Please see next page for detailed instructions on how to participate in the meeting.

PUBLIC ADVISORY
Given recent public health directives limiting public gatherings due to the threat of COVID-19 and in compliance with the Governor’s recent Executive Order N-29-20, the meeting will be held telephonically and electronically.

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Peter Waggonner at (213) 630-1402 or via email at waggonner@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) 630-1402. 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. Submit written comments via email to: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov by 5pm on Tuesday, March 30, 2021.

   All written comments received after 5pm on Tuesday, March 30, 2021 will be announced and included as part of the official record of the meeting.

2. If participating via Zoom or phone, during the Public Comment Period, 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.

   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](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, 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. Limit oral comments to 3 minutes, 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, 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. Limit oral comments to 3 minutes, or as otherwise directed by the presiding officer.
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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 Rex Richardson, Chair)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
Members of the public are encouraged to submit written comments by sending an email to: ePublicComment@scag.ca.gov by 5pm on Tuesday, March 30, 2021. Such comments will be transmitted to members of the legislative body and posted on SCAG’s website prior to the meeting. Written comments received after 5pm on Tuesday, March 30, 2021 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 will be allowed up to 3 minutes to speak, 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 reduce the time limit based upon the number of comments received and may limit the total time for all public comments to twenty (20) minutes.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Proposed Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA) and American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA) Apportionments
(Kome Ajise, Executive Director)

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EAC:
Recommend to the Regional Council that it approve staff’s recommendation to follow the FTA approach that uses 75% and 132% of the 2018 Operating Costs as reported for the urbanized area (UZA) in the 2018 national transit database (NTD) to allocate CRRSAA and ARPA funds, respectively, when combined with the preceding rounds of stimulus funds to each of the UZAs to further sub-allocate to the eligible counties within each of the multi-county UZAs.

2. Contracting to Implement the Regional Early Action Plan Program
(Jenna Hornstock, Deputy Director for Planning, Special Initiatives)
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve a procurement program to accelerate project delivery for the Regional Early Action Plan Program (REAP) and a new model for timely implementation of SCAG’s local assistance programs as follows: (1) authorization 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) waiver of 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) waiver of 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 designee 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.

CONSENT CALENDAR
Approval Items
3. Minutes of the Meeting - March 3, 2021
4. Sustainable Communities Program - Housing & Sustainable Development Applications
5. Contracts $200,000 or Greater: Contract No. 19-066-C06, Aerial Imagery and Related Products - County of Imperial
6. Contracts $200,000 or Greater: Contract No. 21-043-C01, I-710 North Mobility Hubs Plan
7. AB 687 (Seyarto) - Riverside County Housing Finance Trust
8. SB 15 (Portantino) - Incentives for Rezoning Idle Retail Sites
9. SB 623 (Newman) – Electronic Toll and Transit Fare Collection Systems
10. SB 261 (Allen) - Sustainable Communities Strategies Reform
11. SB 266 (Newman) - Chino Hills State Park Expansion
12. SCAG Memberships and Sponsorships
Receive and File
13. Purchase Orders $5,000 - $199,999; Contracts $25,000 - $199,999 and Amendments $5,000 - $74,999
14. CFO Monthly Report
CFO MONTHLY REPORT  
(Cindy Giraldo, Chief Financial Officer)  

PRESIDENT’S REPORT  
(The Honorable Rex Richardson, Chair)  

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

FUTURE AGENDA ITEM/S  

ANNOUNCEMENT/S  

ADJOURNMENT
RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EAC AND TC:
Recommend to the Regional Council that it approve staff’s recommendation to follow the FTA approach that uses 75% and 132% of the 2018 Operating Costs as reported for the urbanized area (UZA) in the 2018 national transit database (NTD) to allocate CRRSAA and ARPA funds, respectively, when combined with the preceding rounds of stimulus funds to each of the UZAs to further sub-allocate to the eligible counties within each of the multi-county UZAs.

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:
Approve staff’s recommendation to follow the FTA approach that uses 75% and 132% of the 2018 Operating Costs as reported for the UZA in the 2018 NTD to allocate CRRSAA and ARPA funds, respectively, when combined with the preceding rounds of stimulus funds to each of the UZAs to further sub-allocate to the eligible counties within each of the multi-county UZAs.

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:
The Coronavirus pandemic continues to have a severe impact on our nation, state, and regions’ transit systems. As the ridership on most of our transit assets, including bus, rapid bus, urban and commuter rail systems, continue to remain depressed, all of our transit operators, large and small, face financial hardships. In order to address this national crisis, the federal government approved a series of stimulus bills that provide direct assistance to the transit operators.

In total, and as a result of three separate stimulus bills, $53 billion in funding has been authorized nationwide to be administered by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) through the Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Grants program. The 5307 Program utilizes a formula-based...
approach to apportion federal transit assistance to urbanized areas to each of the designated Urbanized Zone Areas or UZAs. The share of the funding allocated to UZAs within the SCAG region has varied across each of the bills, with two of the bills limiting resources based on operating costs to ensure funding is targeting transit operators with the greatest need.

SCAG is the designated recipient for several UZAs and is responsible for allocating the funds apportioned within the UZAs to each of the eligible county transportation commissions (CTCs) for UZAs that span across multiple counties. Historically, SCAG has utilized the same approach that FTA applies at the UZA level to further sub apportion to the eligible counties within each of the multi-county UZAs. SCAG staff utilized this approach in apportioning the funding allocated to the region through the first stimulus bill, the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act), and is recommending to also sub apportion the funding from the other two bills, the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA) and American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA), utilizing the same approach that FTA applies at the UZA level.

BACKGROUND:
The Coronavirus pandemic continues to have a severe impact on our nation, state, and regions’ transit systems. As the ridership on most of our transit assets, including bus, rapid bus, urban and commuter rail systems, continue to remain depressed, all of our transit operators, large and small, are struggling to remain afloat. In other to address this national crisis, the federal government has championed a series of stimulus bills that provide direct assistance to the transit operators.

