 31, 2024

Project Number(s): 811-1163.08 $38,467
811-1163.08 $119,770

Funding source(s): Indirect Cost.

Funding of $38,467 is available in the FY 2021-22 Overall Work Program (OWP) in Project Number 811-1163.08. The remaining $119,770 is expected to be available in FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24. Specifically, $59,144 is expected to be available in the FY 2022-23 budget in Project Number 811-1163.08, and $60,626 is expected to be available in the FY 2023-24 budget in Project Number 811-1163.08, subject to budget availability.
Basis for Selection:

In accordance with SCAG’s Contract Manual Section 6.3, dated 12/1/16, to foster greater economy and efficiency, SCAG’s federal procurement guidance (2 CFR 200.318 [e]) authorizes SCAG to procure goods and services by entering into State and local intergovernmental agreements (Master Service Agreements – MSA’s). The goods and services procured under an MSA were previously competitively procured by another governmental entity (SCAG is essentially “piggy backing” on the agreement.) SCAG utilized an MSA with The County of Ventura and Gartner, Inc. (Contract #7914) that was competitively procured.

SCAG has vetted County of Ventura Contract 7914 (MSA) with Gartner, Inc. for Gartner Enterprise for HR Leaders. Gartner has provided us with the pre-negotiated pricing outlined in the original County of Ventura Contract #7914. This is a two-year service agreement.
Approve Amendment No. 1 to Contract No. 22-005-C01, with Gartner, Inc., in an amount not-to-exceed $158,237, increasing the contract value from $257,738 to $415,975, to provide access to Gartner Research and Research Experts in an advisory service to directly support SCAG’s Project Management Office. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, pursuant to legal counsel review, to execute the contract amendment on behalf of SCAG.

The consultant team for this contract includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Name</th>
<th>Did the consultant disclose a conflict in the Conflict of Interest Form they submitted with its original proposal (Yes or No)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gartner Inc. (prime consultant)</td>
<td>No - form attached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment: Contract Summary 22-005-C01 Amendment No. 1 (Contract Amendment Greater Than 30% of the Contract’s Original Value and...
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 https://scag.ca.gov. The SCAG Conflict of Interest Policy is located under “GET INVOLVED”, then “Contract & Vendor Opportunities” and scroll down under the “Vendor Contracts Documents” tab; whereas the SCAG staff may be found under “ABOUT US” then “OUR TEAM” then “Employee Directory”; and Regional Council members can be found under “MEETINGS”, then scroll down to “LEADERSHIP” then select "REGIONAL COUNCIL" on the left side of the page and click on “Regional Council Officers and Member List.”

Any questions regarding the information required to be disclosed in this form should be directed to SCAG’s Legal Division, 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: Gartner, Inc.
Name of Preparer: 
Project Title: 
Date Submitted: June 22, 2021

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nature of Financial Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ YES  ☒ NO

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dollar Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) Karoline Bonacci, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) VP, Contracts of (firm name) Gartner, 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 June 22, 2021 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]

Signature of Person Certifying for Proposer
(original signature required)

June 22, 2021

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.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
That the Regional Council approve inclusion of the project budget within a Request for Proposal (RFP) and authorize staff to do so when including the project budget is deemed by staff to be in the best interest of SCAG.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 7: Secure funding to support agency priorities to effectively and efficiently deliver work products.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Staff recommends that the Regional Council approve including the project budget amount with the RFP and authorize staff to do so when including the project budget is deemed by staff to be in the best interest of SCAG. With additional flexibility and professional judgment used to evaluate whether to include the project budget in the RFP, SCAG aims to both further the goals of the Regional Council’s Racial Equity Action Plan by reducing barriers for small, woman-owned, Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises (DVBE), Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE), and minority-owned businesses and incentivize existing service providers to complete for SCAG contracts, thus leading to a larger pool of SCAG contracted service providers, a reduction in failed procurements, and improved pricing through more competition.

BACKGROUND:
The SCAG Bylaws assign specific powers and duties to the Executive Director. In part, the Bylaws assign to the Executive Director, subject to the authority of the General Assembly and Regional Council, oversight, and approval of the procurement manual. At the February 18, 2009, Contracts Audit and Personnel (CAP) Subcommittee meeting, the subcommittee directed staff to end the practice of including project budgets in RFPs. The subcommittee based its direction on the review of RFPs in which proposers typically bid at or within a few hundred dollars of the project’s budget. Based on that concern, it was determined that this practice may result in SCAG not receiving the true economic benefits from competitive offers. The Regional Council considered the
subcommittee’s recommendation to change this procurement practice at its March 5, 2009, meeting. Following discussion, the Regional Council approved a motion to exclude the project budget from RFPs. As a result of this action, SCAG’s procurement manual was updated to disallow including the project budget in RFPs.

DISCUSSION:
SCAG staff agrees that holding back budget information can, in many circumstances, help drive competition between suppliers and service providers leading to the delivery of more value. This is particularly true when the project requires a low degree of complexity/resources to prepare the RFP response. However, in cases where more complex proposals are necessary to respond to an RFP adequately, the lack of project budget information may dissuade potential bidders from responding, leading to fewer proposals and less competition. Staff has noted a reduction in the number of proposals received for specific projects, which has led to the delay of REAP (Regional Early Action Planning Grant) program deliverables. Including the project budget in more complex RFPs or in RFPs for services where SCAG has experienced low response (fewer than three bidders) may provide the additional incentive needed to attract more bidders.

As part of the Regional Council’s Racial Equity Action plan, staff was directed to assess and align procurement procedures with diversity goals. Service providers will consider the best use of their limited staffing resources when deciding whether to respond to RFPs, and the evaluation of the adequacy of project funding is a key consideration. Small, woman-owned, DVBE, DBE, and minority-owned businesses are more likely to face the challenge of limited staffing resources, thus RFPs that do not provide project budget information may disproportionately disincentivize or prohibit these service providers from bidding.

Another factor to consider is the limited benefit SCAG receives from excluding project budget information. SCAG proposers who are more familiar and experienced with SCAG’s procurement and workplan processes can obtain budget information from our published Overall Work Program (OWP). This fact is a competitive advantage for these providers, as they can assess the adequacy of the project budget and or choose to modify their proposal accordingly (for example, assigning lower-level staff to reduce project execution costs). Ultimately, in certain cases, our current practice of not including project budget information may limit the diversity of proposers and provide an unintended competitive advantage to some who are more familiar with our processes. Providing the project budget in specific RFPs may incentivize more providers to respond, thus increasing the diversity of SCAG’s providers and leading to better economic value through more competition.

Including the project budget in the RFP is a common practice, one that is shared by similar agencies including, SACOG and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. Further, the practice does not conflict with Federal or State regulations.
Delivering the overall highest value to SCAG and the region requires thoughtful consideration and use of judgment to determine when it is appropriate to convey some financial parameters within an RFP. As such, staff requests that the Regional Council authorize staff to use professional judgment to consider including the project budget in an RFP and to do so only when it is deemed in the overall best interest of SCAG. Approval of the recommended action contained in this staff report would have the effect of rescinding the March 5, 2009, action.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
There is no immediate fiscal impact. However, by allowing more flexibility to include the project budget in an RFP, SCAG aims to expand the diversity of our service providers and incentivize existing service providers to compete for SCAG contracts leading to a larger pool of SCAG contracted service providers, a reduction in failed procurements, and improved pricing through more competition.
AGENDA ITEM 10
REPORT
Southern California Association of Governments
Hybrid (In-Person and Remote Participation)
January 5, 2022

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

From: Javiera Cartagena, Director of Government and Public Affairs
(213) 236-1980, cartagena@scag.ca.gov

Subject: SCAG Memberships and Sponsorships

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve up to $57,500 for memberships with 1) Mobility 21 ($25,000); 2) the Southern California Leadership Council ($20,000); and 3) the METRANS Transportation Center Associations Program ($12,500).

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
At its December 21, 2021, meeting, the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) recommended approval of up to $57,500 to retain memberships with 1) Mobility 21 ($25,000); 2) the Southern California Leadership Council ($20,000); and 3) the METRANS Transportation Center Associations Program ($12,500).

BACKGROUND:

| Item 1: Mobility 21 | Type: Membership | Amount: $25,000 |

Mobility 21 is a coalition of public, business, and community stakeholders to pursue regional solutions to transportation challenges facing the SCAG region and San Diego County. Created in 2002 as an effort in Los Angeles County, Mobility 21 became a regional effort in 2007 with the primary goals to:

- Support practical solutions to Southern California’s transportation challenges;
- Mobilize regional support for transportation funding and legislative priorities at the federal and state levels;
− Unite political leaders around common priorities for transportation; and
− Bring together residents, civic leaders, business groups, and industry experts to inspire them to act and educate them on how to effectively speak out in support of transportation initiatives.

SCAG is a founding member of Mobility 21, and Kome Ajise, SCAG’s Executive Director, is a member of the coalition’s board of directors.

Item 2: Southern California Leadership Council
Type: Membership  Amount: $20,000

Established in 2005, The Southern California Leadership Council (SCLC) is comprised of business and community leaders from throughout the seven counties of Southern California, including three former California Governors. The SCLC is currently partnered with many business organizations in the SCAG region, including the LA County BizFed, Inland Empire Economic Partnership, LA Area Chamber of Commerce, Orange County Business Council, and the Ventura County Economic Development Association, among others. The SCLC’s work and strategic partnerships focus on shaping and solving public policy issues such as business vitality, resources (energy, water, and environment), and transportation (goods and people) that are critical to SCAG and the region's economic vitality and quality of life. The SCLC also co-hosted (with SCAG) the 9th and 10th annual Southern California Economic Summits. SCAG Chief Operating Officer Daring Chidsey serves on the SCLC Board, and SCAG Board officers and executive leadership regularly attend SCLC meetings.

Item 3: METRANS Transportation Center Associations Program
Type: Membership  Amount: $12,500

The METRANS Transportation Center is one of the key transportation research, education, and outreach centers in the United States. With its focus on solving transportation problems of large metropolitan areas, it has used Southern California as a laboratory and developed methods to increase the efficiency and sustainability of the region's transportation systems. As a partnership of two of the largest universities in the region—University of Southern California (USC) and California State University, Long Beach (CSULB)—the Center trains the region's transportation professionals in engineering, urban planning, logistics, economics, and public policy. METRANS serves as the regional focus for research dissemination and policy outreach through conferences, workshops, and comprehensive media programs. METRANS is a United States Department of Transportation-designated University Transportation Center.

The METRANS Associates Program provides the core support for METRANS. It serves as a model of collaboration between the University community, corporations, and government agencies who come together to study emerging trends and forecasts in goods movement and international trade, discuss relevant and timely developments in transportation policy and share best practices in the
field. METRANS Associates enjoy unparalleled access to USC and CSULB faculty and other policy experts and leaders in transportation. Additionally, METRANS Associates receive access to exclusive educational opportunities and outreach programming that explore timely and relevant topics in transportation and provide access to an elite network of professionals working in the field. METRANS Associates also have access to the intellectual capital provided by graduate students and faculty at USC and CSULB, who are available to assist with a variety of planning and analysis projects within transportation.

SCAG staff is recommending that the agency maintain membership at the "Silver Partner" level in the amount of $12,500, which will provide SCAG with the following:

- Membership on the METRANS Advisory Board;
- METRANS approved/recommended intern (master's student) for one semester (20 hours per week);
- Opportunities to propose special topical events related to current transportation issues;
- Customized opportunities for student engagement and recruitment;
- Sponsorship acknowledgment and participation in the annual Careers in Transportation panel;
- Feature article in various METRANS/CITT publications and online media;
- Admission to all METRANS events and VIP receptions, including four (4) complimentary admissions to the biennial International Urban Freight Conference (I-NUF); and
- Recognition on METRANS website and other communication materials and at all METRANS events, including: I-NUF, Town Hall meetings, and the annual Seminar Series.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTION:
Staff presented the memberships for 1) Mobility 21 ($25,000), 2) the Southern California Leadership Council ($20,000), and 3) the METRANS Transportation Center Associations Program ($12,500) to the LCMC at its meeting on December 21, 2021. The LCMC approved all three items as part of its consent calendar.

FISCAL IMPACT:
$57,500 for SCAG’s memberships with Mobility 21, the Southern California Leadership Council, and METRANS is included in the approved FY 21-22 General Fund budget.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Receive and File

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians. 2: Advance Southern California's policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
This is a quarterly status report on progress made on the Executive Committee’s Work Plan since October 2021.

BACKGROUND:
This is a progress report following up on the EAC Work Plan developed through an interactive EAC and Executive Staff retreat held in June 2021 and adopted by the EAC and RC at the October 2021 meeting.

Following the June 24th Special EAC meeting, the EAC established clear direction and focus for the executive staff related to its goals and priorities and further communicated its desire for staff to blend the results into the future update to SCAG’s Strategic Plan and related work planning. This work plan will remain a fluid and evolving document to be revisited at regular intervals for progress and re-shifting of priorities, as needed.

Staff expects to start the wholistic update to the Strategic Plan in 2022. A consultant has been selected and staff is working through the final stages of executing the contract. This process will be discussed further with the EAC after the consultant has been brought on board.
Priority Area 1: Regional Policy Development—Regional Plan Update

Connect SoCal, SCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, provides a regional vision for Southern California’s future and establishes the overarching policies and strategies that guide SCAG’s regional plans and programs. As staff initiates the process of updating the plan in FY 22, the following goals will be prioritized through the specific actions outlined below.