In April 2020, the FTA announced $25 billion in funding as part of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act. Under the CARES Act, $1.453 billion was apportioned to the six UZAs for which SCAG is the designated recipient (Los Angeles County - Los Angeles - Long Beach-Anaheim, Riverside – San Bernardino, Murrieta – Temecula – Menifee, Indio – Cathedral City, Lancaster - Palmdale and Santa Clarita) under the existing FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Grants program. The funds were allocated using FTA’s 5307 distribution formula (See Attachment 1, which relies on data sets that are released with the annual Federal Register including on factors such as rail/fixed guideway, bus incentive, basic bus capital, growing states, and low income. SCAG was responsible for distributing the CARES Act funds to the CTCs for two of the multi-county UZAs (Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim UZA and the Riverside – San Bernardino UZA). The CARES apportionments were made through an administrative process, as is SCAG’s procedure for distributing 5307 funds, which carry forward the federal formula for inter-county distribution. The CARES Act funds were released in April 2020 in accordance with FTA’s formula distribution.

On December 27, 2020, CRRSAA was signed into law; the act allocates $14 billion in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) relief funds with $13.26 billion allocated to large and small UZAs to support the transit industry during the COVID-19 public health emergency. The CRRSAA funding received by
the SCAG region represents the second allocation of federal transit stimulus funding to the transit agencies to address the fiscal impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Furthermore, on March 11, 2021, the American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA) was signed into law and provides for a third round of stimulus funding. Approximately $1.8 billion is apportioned to the SCAG region. Unlike the CRRSAA, all of the designated UZAs are eligible to receive funds from ARPA because the cap is raised to 132% of the 2018 operating costs as reported by NTD when all three rounds of funding are combined.

As the designated recipient for the UZAs, SCAG is responsible for allocating the funds apportioned within the UZAs to each of the eligible CTCs for UZAs that span across multiple counties. Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim and Riverside – San Bernardino are two major multi-county UZAs within the SCAG region. FTA utilizes a formula-based approach to apportion federal transit assistance to urbanized areas through a program called 5307 to each of the designated Urbanized Zone Areas or UZAs. Historically, SCAG has utilized same approach that FTA applies at the UZA level to further sub apportion to the eligible counties within each of the multi-county UZAs. SCAG staff is recommending that we do the same for apportioning CRRSAA and ARPA funds to the eligible counties in the two aforementioned UZAs.

**CRRSAA APPORTIONMENT**
The CRRSAA funding received by the SCAG region represents the second allocation of federal transit stimulus funding to the transit agencies to address the fiscal impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. CRRSAA specifies that FTA Section 5307 funding for a given UZA, when combined with the amounts allocated to that UZA from Section 5307 funds appropriated under the CARES Act, shall not exceed 75 percent of that UZA’s 2018 NTD operating cost.

“...That the amounts allocated to any urbanized area from amounts made available under this paragraph in this Act when combined with the amounts allocated to that urbanized area from funds appropriated under this heading in title XII of division B of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136; 134 Stat. 599)) may not exceed 75 percent of that urbanized area’s 2018 operating costs based on data contained in the National Transit Database...”

For this reason, only three of the six UZA’s in the SCAG region received a share of CRRSAA apportionments. The other three UZA’s had already received CARES Act funding exceeding 75 percent of the UZA’s 2018 NTD operating cost and were therefore excluded from the apportionments due to the federal guidelines. Of the $13.26 billion available under CRRSA, the following UZAs in the SCAG region received CRRSAA apportionments.
As the MPO and the designated recipient, SCAG is responsible for distributing the CRRSAA apportionments in the multi-county UZA, Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim. CRRSAA provides SCAG with the discretion to carry forward the federal formula as the basis for inter-county apportionments or develop an alternative methodology for determining each county transportation commission’s apportionment. Staff is recommending the federal formula be carried forward for the inter-county distributions to mirror the federal process for apportioning CRRSAA funds to each UZA.

The following table shows SCAG’s inter-county distributions recommended through CRRSAA for the Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim UZA pursuant to this proposed allocation methodology. The allocations for each county are as shown under “CRRSAA Final Allocation” (see fourth shaded row). In addition, the table reflects operating expenses in each county and the total resources apportioned to each county as a result of both federal transit stimulus relief:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRRSAA Allocations Based on Federal Methodology</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>San Bernardino</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>Ventura</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 Operating Expense</td>
<td>$2,557,384,189</td>
<td>$299,429,433</td>
<td>$36,902,117</td>
<td>$789,887</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,894,505,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of 2018 NTD OE</td>
<td>$1,918,038,142</td>
<td>$224,572,075</td>
<td>$27,676,588</td>
<td>$592,415</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,170,879,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES Act Allocation</td>
<td>$999,267,072</td>
<td>$181,131,657</td>
<td>$35,266,741</td>
<td>$312,970</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,215,978,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRRSAA Final Allocation</td>
<td>$911,525,690</td>
<td>$43,097,849</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$277,242</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$954,900,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES + CRRSA</td>
<td>$1,910,792,762</td>
<td>$224,229,506</td>
<td>$35,266,741</td>
<td>$590,212</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,170,879,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of OE</td>
<td>74.72%</td>
<td>74.89%</td>
<td>95.57%</td>
<td>74.72%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on this allocation, Los Angeles, Orange, and Riverside receive nearly 75% of their operating costs through a combination of the first (CARES Act) the second (CRRSAA) allocation of federal transit stimulus funding. San Bernardino County received about $7.59 million more through the CARES Act compared to the equivalent of 75% of operating expenses reported by transit operators in the county for 2018. Therefore, San Bernardino County does not receive additional funds through CRRSAA using this allocation methodology.

Per the suggestion of the CTCs, SCAG also reviewed and considered proportionately distributing the CRRSAA funds based on the FTA Section 5307 formula which was used to apportion the CARES Act funds. This approach would result in distributions that exceed 75% of operating expenses in Orange and San Bernardino counties while falling below the 75% equivalent in Los Angeles and Riverside counties. Given the disparity in total funding that results from this allocation approach as
compared to the 2018 operating costs, staff does not recommend this approach. For reference, a summary result of this approach is provided in Table 1 of Attachment 2 to this report.

Staff’s recommendation for CRRSAA apportionments was placed on the agenda for SCAG’s Executive Administration Committee (EAC) and Regional Council (RC) meetings on March 3 and 4, 2021, respectively. However, partly at the request of several of the CTCs, the item was pulled from the agenda and deferred to the April board meeting for further action. At the same time, SCAG President Rex Richardson directed staff to move forward with distributing the “uncontested amount” of CRRSAA funds through issuance of a split letter to FTA as noted in the table below (Los Angeles County’s sub-allocation is pending board approval). Therefore, the table below represents the first round of CRRSAA funding that represents uncontested amounts, which is the smaller of the amounts for each county between the two approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allocations Based on 75% Operating Cost</th>
<th>Allocations Proportionate to CARES Act</th>
<th>CRRSAA Round 1 Distribution - Unconstrained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$911,525,690</td>
<td>$784,718,607</td>
<td>$784,718,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$43,097,849</td>
<td>$142,241,634</td>
<td>$43,097,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,694,766</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>$277,242</td>
<td>$245,774</td>
<td>$245,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$954,900,781</strong></td>
<td><strong>$954,900,781</strong></td>
<td><strong>$828,062,230</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRRSAA Apportionment:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$954,900,781</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Balance - Round 2 Distribution:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$126,838,551</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once approved, staff will work with the CTCs to finalize the split letter and issue Round 2 of the remaining CRRSAA funds.

ARPA APPORTIONMENTS
On March 11, 2021, the American Recovery Plan Act (ARPA) was signed into law and provides for a third round of stimulus funding. Approximately $1.8 billion is apportioned to the SCAG region.

Language in the ARPA specifies that FTA Section 5307 funding for a given UZA, when combined with the CARES Act and CRRSAA allocations shall not exceed 132 percent of that UZA’s operating costs as reported in the 2018 NTD. Because of the increase in the cap to 132 percent, all of the UZAs in the SCAG region were eligible for funding under ARPA. The following are six UZAs for which SCAG is the designated recipient that receive ARPA funding as specified in the table below.
ARPA funding shown above is tentative at this point pending release of final numbers in the Federal Register. Staff is providing this information based on preliminary data. Funding amounts are subject to change once the final FTA Section 5307 funding tables are published.

Similar to the CRRSAA apportionment, SCAG is recommending that the same methodology, applying 132% of the UZAs reported operating cost, be applied to the inter-county allocations for the Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim UZA as well as Riverside – San Bernardino UZA.

**ARPA Los Angeles – Long Beach - Anaheim UZA allocations**
The following table reflects the inter-county allocations for the Los Angeles – Long Beach – Anaheim UZA using the 132% allocation methodology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARPA Allocations Based on Federal Methodology</th>
<th>LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH - ANAHEIM UZA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132% of 2018 NTD OE</td>
<td>$3,375,747,129 $395,246,852 $48,710,794 $1,042,651 $0 $3,820,747,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES Act Apportionment Total</td>
<td>$999,267,072 $181,131,657 $35,266,741 $312,970 $0 $1,215,978,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Recommended CRRSAA</td>
<td>$911,525,690 $43,097,849 $0 $277,242 $0 $954,900,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES + Staff Recom. CRRSAA</td>
<td>$1,910,792,762 $224,229,506 $35,266,741 $590,212 $0 $2,170,879,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance (Potential ARPA Dist.)</td>
<td>$1,464,954,368 $171,017,346 $13,444,054 $452,440 $0 $1,649,868,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES+CRRSAA+ARPA</td>
<td>$3,375,747,129 $395,246,852 $48,710,794 $1,042,651 $0 $3,820,747,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of 2018 OE</td>
<td>132.0% 132.0% 132.0% 132.0% 132.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By applying the 132% cap methodology, all counties receive an equal 132% share of their operating costs when combined with their CARES, CRRSAA and ARPA allocations, consistent with the intent of the ARPA.

Similar to CRRSAA apportionments, staff also analyzed the implications of apportioning the ARPA funds ignoring the 132% cap and simply relying on the proportions used for the CARES Act funds. This approach results in Orange and San Bernardino counties exceeding their 132% share significantly, while Los Angeles and Riverside counties’ distribution is below the 132% cap, which is not consistent with the intent of ARPA. Staff does not recommend following this allocation.
approach because of the disparity it creates between the counties. For reference, a summary result of this approach is provided in Table 2 of Attachment 2 to this report.

RIVERSIDE – SAN BERNARDINO UZA ALLOCATIONS for ARPA
As previously mentioned, the Riverside – San Bernardino UZA did not receive a CRRSAA apportionment due to their CARES Act allocations exceeding the 75% threshold. As such, the allocations in the following tables under CRRSAA Apportionment are shown as $0. The following table reflects the inter-county allocations for the Riverside – San Bernardino UZA from ARPA using the federal cost methodology which includes a 132% cap:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>San Bernardino</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>132% of 2018 NTD OE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$345,700</td>
<td>$102,988,548</td>
<td>$106,228,227</td>
<td>$209,562,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES Act Apport. Total</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,321,150</td>
<td>$58,246,293</td>
<td>$77,999,230</td>
<td>$137,566,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRRSAA Apportionment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance (Potential ARPA Dist.)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($975,450)</td>
<td>$44,742,255</td>
<td>$28,228,997</td>
<td>$71,995,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential ARPA (zeroing out OC)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$44,144,159</td>
<td>$27,851,644</td>
<td>$71,995,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES+CRRSAA+ARPA</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,321,150</td>
<td>$102,390,452</td>
<td>$105,850,874</td>
<td>$209,562,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of 2018 OE</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>504.5%</td>
<td>131.2%</td>
<td>131.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Riverside – San Bernardino UZA, San Bernardino and Riverside would receive slightly less than 132% of their operating costs through a combination of CARES Act and ARPA. Orange County received $975,450 more in their CARES Act allocation compared to their 132% operating expenses reported in 2018 NTD and does not meet the threshold to receive ARPA funds based on the 132% cap.

Again, for comparison, staff analyzed the implications of apportioning this UZA ignoring the 132% cap and simply relying on the CARES Act proportions (Attachment 2 Table 3). This approach would result in Riverside County exceeding the 132% distribution. Orange County would receive a 768% of their 2018 operating costs between CARES Act and ARPA allocations, while San Bernardino County falls below the 132% cap. Staff does not recommend following this allocation approach because of the disparity it creates between the counties.