**Goals**

- To build collaborative relationships with stakeholders on policy issues
- To advance clean transportation across Southern California
- To be visionaries for infrastructure and the environment for the next generations
- To find connectivity in modes of transportation and to be the center of collaboration
- To help make local leaders better – leadership development

**Actions**

1. **Elevate & Expand Policy Leadership**

To develop visionary policies to advance the EAC’s goals, staff will pursue process improvements that enable elected leaders to more actively engage with each other and staff to set policy direction and lead policy discussions for Connect SoCal. This will include:

   a. Changing the process for agenda development and staffing of Policy Chairs to give policy makers a greater role in agenda setting. Create an opportunity for report-outs from Policy Committees for greater awareness and coordination across committees (October 2021)

   **Ongoing.** Meetings held with Executive Director, Chair and Vice-Chair of each committee in October to establish annual priorities. A Planning Executive and Regional Affairs Officer have been assigned to support each Chair, align agenda development with established priorities, and hold monthly briefings to identify any emerging issues to be brought forward to the committees. A process for Chairs to report-out on the work of the committee is under-development and will be finalized when a regular format and schedule of the legislative body, post COVID-19 pandemic a public health emergency, has been determined.

   b. Creating opportunities for leadership development and mentorship among Chairs and Vice Chairs (Ongoing)

   **Ongoing.** SCAG has developed a series of trainings that will support elected officials and interested stakeholders better understand how to advance policy solutions to increase the supply and availability of affordable housing. The SCAG Housing Policy Leadership Academy (SCAG-HPLA) will offer a 10-session online training starting in February 2022.
c. Working with the Executive Officers and the Policy Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs to develop a Policy Development Framework for 2024 Connect SoCal that identifies priority policy issues for deeper discussion and establishes a sub-committee structure for policy education, engagement, and consensus building to guide visionary policy development (March 2022)

*On-track. Work with President and Executive Officers to outline process for developing framework anticipated to begin in January 2022.*

2. **Strengthen Stakeholder Engagement**

To build collaborative relationships and strengthen stakeholder engagement in regional policy development, staff will:

a. Provide opportunities to highlight SCAG’s work and best practices throughout the region through Board Officer site visits and briefings, including collaboration with existing and new stakeholders and policy makers (Ongoing)

*Ongoing. President Lorimore, along with Board Officers, Regional Councilmembers, and SCAG staff continue to lead site tours across our 6-county region in partnership with member cities to highlight SCAG programs and projects. These included at least fifteen visits to cities such as Anaheim, Brea, Long Beach, Murrieta, Placentia, and Yorba Linda; a number of organizations such as BizFed, Greater Ontario Business Council, Milken, Ontario Airport, Orange County Council of Governments (OCCOG), and Western Riverside County Council of Governments (WRCOG); and others. During these visits, President Lorimore met with local elected officials, visited SCAG Go Human demonstrations, toured SCAG funded projects, and more.*

b. Develop a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy for the 2024 Connect SoCal Plan based on SCAG’s updated Public Participation Plan currently under development, including latest technologies, emphasis on equity and increased participation from tribal governments (Due Spring 2022)

*On-track. A request for proposals is under-development to procure a consultant by Spring 2022 to develop a comprehensive strategy that aligns with the Public Participation Plan. Update to be provided to the Regional Council as part of the February Joint Policy Committee on Connect SoCal 2024.*
c. Enhance strategic partnerships with members of the business community, including members of SCAG’s Global Land-Use & Economic Council (GLUE). Leverage existing and potential SCAG memberships and sponsorships to promote and share SCAG’s mission and work (Ongoing)

_Ongoing_

d. Host bi-monthly meetings and improve communications with the Executive Directors of the sub-regional councils of governments to improve the flow of information to local jurisdictions and increase local engagement in the plan development process (Ongoing)

_Ongoing_

e. Host bi-annual meetings with City Managers to increase engagement in SCAG’s planning process and improve awareness of member benefits (Ongoing)

Work underway to plan outreach event(s) this Spring to align with the “kick-off” of the Connect SoCal 2024 local data exchange process and to promote resources available through the Regional Data Platform. Briefings and visits to SCAG’s Subregional Council of Governments are scheduled to begin in the new year.

Priority Area #2: Leadership in Resource Deployment—Connect SoCal Implementation

Build upon the framework established in the Connect SoCal Implementation Strategy to expand and develop new programs with federal and state resources, including REAP 2021, that advance the following goals:

**Goals**

- To be the leader in resource deployment and convenor of biggest challenges and best practices
- To support efforts to accelerate housing production across Southern California
- To be leaders in the roll out of technologies to communities
- To be good innovators in our region

**Actions**

1. _Pursue REAP 2021 Resources (January 2022)_

Established as a part of AB 140 for the FY 21-22 state budget, approximately $600 million is available statewide for the Regional Early Action Planning Grant Program for 2021 (REAP 2021). The SCAG region’s formula share is estimated to be $246 million, of which an initial allocation of 10
percent of funds are available starting January 1, 2022. In October, staff will prepare a REAP 2021 Program Development Framework for review by the Policy Committees that is based upon the above Leadership in Resource Deployment goals, supports implementation of Connect SoCal, and can be delivered within the funding constraints of the program. Staff will then prepare an application for funding based on the Program Development Framework for EAC consideration in November and Regional Council approval in January 2022.

Staff presented a draft REAP 2021 Program Development Framework to the Board in October 2021 and continues to provide feedback to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to ensure the funding guidelines align with the priorities identified in the framework. HCD’s process for releasing program guidance and the application for initial funding allocations has been delayed. Assuming an application is released by HCD in early January 2022, SCAG staff anticipates returning to the EAC and Regional Council in February 2022 for authorization to pursue an initial allocation of REAP 2021 resources to support program development and pursue early action items, as authorized by HCD.

2. Accelerate deployment of general plan development tools. (Due Spring 2022)

Complete the first phase of the Regional Data Platform focused on the development and deployment of general plan development tools. Pursue additional resources including as part of REAP 2021 to leverage the capacity of RDP to advance the Leadership in Resource Deployment goals.

On-track. Work underway to roll-out the RDP to local agencies this Spring in coordination with the Connect SoCal 2024 local data exchange process. Enhancements are being discussed internally and with subregional agencies and stakeholders for consideration in the FY 22-23 budget development process and SCAG’s REAP 2021 application.

Priority Area #3: Legislative Action

Develop more targeted legislative strategies focused on key policy initiatives. Augment and amplify SCAG’s legislative advocacy program to include taking stronger positions on pending legislative bills and SCAG sponsored legislation.

Goals
  • To lead in legislative advocacy

Under the leadership of the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC), and within the parameters of the Regional Council adopted Legislative Platform, be courageous in adopting formal positions that express the Southern California region’s legislative concerns,
identify legislative solutions to regional challenges that affect SCAG’s member agencies and stakeholders, and sponsor legislation to secure the tools needed to achieve state and federal transportation and climate goals.

Areas of consideration for focus include, but are not limited to, the following:

State:
- Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Reform – While incorporating the lessons learned from SCAG’s 2021 RHNA process, participate in HCD’s RHNA “Reform” Committee and identify legislative solutions that will improve future cycles of the RHNA.
- Senate Bill (SB) 375 Reform – Participate and heavily engage in legislative efforts that would update and modernize the state’s SB 375 Program, which establishes the regional GHG reduction and SCS processes.
- Housing Production Incentives – In the prolonged absence of redevelopment, continue to advocate for state-supported tools that enable local agencies to implement their housing programs, according to their local visions.
- Brown Act Reform – Support the modernization of the Brown Act to increase public participation and support the wide-spread adoption of virtual meetings and other technologies.

Federal:
- Federal Reauthorization Implementation – Monitor, apply, and advocate for funding opportunities that support SCAG programs and regional projects that implement Connect SoCal.
- Southern California Freight-Goods Movements – Monitor, apply, and advocate for initiatives that maximize the Southern California region’s share of federal funding opportunities that support our region’s freight and goods movement sector.

Actions

1. Dedicated policy discussion on the LCMC agenda to discuss and develop potential legislative efforts, such as the RHNA Reform or Brown Act Reform policy framework (Due September and November 2021)
   a. Staff provided a report on September 1, 2021 to the EAC committing the LCMC to discuss and evaluate legislation ideas that could lead to SCAG sponsorship of legislative bills. Three meetings have been held from September through December with the LCMC to further refine legislative topics and ideas for SCAG sponsorship.
   b. Staff in conjunction with SCAG’s state lobbyist has and continues to conduct research, survey LCMC members, identify influential legislators and key stakeholders
as well as identify potential partnership opportunities with other public agencies, private sector leaders and trade/or advocacy organizations.