Conclusion
Given the intent of the program to address the fiscal impacts of COVID-19 pandemic, SCAG staff does not believe the approach that ignores the transit operators expense cap is as well aligned with the intent of the bill. Moreover, because the funding allocated to each UZA is based on operating expenses, it does not seem appropriate to then redistribute those resources through a formula that does not consider operating expense. Therefore, staff recommends following the federal formula that caps the UZA level allocations to 75% and 132% of their 2018 operating costs for CRRSAA and
ARPA, respectively, when combined with the preceding rounds of apportionments for inter-county distributions as well. SCAG staff believes this approach is more transparent, fair, consistent with the intent of the emergency appropriations and consistent with SCAG’s past practices of applying the same approach that is used to allocate to the UZA down to each of the eligible counties.

Next Steps
Upon approval, SCAG staff will work with the CTCs to finalize the split letter and distribute Round 2 of the remaining CRRSAA funds as well as the ARPA funds.

FISCAL IMPACT:
None. Work associated with this item is included in the current FY 20-21 Overall Work Program (030.00146A.02: Federal Transportation Improvement Program and 010.SC0170.01: RTP Support, Development, and Implementation)

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. 5307 Formula Flow Chart
2. CARES Act Proportionate Allocations (Alternative Allocation Approach)
Section 5307
Urban Area Formula Grants

Appropriated Amount

- $30 Million Passenger Ferry Grants (Discretionary)
- 3.07% Low Income Tier
- 75% Apportioned to UZAs with a population greater than 200K
- 25% Apportioned to UZAs with a population less than 200K

Reapportioned Funds

9.32% Allocated to UZAs of less than 200K

90.68% Allocated to UZAs of 200K or Greater in population

Remaining Amount

Fixed Guideway Tier (33.29%)

- 50% Population
- 50% Population x Density

- Incentive Tier (4.39%)
  - 0.75% to UZAs with Commuter Rail and Population of 750,000+
  - (FG PMT x FG PMT)/OC

- Non-Incentive Tier (95.61%)
  - 60% FG VRM
  - 40% FG DRM

Bus Tier (66.71%)

- Non-Incentive Tier (90.8%)
  - BPMT/OC

- Incentive Tier (9.2%)
  - 73.39% Allocated to UZAs of 1 Million or more in population
  - 26.62% Allocated to UZAs under 1 Million in population

Oversight (0.75%)
- STIC (1.5%) – Allocated to UZAs ≤ 200K in population
- State Safety Oversight (0.5%)

Low Income Tier
- 75% Apportioned to UZAs of 200K or Greater in population
- 25% Apportioned to UZAs less than 200K

Incentive Tier

- 0.75% to UZAs with Commuter Rail and Population of 750,000+

STIC= Small Transit Intensive Cities
UZA = Urbanized Area
Population Density= Persons Per Square Mile (2010 Census)
Pop= Population (2010 Census)
FG PMT= Fixed Guideway Passenger Miles Traveled
OC= Operating Costs
FG VRM= Fixed Guideway Vehicle Revenue Miles
BPMT= Bus Passenger Miles Traveled
BVRM= Bus Vehicle Revenue Miles
FG DRM= Fixed Guideway Directional Route Miles
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Attachment: 5307 Formula Flow Chart (Proposed CRRSAA and ARPA Apportionments)
ATTACHMENT 2: CARES Act Proportionate Allocations (Alternative Allocation Approach)

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2018 Operating Expense</th>
<th>75% of 2018 NTD OE</th>
<th>CARES Act Allocation</th>
<th>% of CARES Act Allocation</th>
<th>Ignoring 75%</th>
<th>CARES + CRRSAA</th>
<th>% of OE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$2,557,384,189</td>
<td>$1,918,038,142</td>
<td>$999,267,072</td>
<td>82.18%</td>
<td>$784,718,607</td>
<td>$1,783,985,679</td>
<td>69.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$299,429,433</td>
<td>$224,572,075</td>
<td>$181,131,657</td>
<td>14.90%</td>
<td>$142,241,634</td>
<td>$323,373,291</td>
<td>108.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>$36,902,117</td>
<td>$27,676,588</td>
<td>$35,266,741</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>$27,694,766</td>
<td>$62,961,507</td>
<td>170.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>$789,887</td>
<td>$592,415</td>
<td>$312,970</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>$245,774</td>
<td>$558,744</td>
<td>70.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,894,505,626</td>
<td>$2,170,879,220</td>
<td>$1,215,978,440</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$954,900,781</td>
<td>$2,170,879,221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>CARES Act Apportionment Total</th>
<th>CRRSAA (Ignoring 75%)</th>
<th>CARES+CRRSAA (Ignoring 75%)</th>
<th>Balance (Potential ARPA Dist.)</th>
<th>CARES+CRRSAA+ARPA</th>
<th>% of 2018 OE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$999,267,072</td>
<td>$784,718,607</td>
<td>$1,783,985,679</td>
<td>$1,355,829,115</td>
<td>$3,139,814,794</td>
<td>122.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$181,131,657</td>
<td>$142,241,634</td>
<td>$323,373,291</td>
<td>$245,763,701</td>
<td>$569,136,992</td>
<td>190.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>$35,266,741</td>
<td>$27,694,766</td>
<td>$62,961,507</td>
<td>$47,850,745</td>
<td>$110,812,252</td>
<td>300.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>$312,970</td>
<td>$245,774</td>
<td>$558,744</td>
<td>$424,645</td>
<td>$983,389</td>
<td>124.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,215,978,440</td>
<td>$954,900,781</td>
<td>$2,170,879,221</td>
<td>$1,649,868,206</td>
<td>$3,820,747,427</td>
<td>132.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>132% of 2018 NTD OE</th>
<th>CARES Act Apport. Total</th>
<th>% of CARES Act</th>
<th>CRRSAA (Ignoring 75%)</th>
<th>CARES+CRRSAA (Ignoring 75%)</th>
<th>Balance (Potential ARPA Dist.)</th>
<th>CARES+CRRSAA+ARPA</th>
<th>% of 2018 OE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,321,150</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,321,150</td>
<td>$691,426</td>
<td>$2,012,576</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>$345,700</td>
<td>$58,246,293</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>$58,246,293</td>
<td>$58,246,293</td>
<td>$30,483,318</td>
<td>$88,729,610</td>
<td>768.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>$102,988,548</td>
<td>$77,999,230</td>
<td>42.34%</td>
<td>$77,999,230</td>
<td>$77,999,230</td>
<td>$40,821,058</td>
<td>$118,820,288</td>
<td>113.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>$106,228,227</td>
<td>$137,566,673</td>
<td>56.70%</td>
<td>$137,566,673</td>
<td>$137,566,673</td>
<td>$71,995,802</td>
<td>$209,562,475</td>
<td>147.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$209,562,475</td>
<td>$137,566,673</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$137,566,673</td>
<td>$137,566,673</td>
<td>$71,995,802</td>
<td>$209,562,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**AGENDA ITEM 2**

**REPORT**

Southern California Association of Governments
Remote Participation Only
March 31, 2021

---

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

**From:** Jenna Hornstock, Deputy Director of Planning
(213) 630-1448, hornstock@scag.ca.gov

**Subject:** Contracting to Implement the Regional Early Action Plan Program

---

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Approve a procurement program to accelerate project delivery for the Regional Early Action Plan Program (REAP) and a new model for timely implementation of SCAG’s local assistance programs as follows: (1) authorization 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) waiver of 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) waiver of 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 designee 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.

**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:**

*Under the California 2019-20 Budget Act, SCAG is eligible for $47.5 million in Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) funding administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to support local governments and stakeholders with housing planning activities that accelerate housing production and meet the region’s goals for producing*
1.3 million new units of housing by 2029, as determined by the 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). The REAP work program was approved by the Regional Council on December 3, 2020 and staff submitted the completed application to HCD on January 29, 2021 to implement the work program. The REAP funding must be spent and the program closed out by December 2023.

In order to deliver the magnitude of programs and technical support within the grant time horizon, SCAG staff is requesting approval of a program to accelerate contracting for procurements that are consistent with SCAG’s procurement policies, as modified by the recommended action for this item. The goal of the pilot will be to reduce the time to procure from an average of six (6) months to three (3) months with a focus on contracted services most needed to support local agencies in updating their housing elements by the October 2021 deadline. The program will sunset with the closeout of the REAP program, in December 2023, and will be limited to work completed as part of the Regional Council approved REAP grant funded program. No more than $15 million, approximately thirty percent, of the REAP program will be contracted through the program. Staff will report monthly on actions taken under the program to the Regional Council.

BACKGROUND:
Under the California 2019-20 Budget Act, SCAG is eligible for $47.5 million in REAP funding to support local governments and stakeholders with housing planning activities that accelerate housing production and meet the region’s goals for producing 1.3 million new units of housing by 2029, as determined by the 6th Cycle RHNA.

On February 6, 2020 the Executive/Administration Committee and Regional Council reviewed information about the REAP and Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) funds and authorized SCAG staff to apply for up to twenty-five (25) percent of the $47.5 million for early program funding. Information related to the early application was also shared at the February 6, 2020 CEHD Committee meeting.

On December 3, 2020, the SCAG Regional Council adopted Resolution 20-627-1 which authorized staff to request the balance (75%) of SCAG’s REAP allocation, or $35.6 million in additional REAP funding. Staff submitted the completed application on January 29, 2021, two (2) days ahead of the January 31, 2021 deadline.

The REAP funds require that all programmatic activities be completed and closed out by December 2023. The $47.5 million REAP grant is the largest program grant that SCAG has received to date and requires an unprecedented amount of work to be procured, managed and completed within 3 years. The recommendation before the Regional Council is needed to ensure expedient
To support this program, staff is seeking the Regional Council’s approval on several items:

(1) Authorization to award up to a total of $10,000,000 in On Call Services (OCS) contracts and agreements upon completion of a competitive procurement process, subject to the requirements below, without additional approval from the Regional Council. The OCS is currently in the procurement process, with proposals under review. Firms will be selected and pre-qualified across five (5) disciplines of work that will support the REAP program. The disciplines are broad scopes of work. Once the OCS firms are under contract, staff would procure, through a competitive solicitation process, proposals to complete more specific scopes of work under each discipline. Pre-qualified firms will compete on their approach and pricing. After scoring and negotiations, the selected firm/team will be issued a task order to proceed. The authorization sought from the Regional Council will allow these second RFP and task order processes to proceed without additional approval from the Regional Council. Monthly reports will be provided to the Regional Council on all activity related to the OCS and contracts or amendments entered hereunder.

(2) Waiver of SCAG’s procurement requirement to first obtain Executive/Administration Committee and Regional Council approval for contracts at or above $200,000 prior to execution, for individual contracts up to $500,000 to be approved as long as SCAG procurement policies are followed. The Executive Director or his/her designee would be authorized to execute such agreements in consultation with legal counsel. This activity anticipates scopes of work or contracts that would not be part of the OCS. For example, working directly with a non-profit or academic institution, or a competitive RFP for a scope of services that was not anticipated and/or is not reflected in the five (5) disciplines that will be part of the OCS contracts.

(3) Waiver of SCAG’s procurement requirement necessitating Executive/Administration Committee and Regional Council approval prior to entering any contract amendment exceeding $75,000, instead requiring amendments related to this program of 30% or more be first brought to the Executive/Administration Committee and Regional Council, and authorizing the Executive Director or his/her designee to execute such amendments in consultation with legal counsel. This request is part of the effort to create efficiency and streamlining in management and delivery of the REAP program.

An average procurement at SCAG takes six (6) months to complete. Under the requested program and through the establishment of On Call Services contracts, SCAG staff anticipates the process will reduce the average to three (3) months. This time savings is particularly beneficial for the work
aimed at supporting local jurisdictions in the update of their Housing Elements, which are due October 2021. Precedent for this approach to the work can be found in the SCAG On Call Services contract for IT services, which authorizes contracts up to $1 million, and in other MPOs using on call services contracts, or "benches" that, once established, allow for contracting without further formal approvals. For example, SANDAG’s planning bench is approved for $40 million in total contracting authority. The requested authority would be in place for the duration of the program through December 2023 and be limited to a total of $15 million of REAP funding. Staff would provide monthly updates on all contracting activities.