2. Create regional consensus on legislative bill language based on selected policy or policies (Due in Jan 2022)
   a. Ongoing

3. With the assistance of SCAG’s lobbying teams, conduct legislative advocacy meetings with the chairs and members of the committees of jurisdiction over the identified and chosen SCAG legislative ideas/frameworks (November and December 2021)
   a. SCAG leadership attended various meetings throughout the region hosted by the California State Assembly Housing Working Group. Additional meetings with key members of the Assembly Housing Committee have also been scheduled.

4. Identify legislative sponsor(s) to introduce legislation (January 2022)
   a. Ongoing

5. Develop strategy to engage SCAG members and broader stakeholders to create a robust coalition in support of SCAG’s legislative ideas (April 2022)
   a. Ongoing

6. SCAG staff representation in HCD’s RHNA reform efforts (Ongoing)
   a. Ongoing

7. Convene regional partners to identify and pursue federal funding opportunities for regionally significant infrastructure projects (Monthly)
   a. SCAG provided 13 letters of support to the Federal Transportation Administration’s “Bus and Bus Facilities Program.”

8. Leverage membership organizations, such as Coalition for America’s Gateways and Trade Corridors and the Regional Broadband Consortium, to influence guidance for funding opportunities (Ongoing)
   a. Ongoing

Priority Area #4: Technology/Innovation Leadership
Create environment for sharing of innovation to advance work in local and regional planning to address the pressing issues facing the region. By providing a forum for innovation sharing, SCAG leads the region in advancing the adoption of effective and efficient technologies for improving mobility, sustainability, and equity.
**Goals**
- To be leaders in the roll out of technologies to communities
- To be good innovators in our region

**Actions**

Work with Policy Committees and the Emerging Technologies Committee (ETC) to provide the best available information and tools to our member jurisdictions, including completing activities and promoting lessons learned from the Future Communities Initiative. SCAG must also lead by adopting and using the best available technology in areas of our work.

1. **Implement and Continue to Refine Broadband Work Plan (Ongoing)**

Continue work to implement Resolution No. 21-629-2, which pledges SCAG to assist in bridging the digital divide in underserved communities. The Transportation Committee and Regional Council will receive a report on progress in September and provide guidance on next steps.

*SCAG staff continues to make progress on priorities for bridging the digital divide as outlined in Resolution No. 21-629-2. This included the release of a Joint Request for Qualifications for Prospective Partnerships with SANDAG to identify partners in the public, non-profit and private sectors interested in collaborating on federal and state funding proposals to implement projects that reach unserved and underserved communities. Additional resources to support the development and implementation of SCAG’s Broadband Work Program were approved by the EAC on behalf of the RC in December as part of Budget Amendment #2. SCAG staff is also pursuing authorization from the EAC and RC in January 2022 to accept a $250,000 grant from the California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF) to support regional broadband planning.*

2. **Launch Regional Data Platform (Fall 2021)**

The Regional Data Platform (RDP) will provide a modern system for holistic planning across the region, fostering a more sustainable and equitable future for Southern California. The RDP will launch this fall providing a robust system for regional data sharing and collaboration in addition to providing long-range planning tools to all member agencies to facilitate better planning at all levels.

*Launch delayed and anticipated in Spring 2022 to align with engagement for the local data exchange process for Connect SoCal 2024. Outreach on the RDP has continued over the last quarter, including with SCAG’s Technical Working Group and Subregional Executive Directors, to keep stakeholders engaged in the tool development and updated on the project schedule.*
3. Share Best Practices from Future Communities Pilot Program (Due June 2022)

In 2018, SCAG and the Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Committee (MSRC) made available a new $2.7 million grant opportunity that would allow local cities and counties to implement new technology and data solutions, while also reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and implementing SCAG’s 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. As pilots conclude this year, SCAG will develop a report and share best practices to support policy development, improve processes for government service provision, and enhance innovative engagement practices with private sector mobility providers.

On-track. The program experienced some initial setbacks due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic but otherwise remains on-track. The individual pilots are moving through implementation and data collection, and the program evaluation team continues to monitor, record, and analyze key performance indicators, focusing on the effectiveness of the pilots to reduce VMT and air pollution. When the pilots conclude, SCAG will disseminate project summaries, significant findings, and recommendations for replicability throughout the SCAG region, followed by the release of the final report.

4. Agile IT Phase 2 (Due March 2022)

Continue work to upgrade and modernize SCAG information technology infrastructure, GIS tools, and internal systems to provide staff the most reliable, resilient, and productive technologies for work across the region.

Work is underway and on schedule implementing key deliverables of Agile IT Phase 2. Notable milestones include set up of SCAG’s new secondary datacenter, migration from ADFS to Azure AD as part of our single-sign-on strategy, application monitoring configuration, and network circuit and equipment upgrades as key infrastructure modernization continues.

FISCAL IMPACT:
None identified at this time. The work included in the 2021/22 work plan is budgeted, however, during the year staff may bring back necessary amendments to the budget to address the needs related to the Priority Areas. Resources were added in Budget Amendment #2 to support Broadband planning and the $250,000 CETF grant will be added in Budget Amendment #3. REAP 2021 resources will be allocated in a future budget amendment after approval by HCD.
AGENDA ITEM 12
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
Hybrid (In-Person and Remote Participation)
January 5, 2022

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

From: Cindy Giraldo, Chief Financial Officer
(213) 630-1413, giraldo@scag.ca.gov

Subject: Purchase Orders $5,000 - $199,999; Contracts $25,000 - $199,999 and Amendments $5,000 - $74,999

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Information Only - No Action Required

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 7: Secure funding to support agency priorities to effectively and efficiently deliver work products.

BACKGROUND:

SCAG executed the following Purchase Orders (PO’s) for more than $5,000 but less than $200,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>PO Purpose</th>
<th>PO Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALCOG</td>
<td>FY22 CALCOG Membership Dues</td>
<td>$43,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royce Carlton Inc</td>
<td>2021 Economic Summit Keynote Speaker</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planetbids Inc.</td>
<td>FY22 PlanetBids Software Subscription</td>
<td>$15,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Paradigm Consulting Inc.</td>
<td>FY22 Consulting Services</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadient Leasing USA Inc.</td>
<td>FY22 Mail Machine Lease</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCAG executed the following Contracts more than $25,000 but less than $200,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant/Contract #</th>
<th>Contract’s Purpose</th>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various (21-047-C01 through 21-047-C19)</td>
<td>Monthly report on Regional Early Action Plan Program (REAP) on-call services.</td>
<td>Various (as identified in the attachment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCAG executed these Amendments for more than $5,000 but less than $75,000 and less than 30% of the original contract value
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant/Contract #</th>
<th>Amendment’s Purpose</th>
<th>Amendment Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. Contract Summary 21-047-C01 through C19
CONSULTANT CONTRACT NOS. 21-047-C01 THROUGH 21-047-C19
MONTHLY REAP FOLLOW UP

Selected Consultants:
1. AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
2. Arup North America, Ltd.
3. Ascent Environmental, Inc.
4. BAE Urban Economics, Inc.
5. CTY Housing, Inc.
6. ECONorthwest
7. Estolano Advisors
8. HR&A Advisors Inc.
11. LeSar Development Consultants
12. National Community Renaissance of California
14. Raimi + Associates
15. Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
16. RDC-S111 (dba Studio One Eleven)
17. Terner Housing Innovation Labs, Inc.
18. Woodsong Associates, LLC
19. WSP USA Inc.

Background & Scope of Work:

On April 1, 2021, the Regional Council approved a procurement program to accelerate project delivery for the Regional Early Action Plan Program (REAP) and requested staff to report back monthly on procurement activities related to the On Call Services for the REAP Program. This report is to inform the RC of those activities. This report is to inform the Regional Council of procurement activities, contracts and amendments related to the On-call Services for the REAP Program.

In summary, the REAP Program provides a new model for timely implementation of SCAG’s local assistance programs and the Regional Council has approved the following:

(1) Authorized staff to enter into up to a total of $10,000,000 in On Call Services contracts to implement the Regional Council’s approved REAP work program, upon completion of competitive procurement and selection of consultants for the On Call Services;

(2) Waived SCAG’s procurement requirement to first obtain the Executive/Administration Committee’s and Regional Council’s approval for contracts at or above $200,000 prior to execution, for any individual contract up to $500,000 awarded to complete work that is part of the Regional Council’s approved REAP grant funded program and authorization for the Executive Director or his/her designee to execute such contracts upon consultation with legal counsel;

(3) Waived SCAG’s procurement requirement necessitating Executive/Administration Committee’s and Regional Council approval prior to entering any contract amendment exceeding $75,000 or 30% (whichever is less) and, instead, requiring amendments of 30% or more to be first approved by the Executive/Administration Committee and Regional Council, and authorizing the Executive Director or his/her designed to execute such amendments upon
consultation with legal counsel; and (4) directing staff to make monthly informational reports to the Regional Council of procurement activities, contracts and amendments related to REAP made pursuant to this action.

Project’s Benefits & Key Deliverables: The project’s benefits and key deliverables include, but are not limited to:
- Supporting local jurisdictions in the update of their Housing Elements;
- Assistance with integrated land use planning, urban design and land use policy;
- Assistance with community development finance;
- Assistance with racial equity analysis and training; and
- Assistance with Grant Writing and Grant Program Administration.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

Contract Amount: Total not to exceed $10,000,000

Note: This is for on-call, or as needed services with consultants to be paid upon a Task Order award. As such, there is no specific award amount to each consultant, nor does SCAG guarantee any specific amount of work to a consultant. Therefore, the amount that may be funded to each consultant is not yet determined.

Contract Period: June 2021 through December 31, 2023

Project Number(s): 300.4887.01 – 300.4887.04
300.4888.01
300.4889.01 – 300.4889.04
300.4890.01 – 300.4890.02
300.4891.01 – 300.4891.02

Funding source(s): REAP Program Grant

Update Below is a table showing the on-call services procurements, and their status at present. Any future dates are subject to change, and procurements may be added or removed to this list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>RFP Released</th>
<th>Awarded to (Consultant)</th>
<th>Amount of Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;O-1 Leadership Academy</td>
<td>5/3/2021</td>
<td>LeSar Development Consultants</td>
<td>$815,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPS-1 CEQA</td>
<td>5/25/2021</td>
<td>Ascent Environmental, Inc.</td>
<td>$337,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 1-A - Advanced ADU Bundle</td>
<td>6/30/2021</td>
<td>AECOM Technical Services, Inc.</td>
<td>$546,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP-1 WSOCOG REAP SRP Project Westside Development Constraints Cost and Land Use Regulation Policy Actions</td>
<td>8/12/2021</td>
<td>Arup North America, Ltd.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPS-2 Other to Residential</td>
<td>7/16/2021</td>
<td>Studio One Eleven</td>
<td>$137,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 1-B Preliminary ADU Bundle</td>
<td>8/4/2021</td>
<td>Woodsong Associates, LLC</td>
<td>$534,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 2-A EIFD Bundle</td>
<td>7/30/2021</td>
<td>Kosmont &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>$579,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 3-A Objective Development Standards</td>
<td>8/26/21</td>
<td>One bid only (*2nd release in Parts please see below)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 2-D One San Pedro EIFD Study</td>
<td>8/11/2021</td>
<td>Kosmont &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>$229,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>RFP Released</td>
<td>Awarded to (Consultant)</td>
<td>Amount of Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP-3 N. La County/Palmdale Digital Utility Data Inventory Tool for Housing</td>
<td>8/11/2021</td>
<td>No bids (<strong>2nd release please see below</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 2-C Heart of Hollywood TIF Study</td>
<td>8/19/2021</td>
<td>TBD (Closed 10/4/21)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 2-B Palmdale Housing Project</td>
<td>9/24/2021</td>
<td>TBD (Closed 11/3/21)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 3-E South El Monte Comprehensive Zoning Update</td>
<td>10/1/2021</td>
<td>TBD (Closed 11/10/21)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 3-C Rialto Specific Plan Merger and Update</td>
<td>10/14/21</td>
<td>TBD (Closed 11/24/21)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP-2 SFVCOG Mapping Application Tool</td>
<td>11/29/21</td>
<td>TBD (Closes 1/11/22)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 3-A1 Objective Development Standards</td>
<td>10/27/21</td>
<td>TBD (Closed 12/3/21)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 3-A2 Objective Development Standards</td>
<td>10/27/21</td>
<td>TBD (Closed 12/3/21)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD 1-A LA Metro Strategic Planning for Housing Acceleration</td>
<td>Expected: Late 2021</td>
<td>Expected: Early 2022</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Below are RFPs anticipated to be released to the bench**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>RFP Released</th>
<th>Awarded to (Consultant)</th>
<th>Amount of Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RRA – Regional Resiliency Analysis</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Expected: Early 2022</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD 1-B LA Metro Community Collaboration For Equitable Housing Acceleration</td>
<td>Expected: 12/2021</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSD 3-D Burbank Media District Specific Plan</td>
<td>Expected: 11/2021</td>
<td>Expected: 12/2021</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC 1 Pomona</td>
<td>Expected: Late 2021</td>
<td>Expected: Early 2022</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCC 2 Riverside</td>
<td>Expected: Late 2021</td>
<td>Expected: Early 2022</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD 2 Metrolink Station Areas Analysis</td>
<td>Expected: Late 2021</td>
<td>Expected: Early 2022</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP-4 Subregion Joint ADU Project-OCOCO/VCOG/GCCOG</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The below RFPs will be/have been re-released on Planet Bids due to insufficient responses.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>RFP Released</th>
<th>Awarded to (Consultant)</th>
<th>Amount of Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRP-3 N. La County/Palmdale Digital Utility Data Inventory Tool for Housing (re-release)</td>
<td>10/14/2021</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRP-1 A WSCCOG REAP Subregional Partnership Project (Project #2 and #4) (re-release)</td>
<td>Expected: Late 2021</td>
<td>TBD*</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Information Only - No Action Required

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 7: Secure funding to support agency priorities to effectively and efficiently deliver work products.

MEMBERSHIP DUES:
As of December 13, 2021, 180 cities and 5 counties had paid their FY22 dues. This represents 92.59% of the dues assessment. 6 cities and 1 county have yet to pay their dues.