All consultant contracting for the REAP program will comply with the competitive bid requirements of both the State Housing and Community Development’s requirements and SCAG’s procurement policies. Any MOUs or other agreements with other municipal entities, Universities or non-profits will similarly comply with SCAG’s contracting policies. All contracting activities will be reported to the Regional Council monthly.

FISCAL IMPACT:
There is no immediate fiscal impact as a result of the recommended actions. Funding for the REAP work program is available in the FY 2020-21 Overall Work Program (OWP) budget in the following project numbers:

300.4872.01 REAP Grant SCS Integration
300.4872.02 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)
300.4872.03 REAP Grant Partnerships and Outreach
300.4872.05 REAP Grant Housing Policy Solutions
300.4872.06 REAP Grant Program Administration
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
EXECUTIVE/ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE (EAC)
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 2021


The Executive/Administration Committee (EAC) of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) held its special meeting telephonically and electronically, given public health directives limiting public gatherings due to the threat of COVID-19 and in compliance with the Governor’s Executive Order N-29-20. A quorum was present.

Members Present
Hon. Rex Richardson, President
Hon. Clint Lorimore, 1st Vice President
Hon. Jan Harnik, 2nd Vice President
Hon. Alan D. Wapner, Imm. Past President
Hon. Frank Yokoyama, Vice Chair, CEHD
Hon. David Pollock, Chair, EEC
Hon. Deborah Robertson, Vice Chair, EEC
Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, Chair, TC
Hon. Art Brown
Hon. Jose Luis Solache, Chair, LCMC
Hon. Peggy Huang, Vice Chair, LCMC
Hon. Margaret Finlay, President’s Appt.
Hon. Kim Nguyen, President’s Appt.
Hon. Carmen Ramirez, President’s Appt.
Hon. Andrew Masiel, Sr.
Mr. Randall Lewis, Ex-officio

Long Beach
Eastvale
Cerritos
Moorpark
Rialto
El Centro
Buena Park
Lynwood
Duarte
Garden Grove
Pechanga Dev. Corp.
Lewis Group of Companies

District 29
District 4
District 23
District 46
District 8
District 1
District 21
District 26
District 35
District 18
Ventura County
TGRPB Representative
Business Representative

Members Not Present
Hon. Jorge Marquez, Chair, CEHD

Covina

District 33

Staff Present
Kome Ajise, Executive Director
The Honorable Rex Richardson called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. and asked Margaret Finlay, Duarte, District 35, to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

Given the public health directives limiting gatherings due to COVID-19, President Richardson announced the meeting was being held telephonically and electronically in compliance with the Governor’s Executive Orders.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

President Richardson opened the Public Comment Period and outlined instructions for public comments.

SCAG staff stated that there was one written public comment received by email before the deadline of 5pm of Tuesday, March 2, 2021 which was transmitted to members and posted to SCAG’s website.

SCAG staff confirmed that there was one verbal public comment speaker by raised hand and acknowledged Warren Whiteakre. Mr. Whiteakre from the Orange County Transportation Authority, commented on agenda Item 2, the Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2021 (CRRSA) Inter-County Apportionments, and requested that action be delayed for one month.

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

There was no prioritization of agenda items.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Approval of the Fiscal Year 2021-22 Draft Comprehensive Budget

Executive Director Ajise reported that the framework for developing the FY 2021-22 Comprehensive Budget was SCAG’s Strategic Plan that focuses on SCAG’s vision and priorities and improves the organization and its operations. He indicated SCAG was required by federal and state law to develop the Overall Work Program (OWP) each year, and after the 30-day public comment period, the Final OWP would be submitted to the Regional Council for final approval on May 6. Additionally, the General Fund Budget and the Membership Assessment would also be forwarded to the General Assembly for approval on May 6. He further explained that the proposed budget met SCAG’s primary responsibility requirements and furthers the implementation of the long-range Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, Connect SoCal. He stated the proposed budget includes funding to address immediate impacts of the COVID-19 and public health crisis and provides funding for identified priorities in three specific areas like the Overarching Pandemic Recovery, for Local Technical Assistance Resources, and for Regional Studies and Programs.

Chief Financial Officer Cindy Giraldo presented the draft comprehensive budget for fiscal year 2022, and stated it was a culmination of months of planning and analysis completed by all of SCAG’s divisions and facilitated by finance. She indicated that in collaboration with the member agencies, SCAG actively pursues opportunities to create long term positive impact for our region. She reported the proposed budget was $147.8 billion, a 54% growth over the prior year. She explained that the largest portion of that growth was from partnerships with local transit operators where SCAG will administer pass through payments as well as local match commitments in support of grant funded projects. In addition, SCAG would be administering the Last Mile Freight Program to help goods movement providers invest in clean truck and infrastructure technology. She added that they were still in the middle of pursuing additional grant opportunities for the benefit of our region and currently had six grant applications outstanding, and if successful, when they return to the Regional Council in May, may find that budget had an additional $38.8 million. With respect to salaries, she reported that total salaries and benefit costs amounted to $31.8 million for a $2.3 million increase over prior year and indicated that most of this increase was to account for increasing CalPERS liability and pension costs. She also reported that three new positions had been included in the budget. She further explained that annual staff merit-based increases, as well as the continuation of the vacation cashout pilot program had also been included in the budget and that SCAG was proposing to suspend all merit pay increases for executive and management employees. In conclusion, she clarified that the general fund revenues included membership fees of $1.9 million which was based on dues collected through January of this year.
Supervisor Carmen Ramirez, Ventura County, requested additional information on the pension liability.

Ms. Giraldo reported that SCAG was making progress with the pension liability payment. She indicated that CalPERS had implemented some significant changes over the past 10 years to the pension program, essentially requiring agencies or member agencies to pay down that unfunded liability over a 20-year period. She explained that SCAG was at about 66% funded for pension liability and had an unfunded pension liability of about $46 million.