BUDGET & GRANTS (B&G):
Staff analyzed and validated the requests received for FY 2022-23 (FY23) Comprehensive Budget and OWP. The preliminary analysis and data were shared with each division and the requests were further reviewed and discussed by the Executive Team. A draft budget will be presented to the EAC and RC in March 2022.

Staff also reviewed and provided comments to the framework paper for the Regional Early Action Planning Grants of 2021 (REAP 2.0), which was issued in November 2021. SCAG is eligible for advance application and staff is currently preparing the application materials to request up to 10% of program funds under formula allocation for Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Council of Governments (COGs).

CONTRACTS:
In November 2021, the Contracts Department issued two (2) Request for Proposals; awarded two (2) contracts; issued four (4) contract amendments; and processed 30 Purchase Orders to support ongoing business and enterprise operations. Staff also administered 157 consultant contracts. Contracts staff continued to negotiate better pricing as well as reduced costs for services. This
month Contracts’ staff negotiated $51,905 in budget savings, bringing the Fiscal Year total to $302,729 in savings.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. CFO Charts 010622
As of December 13, 2021, 180 cities and 5 counties had paid their FY22 dues. This represents 92.59% of the dues assessment. 6 cities and 1 county had yet to pay their dues.

### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY22 Membership Dues</td>
<td>$2,194,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Collected</td>
<td>$2,032,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Collected</td>
<td>92.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of Indirect Cost (IC), incurred by SCAG vs. IC recovered from SCAG's grants.

Through November 2021, SCAG was over-recovered by $1,634,248.99 due to unspent Indirect Cost budget. This is in line with the over-recovery built into the FY22 IC rate.
### Office of the CFO

**Consolidated Balance Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2021</th>
<th>11/30/2021</th>
<th>Incr (decr) to equity</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash at Bank of the West</td>
<td>$5,588,562</td>
<td>$13,689,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues of $9.9M and Expenses of $4.2M both on cash basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA County Investment Pool</td>
<td>$6,492,681</td>
<td>$4,130,149</td>
<td></td>
<td>Payments of $5.89M from FHWA PL, $2.36M from FTA5303, $838K from OTS, $307K from FY19 ATP Local Planning Initiative, $230K from FY22 SB1 SC Formula, $133K from TDA, $66K from memberships, $33K from City of LA, $29K from FY20 ATP Imperial County Project, $20K from DOE, and $9K from Sponsorship and Misc items, offset by billings of $2.2M to FHWA PL, $962K to FTA5303, $69K to FY22 SB1 SC Formula, $1.1M to MSRC and $42K AR Unbilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash &amp; Investments</td>
<td>$12,081,244</td>
<td>$17,819,399</td>
<td>$5,738,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>$17,353,207</td>
<td>$11,951,006</td>
<td>$(5,402,201)</td>
<td>Increase in liabilities due to 10 unpaid working days in November and 5 in October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Assets</td>
<td>$(509,232)</td>
<td>$(88,066)</td>
<td>$421,167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets - Net Book Value</td>
<td>$5,433,945</td>
<td>$5,433,945</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$34,359,164</td>
<td>$35,116,284</td>
<td>$757,121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$(455,902)</td>
<td>$(1,521,701)</td>
<td>$(1,065,799)</td>
<td>Increase in Accounts Payable due to decrease in Contracts $905K and AP $160K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-related Liabilities</td>
<td>$(400,446)</td>
<td>$(607,261)</td>
<td>$(206,815)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>$(7,707,535)</td>
<td>$(7,707,535)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Liabilities and Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>$(8,563,883)</td>
<td>$(9,836,497)</td>
<td>$(1,272,614)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>$25,795,280</td>
<td>$25,279,787</td>
<td>$(515,493)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WORKING CAPITAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10/31/2021</th>
<th>11/30/2021</th>
<th>Incr (decr) to working capital</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$12,081,244</td>
<td>$17,819,399</td>
<td>$5,738,155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Receivable</td>
<td>$17,353,207</td>
<td>$11,951,006</td>
<td>$(5,402,201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$(455,902)</td>
<td>$(1,521,701)</td>
<td>$(1,065,799)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-related Liabilities</td>
<td>$(400,446)</td>
<td>$(607,261)</td>
<td>$(206,815)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Capital</td>
<td>$28,578,103</td>
<td>$27,641,443</td>
<td>$(936,660)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comprehensive Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>Budget Balance</th>
<th>% Budget Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Staff &amp; Allocated Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>257,016</td>
<td>257,016</td>
<td>76,675</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>180,341</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 51001 Allocated Indirect Costs</td>
<td>363,202</td>
<td>363,202</td>
<td>108,349</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>254,853</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 54300 SCAG Consultants</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>276,004</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>168,978</td>
<td>41,026</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 54340 Legal costs</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 55440 Payroll, bank fees</td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>11,809</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 55580 Outreach/Advisement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 55600 SCAG Memberships</td>
<td>127,600</td>
<td>127,600</td>
<td>62,617</td>
<td>25,511</td>
<td>39,472</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 55610 Professional Membership</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>2,670</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 55620 Res mat/sub</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 55730 Capital Outlay &gt; $5,000</td>
<td>1,512,183</td>
<td>1,512,183</td>
<td>109,988</td>
<td>899,269</td>
<td>502,927</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 55840 Training Registration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,996</td>
<td>11,996</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 55860 Scholarships</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 55910 RC/Committee Mtgs</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 55912 RC Retreat</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 55914 RC General Assembly</td>
<td>611,500</td>
<td>611,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>611,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 55915 Demographic Workshop</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 55916 Economic Summit</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>89,252</td>
<td>51,075</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 55918 Housing Summit</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 55920 Other Meeting Expense</td>
<td>86,500</td>
<td>86,500</td>
<td>2,320</td>
<td>19,259</td>
<td>64,921</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 55xxx Miscellaneous other</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>12,897</td>
<td>52,052</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 55940 Stipend - RC Meetings</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>202,000</td>
<td>81,270</td>
<td>120,730</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 56100 Printing</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 58100 Travel - outside SCAG region</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 58101 Travel - local</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>46,212</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 58110 Mileage - local</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31,466</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 58150 Travel Lodging</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12,977</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 58800 RC Sponsorships</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>26,931</td>
<td>127,869</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Total General Fund</td>
<td>4,213,001</td>
<td>4,213,001</td>
<td>563,333</td>
<td>1,296,543</td>
<td>2,533,125</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Total OWP, FTA Pass Thru &amp; TDA</td>
<td>144,250,025</td>
<td>188,571,449</td>
<td>23,148,364</td>
<td>40,550,876</td>
<td>120,872,208</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Comprehensive Budget</td>
<td>148,463,026</td>
<td>188,784,450</td>
<td>23,711,697</td>
<td>41,847,419</td>
<td>123,255,334</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDIRECT COST EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Commitments</th>
<th>Budget Balance</th>
<th>% Budget Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 50010 Regular Staff</td>
<td>7,746,533</td>
<td>7,746,533</td>
<td>3,361,395</td>
<td>4,385,138</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 50013 Regular OT</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 5014 Interns, Temps, Annuit</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>14,144</td>
<td>63,857</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 50016 Retired Annuitant</td>
<td>25,150</td>
<td>24,367</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 5030 Severance</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>17,288</td>
<td>56,712</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 51xxx Allocated Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>6,077,056</td>
<td>6,077,056</td>
<td>2,647,486</td>
<td>3,429,570</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 54300 SCAG Consultants</td>
<td>1,961,819</td>
<td>1,940,669</td>
<td>649,668</td>
<td>1,291,000</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 54301 Consultants - Other</td>
<td>731,000</td>
<td>781,000</td>
<td>89,230</td>
<td>432,358</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 54340 Legal</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 5520 Network and Communications</td>
<td>304,000</td>
<td>304,000</td>
<td>90,996</td>
<td>83,252</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 55210 Software Support</td>
<td>548,900</td>
<td>508,400</td>
<td>224,547</td>
<td>283,853</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 55220 Hardware Supp</td>
<td>940,817</td>
<td>853,577</td>
<td>35,980</td>
<td>100,145</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 55240 Repair &amp; Maint Non-IT</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>26,500</td>
<td>5,174</td>
<td>21,326</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 55251 Infrastructure Cloud Services</td>
<td>623,465</td>
<td>658,465</td>
<td>131,031</td>
<td>51,462</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 55271 On-Prem Software</td>
<td>247,690</td>
<td>247,690</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 55275 Co-location Services</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>49,658</td>
<td>100,145</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 55315 F&amp;F Interest</td>
<td>4,376</td>
<td>4,376</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 55325 AV Interest</td>
<td>8,162</td>
<td>8,162</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 55400 Office Rent DTLA</td>
<td>2,302,445</td>
<td>2,302,445</td>
<td>1,165,102</td>
<td>1,137,268</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 55410 Office Rent Satellite</td>
<td>278,200</td>
<td>278,200</td>
<td>64,095</td>
<td>78,424</td>
<td>135,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 55415 Office Supplies</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 55420 Equip Leases</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>21,268</td>
<td>38,732</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 55430 Equip Repairs &amp; Maint</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 55435 Security Services</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>21,876</td>
<td>78,124</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 55440 Insurance</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td>14,009</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 55441 Payroll / Bank Fees</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 55450 Taxes</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 55460 Mater &amp; Equip &lt; $5,000 *</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>2,831</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>51,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 55510 Office Supplies</td>
<td>73,800</td>
<td>73,800</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>59,104</td>
<td>11,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 55520 Graphic Supplies</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 55530 Telephone</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 55540 Postage</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 55550 Delivery Svc</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,259</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 55600 SCAG Memberships</td>
<td>102,200</td>
<td>102,200</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>101,200</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 55610 Prof Memberships</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 55611 Prof Dues</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 55620 Res MatSrv/Subscription</td>
<td>59,100</td>
<td>57,100</td>
<td>25,064</td>
<td>7,209</td>
<td>24,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 55630 COVID Facility Expenses</td>
<td>53,740</td>
<td>8,966</td>
<td>7,131</td>
<td>37,644</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 55633 Deprec - Furn &amp; Fixt</td>
<td>250,330</td>
<td>250,330</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>250,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 55700 Amortize - Leasehold Improvements</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 55790 Recruitment Notices</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>22,939</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 55791 Recruitment - other</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>5,419</td>
<td>27,856</td>
<td>11,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 55810 Public Notice</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 55820 In House Training</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 55830 Networking Meetings/Special Events</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>19,810</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 55840 Training Registration</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>12,217</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 55920 Other Mfg Exp</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 55xxx Miscellaneous - other</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 56100 Printing</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>7,628</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 58100 Travel - Outside</td>
<td>83,300</td>
<td>80,800</td>
<td>1,478</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 58101 Travel - Local</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,616</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 58110 Mileage - Local</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 58120 Travel Agent Fees</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Total Indirect Cost</td>
<td>23,891,359</td>
<td>23,891,359</td>
<td>8,873,368</td>
<td>4,121,537</td>
<td>10,896,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview
This chart shows the number of contracts administered by the Contracts division, by month, from July 2020 thru November 2021.