Councilmember Cheryl Viegas-Walker, El Centro, District 1, expressed concern over the vacation cashout pilot program and stated she had seen a decline in the use of vacation hours per employee from 81 hours in fiscal year 2020 to 62.74 hours in fiscal year 2021. She thought that employees needed to use their vacation time and wanted a culture that celebrates work-life balance. She indicated that she would prefer not to continue the vacation cashout program for vacation but rather have staff use their vacation. She also asked for additional information on the employee recognition and department allowance numbers which had increased from $9,000 to $30,000.

Executive Director Ajise stated that SCAG promotes a work-life balance. He stated SCAG had been affected severely by the current situation we had with COVID-19 and indicated that in a good year on average employees used 80 hours, and last year had not been conducive to that, not only could employees not visit families, but they also could not go to anywhere. He indicated this was not an excuse and taking time from work was key. He further clarified that they had encouraged time off as much as possible in the last year, understanding that not only did they have a pandemic, but also had the added pressure of having to deal with both the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and Connect SoCal in the same year. He stated these were some of the factors to consider. He also indicated that the year was not done and expected additional time off. He thanked Councilmember Viegas-Walker for bringing this up and hoped that they continued the pilot program so they can gather more data and then decide whether this is something they want to continue. He expressed that he hoped that they grant us the opportunity to continue the pilot program for another year or two before they bring it back for a further decision.

Councilmember Viegas-Walker stated she also believed in succession planning and thought another reason why they needed to encourage people to be out of the office was to allow staff the opportunity to act in place of their manager to make sure that they can do the job.

A MOTION was made (Ramirez) that the Regional Council: 1) Approve the Fiscal Year 2021-22 (FY 2021-22) Draft Comprehensive Budget in the amount of $147,812,051; 2) Authorize the release of the Draft Overall Work Program (OWP) to initiate the 30-day public comment period; and 3) Approve the General Fund Budget and Membership Assessment and transmit to the General Assembly. Motion was SECONDED (Brown) and passed by the following votes:
AYES: Brown, Finlay, Harnik, Huang, Lorimore, Nguyen, Pollock, Ramirez, Richardson, Robertson, Solache, Viegas-Walker, Wapner and Yokoyama (14)

NOES: None (0)

ABSTAIN: None (0)

Councilmember Deborah Robertson, Rialto, District 8, asked how they would keep track of the issues that were raised by Councilmember Viegas-Walker.

Executive Director Ajise stated that this was something they had committed to reporting and was in the CFO monthly report so they could track it. He indicated that as an executive team they would be looking at strategies to ensure that staff are in fact taking time off.

2. Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2021 (CRRSAA) Inter-County Apportionments

President Richardson requested to pull Item 2, and in the meantime, staff would prepare the inter-county apportionment split letter for the first $828 million of CRRSA funds administratively. He indicated that the remaining unapportioned funds, approximately $126 million, staff would be doing more work on it and would come back to the EAC next month, based on further conversation with the transit agencies. He stated this would hopefully put SCAG in a position to be able to move forward with the additional amount. Seeing no objection, he proceeded to pull the item as requested by staff so that staff could return to the Regional Council in April.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

3. Minutes of the Meeting – February 2, 2021

4. Contracts $200,000 or Greater: 21-015-C01, SCAG Local Demonstration Initiative

5. Contracts $200,000 or Greater: 21-028-C01, Safe and Resilient Streets Strategies and Mini-Grants

6. Contracts $200,000 or Greater: 21-032-C01, Enterprise Business Intelligence

7. Contracts $200,000 or Greater: Contract No. 21-041-C01, Secondary Data Center Services
8. ACA 1 (Aguiar-Curry) – Voter Approval Threshold

9. SB 4 (Gonzalez) and AB 14 (Aguiar-Curry) – Broadband

10. SB 7 (Atkins) - The Jobs and Economic Improvement Through Environmental Leadership Act of 2021

11. SB 44 (Allen) - CEQA Streamlined Judicial Review: Environmental Leadership Transit Projects

12. AB 43 (Friedman) - Traffic Safety

13. SCAG Memberships and Sponsorships

Receive and File

14. CFO Monthly Report

First Vice President Clint Lorimore, Eastvale, District 4, requested to pull Items 8 and 9.

Councilmember Peggy Huang, TCA, requested to pull Item 8.

A MOTION was made (Solache) to approve Consent Calendar, Items 3 through 7 and 10 through 13; Receive and File Item 14. Motion was SECONDED (Finlay) and passed by the following votes:

AYES: Brown, Finlay, Huang, Lorimore, Masiel, Nguyen, Pollock, Ramirez, Richardson, Robertson, Solache, Viegas-Walker, Wapner and Yokoyama (14)

NOES: None (0)

ABSTAIN: None (0)

Director of Policy and Public Affairs Art Yoon provided a report on Item 8 regarding the ACA 1 bill sponsored by Assemblymember Aguiar-Curry, which would lower the voter threshold from two thirds to 55% to approve local bonds and special taxes by city, county, or special district to fund public infrastructure, affordable housing, or permanent supportive housing.

Councilmember Peggy Huang thanked staff for inviting Assemblywoman Aguiar-Curry to join the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC). She stated they had had conversations about need for funding for affordable housing, however, after hearing the discussion, she thought lowering the threshold did not seem to be the answer to this problem. She indicated they needed more state funding rather than what this did at the local level. She emphasized that
the reason they had a higher threshold was because they wanted the buy in of the whole community.

Supervisor Ramirez stated she supported this because it gave the local jurisdiction the ability to work on getting something passed with a lower threshold.

First Vice President Clint Lorimore stated he appreciated the comments from his colleagues and the reason why he had Items 8 and 9 pulled was because he did not agree and could not support either of the items. He indicated that city of Eastvale conducted a special election on a measure they put forward and the community came out in support of this item with 82.6%. He stated that it was possible to work with your community, if it was something that the community needed, and have a vote in favor of it. He indicated he disagreed with lowering the voter threshold, which is why he could not support this item. For Item 9, he stated the concern was related to there being no cap in AB 14 and therefore was not going to be able to vote in favor of it. He suggested that to save time they could vote on both items together.

Councilmember Jose Luis Solache, Lynwood, District 26, reported that the LCMC recommend this item for approval and they had some healthy discussion on the areas of concern, but ultimately the committee did approve it.

Councilmember Viegas-Walker stated she wanted this opportunity as an option for her city and this allowed for that.