Summary
As illustrated on the chart, the Contracts Department is currently managing a total of 157 contracts. Forty-one (41) are Cost Plus Fee contracts; seventy-eight (78) are Lump Sum (formerly Fixed Price) contracts, and the remaining thirty-eight (38) are Time and Materials (T&M) contracts (includes Labor Hour and Retainer contracts). Note, due to the nature of SCAG’s work, the majority of SCAG contracts have a one year term and end on June 30th each year.
Staffing Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Authorized Positions</th>
<th>Filled Positions</th>
<th>Vacant Positions</th>
<th>Interns/Temps</th>
<th>Agency Temps</th>
<th>Volunteers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Office</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Programs</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CalPERS Membership

- Classic, 78, 45%
- PEPRA, 95, 55%
CFO Report
As of November 1, 2021

Vacation Update

Vacation Usage FY22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours Used</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,891.60</td>
<td>$306,453.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>47.03</td>
<td>$2,946.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Staff</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Staff</td>
<td>60.12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vacation Cash Out Pilot Program Usage in FY22 and FY21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY22 Hours Used</th>
<th>FY22 Cost</th>
<th>FY21 Hours Used</th>
<th>FY21 Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$10,894.40</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>$81,956.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$2,178.88</td>
<td>39.33</td>
<td>$2,731.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,227.00</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,352.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>40 (max)</td>
<td>$2,866.80</td>
<td>40 (max)</td>
<td>$5,568.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Staff</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Information only – No Action Required. Discussion and input requested.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
At the November 3, 2021 Executive/Administration (EAC) meeting SCAG staff updated the committee on the potential format of legislative body meetings in 2022. At that time, staff presented several options for the eventual return to “in person” meetings of SCAG’s Regional Council (RC), the EAC, and the Policy Committees. Feedback was solicited and EAC members provided input. Since the November EAC meeting, SCAG staff has met to consider advantages and disadvantages of several meeting models and the input given by the EAC, including: hybrid meetings (i.e., meetings with both remote and in-person components), fully remote meetings, in-person meetings, and holding Policy Committee meetings on different days/weeks from the monthly RC meeting.

As you know, the EAC has been meeting in a hybrid meeting format since September 2021. The RC and other committees continue to hold their meetings remotely. Nevertheless, as reported in November and based on input from this committee, staff is reviewing public health, operational and agency considerations as the new year begins to ascertain an optimal way to increase in-person participation for EAC, RC and Policy Committee members and members of the public. Further, President Lorimore has expressed interest in potentially holding the February RC, EAC and Policy Committee meetings in a hybrid format (rather than just holding the EAC meeting in hybrid format).

This report updates the EAC on staff efforts to review various options since initially reporting to the EAC in November. Additionally, and importantly, staff seeks input from the EAC on holding
February’s RC and Policy Committee meetings in a hybrid format, compared to the remote format that has been used since mid-2020.

BACKGROUND:
SCAG’s legislative bodies continue to meet remotely pursuant to recent amendments to the Brown Act, known as Assembly Bill 361 (AB 361), following gubernatorial declaration establishing the COVID-19 pandemic a public health emergency in the State of California – a declaration that was made in March of 2020 and continues to this day. Generally, the Brown Act permits “remote” or “virtual” meetings if the locations of all teleconferenced meeting sites are identified on the agenda and if the public is able to attend in-person at all teleconference locations (Govt. Code § 54953(b)(3)). AB 361 provides flexibility from these general requirements and permits agencies to forego publishing the teleconference locations and making such locations open to the public if a declared state of emergency exists and other public health factors are met (Govt. Code § 54953(e)). In such cases, public agencies must provide “real time” public comment and meet other requirements. The provisions of AB 361 are not intended to be used ad infinitum, however, and ultimately once a state of emergency is withdrawn or certain findings cannot be made, the general provisions of the Brown Act are triggered for telephonic meetings.

SCAG is currently holding EAC meetings in hybrid format, with both in-person and remote participation available. The RC, Policy Committees and other SCAG bodies continue to meet in a fully remote format, in compliance with AB 361. Remote meetings have benefits, such as providing the ability to social distance in light of public health concerns, permitting real-time participation of the public without individuals needing to travel to a physical meeting site during the business day, and reducing vehicle miles to travel to/from meetings. Given the 38,000 square mile jurisdiction of SCAG, permitting remote meeting opportunities can enhance meaningful participation by both our RC, EAC and Policy Committee members as well as the public. Remote meetings also permit flexibility as public health requirements are modified. For instance, just recently and in light of changing public health concerns, the Governor imposed a state-wide indoor mask mandate that is presently set to expire on January 15th. Los Angeles already requires that masks be worn indoors.

As previously discussed in the November staff report, SCAG’s public meeting spaces have established capacity limits, and capacity can also be dependent on social distancing recommendations that may additionally limit capacity. A chart showing the established capacity limits and capacity with 6-foot and 3-foot distancing is included as Attachment 1. Depending on the nature of social distancing used, SCAG’s public meeting spaces do not necessarily have capacity to hold all members of the legislative body, requisite staff and public attendance. Said differently, social distancing may still militate to some form of remote meeting participation. It bears mentioning that while there are presently no mandated social distancing requirements, LA County’s Public Health Department recommends social distancing of at least 6 feet indoors where the vaccination status of all participants is unknown.
Apart from considering public meeting formats, SCAG staff has been planning for staff’s return to their physical office locations, which is presently scheduled for February 7, 2021. Returning to physical meetings and physical officing necessitates balancing the health of the public, employees and members with the importance of providing vibrant and functional methods to solicit and receive input from the general public and stakeholders.

**UPDATE ON REVIEW OF OPTIONS:**

At the November meeting, staff presented several options and received feedback from EAC members. Based on input received at the November meeting, staff is investigating the following potential structures/formats:

- Hold Policy Committee meetings on a different day/week from RC, with Policy Committee meetings being held at same time.
- Hold Policy Committee meetings on a different day/week from RC, but hold the committee meetings at different times.
- Hold Policy Committee meetings in hybrid form, not remote only as currently is the case.
- Hold EAC/RC hybrid meetings on the same day (presently EAC is held the afternoon before RC).
- Hold EAC, RC and the Policy Committee meetings in hybrid form on the same day (historically, all SCAG meetings were held on one day).

Several of these options will require surveying committee and council members for their availability, which has not yet been done. Some councilmembers have expressed that having SCAG’s RC and Policy Committee meetings on the same day allows coordination of SCAG meetings with their other obligations (such as employment). Additionally, staff has been reviewing advantages and disadvantages of each of these options and is still in the process of developing recommendations. Ongoing evaluation, which is expected to culminate in recommendations to the EAC in February, include considering public health, seating capacity of rooms, social distancing measures, staggering of meetings and ability to safely welcome the public, stakeholders and members.

**CONSIDERATION AND INPUT ON FEBRUARY MEETING FORMAT**

As reflected in the Executive Summary, President Lorimore has expressed interest in potentially holding the February RC, EAC and Policy Committee meetings in a hybrid format. The February SCAG meeting cycle poses an opportunity to test a hybrid meeting format across SCAG’s legislative bodies. Namely, the February meeting schedule includes an EAC meeting scheduled for February
2nd and a joint meeting of the three Policy Committee meetings, followed by the Regional Council meeting on February 3rd.

Given that the Policy Committees will all be meeting together at the same time, staff is engaged in a planning process to hold hybrid meetings of the RC and Policy Committees on February 3rd. At the same time, however, and given that COVID-19 considerations evolve and shift on a frequent basis, staff also is monitoring the environment so that it is prepared to modify plans should public health officials indicate more concern should be taken. Depending on EAC input, staff is also considering whether holding all meetings on February 3rd is feasible (rather than having the EAC meet the day before on February 2nd).

Hosting hybrid meetings in February for the RC and Policy Committees, in addition to the EAC, requires staff to expeditiously operationalize and test facilities and technical systems. Staff is engaged in a planning process to implement this change to the meeting format for February while also being prepared to alter this direction should health consideration dictate otherwise.

Based on the foregoing, staff specifically seeks EAC input on holding the February RC and Policy Committee meetings in hybrid format (versus fully remote). Notably, regardless of EAC input, staff will need to survey membership to understand the level of interest in attending in person so that social distancing can be contemplated and implemented. In this regard, and given the limited interest to date in councilmembers participating in person at EAC meetings, staff also seeks EAC input on what it might consider “critical mass” of in person attendance that would warrant hybrid meetings in February.

FISCAL IMPACT:
None.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Attachment 1 - Room Capacities and Pre-COVID 19 Data Points
Room Capacities of SCAG’s Public Meeting Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Zero social distancing</th>
<th>6-foot social distancing</th>
<th>3-foot social distancing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy A</strong></td>
<td>68 (32RC/36Pub)</td>
<td>34 (16RC/18Pub)</td>
<td>51 (16RC/35Pub)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy B</strong></td>
<td>72 (36RC/36Pub)</td>
<td>36 (18RC/18Pub)</td>
<td>54 (18RC/36Pub)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Council Room</strong></td>
<td>136 (71RC/65Pub)</td>
<td>68 (35RC/33Pub)</td>
<td>102 (35RC/67Pub)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reception</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Lounge</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RC Lounge</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Parentheticals in the chart above reflect the number of RC (or committee member) seats available at the dais, out of the total room capacity listed. Numbers for RC seating capacity is based on desk seating at room dais not being moveable.

Pre-COVID Meeting Data Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Location</th>
<th>Attendee Data</th>
<th>Support Staff Estimate*</th>
<th>Pre-Pandemic Meeting Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Administration Committee</td>
<td>18 – All are RC members</td>
<td>17 - 1 clerk, 1 GC, 11 ET, 2 IT, 2 RAO</td>
<td>9:00 – 10:00 AM Thursday (now 3-4 PM Wednesdays)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Economic and Human Development Committee</td>
<td>55 – 27 are RC members</td>
<td>10 - 1 clerk, 1 GC, 3 ET, 1 Planning, 2 IT, 2 RAO</td>
<td>10:00 – 12:00 AM Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Committee</td>
<td>65 – 38 are RC members</td>
<td>10 - 1 clerk, 1 GC, 3 ET, 1 Planning, 2 IT, 2 RAO</td>
<td>10:00 – 12:00 AM Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Council Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Environment Committee</td>
<td>31 – 7 are RC members</td>
<td>10 - 1 clerk, 1 GC, 3 ET, 1 Planning, 2 IT, 2 RAO</td>
<td>10:00 – 12:00 AM Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Council</td>
<td>86 members</td>
<td>17 - 2 clerks, 1 GC, 11 ET, 2 IT, 2 RAO</td>
<td>12:15 – 2 PM Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Council Room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>