Councilmember David Pollock, Moorpark, District 46, stated he had a different perspective from his time at the California School Boards Association, and was there when Senator O’Connell lowered the voting threshold for school bonds from sixty-six and two thirds to 55%. He indicated that what he had seen happen since then had been a whole lot more investment in public school facilities. He expressed that he did not think this was negative at all as it gave the opportunity for small communities to be able to vote to tax themselves without having to get that two thirds threshold, which was extremely difficult in most communities. He stated 55% was still a super majority.

Councilmember Margaret Finlay stated she thought that with the funding coming down for schools in Sacramento these days, the school bond initiatives that people were passing in their cities was the way that capital improvements were being funded and expressed support for this.

Councilmember Robertson stated this puts them in a position to be able to have local control and this was a tool that local elected officials needed, for this reason she was in support of it.

President Richardson stated housing was a big focus for SCAG and thought SCAG needed to be on the right side of this by giving them the tools. He expressed that he did not believe it was the state’s
responsibility to pay for our housing and believed that they had to have local tools because building housing was an economic development strategy.

A MOTION was made (Robertson) to approve Consent Calendar, Items 8 and 9. Motion was SECONDED (Brown) and passed by the following votes:

AYES: Brown, Finlay, Harnik, Masiel, Nguyen, Pollock, Ramirez, Richardson, Robertson, Solache, Viegas-Walker, Wapner and Yokoyama (13)

NOES: Huang and Lorimore (2)

ABSTAIN: None (0)

CFO REPORT

Ms. Giraldo reported they made some changes to the CFO report and were looking to enhance it over the months to come. She indicated there would be monthly updates on the vacation cashout pilot program, as well as funding on pension liabilities, and information on how the employees are transitioning from the classic plan to the much more affordable and manageable PEPRA Plan that is now required by CalPERS.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT

President Richardson welcomed Councilmember Art Brown, Buena Park, District 21, as the newest member of the EAC and reported that he was selected as Vice Chair of the Transportation Committee last month. He reminded the members that in place of the Policy Committee meetings, there would be a Joint Policy Committee meeting at 9:30 a.m. featuring the work of the Special Committee on Equity and Social Justice and three presentations from experts who were going to talk about equity from several stand points, followed by the Regional Council meeting at 12:30 p.m. In closing, he reported the next meeting of the EAC was scheduled for Wednesday, March 31, 2021 at 3:00 p.m.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Executive Director Ajise reported that the final RHNA Allocation Plan would be considered by the Regional Council for adoption and that the final action would provide certainty to local jurisdictions on the number units they needed to be planning for as part of their Housing Element updates, which were due October 2021. He stated that part of the final RHNA Allocation Plan includes the redistribution of successfully appealed units from the RHNA appeals process and must be consistent
with the regional determination provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). He reported that at the request Peggy Huang, Chair to the RHNA Appeals Board, the Regional Council would also consider a resolution to address various issues that were raised during the RHNA process. He further stated that the resolution outlined a strategy for SCAG to explore reforms for RHNA such as continued support of the subregions and local jurisdictions in advancing the housing element work, facilitation of discussions with HCD, statewide committee participation, legislative changes, and enhanced communications with county transportation commissions. He indicated the resolution was reviewed and approved by RHNA Appeals Board and the Community, Economic, and Human Development Committee.

He also reported that SCAG had launched a public survey to gather input on the development of the Racial Equity Early Action Plan and stated that through the work of the President’s Special Committee on Equity and Social Justice, SCAG had drafted a definition of racial equity and established a set of goals and strategies to guide SCAG in this work going forward. He mentioned they were seeking input on specific actions and the input would inform a draft Racial Equity Early Action Plan. In closing, he indicated the survey was available on the new Inclusion, Equity, Diversity and Awareness webpage on SCAG’s website.

**FUTURE AGENDA ITEM/S**

There were no future agenda items.

**ANNOUNCEMENT/S**

There were no announcements.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, President Richardson adjourned the Regular Meeting of the EAC at 3:58 p.m.

[MINUTES ARE UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE EAC]
## Executive / Administration Committee Attendance Report

### 2020-21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>JUN (Sp. Mtg.)</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUG (Retreat)</th>
<th>SEPT</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 Mtgs Attended To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Rex Richardson, President</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>District 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Clint Lorimore, 1st Vice Chair</td>
<td>Eastvale</td>
<td>District 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jan Harnik, Chair, 2nd Vice Chair</td>
<td>RCTC</td>
<td>District 40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Alan Wapner, Imm. Past Chair</td>
<td>SBCTA</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jorge Marquez, Chair, CEHD</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>District 33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. David Pollock, Chair, EEC</td>
<td>Moorpark</td>
<td>District 46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</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>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker, Chair, TC</td>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. José Luis Solache, Chair, LCMC</td>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>District 26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Peggy Huang, Vice Chair, LCMC</td>
<td>TCA</td>
<td>District 34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Margaret Finlay, President's Appt.</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>District 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Kim Nguyen, President's Appt.</td>
<td>Garden Grove</td>
<td>District 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. Carmen Ramirez, President's Appt.</td>
<td>County of Ventura</td>
<td>District 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revised to reflect attendance not previously recorded in the minutes approved on 1/7/21*
RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR CEHD:
Recommend that the Regional Council approve the 2020/2021 Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) Housing and Sustainable Development (HSD) applications and authorize staff to initiate the projects.

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR RC:
Approve 2020/2021 Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) Housing and Sustainable Development (HSD) applications and authorize staff to initiate the projects.

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EAC, EEC AND TC:
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. 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies’ planning and operations and promote regional collaboration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
On November 5, 2020, the Regional Council approved the guidelines and scoring criteria for the 2020/2021 Sustainable Communities Program (SCP) Housing and Sustainable Development (HSD) Call for Applications. The SCP is a multi-year program designed to support and implement the policies and initiatives of Connect SoCal, the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and continues the themes of the previous round of funded projects.
Upon Regional Council approval of guidelines, staff released the SCP Housing and Sustainable Development Call for Applications and received a total of twenty-six (26) project proposals across all project categories and types by the January 29th, 2021 deadline.

Staff has completed an evaluation of proposals and has identified that all twenty-six (26) projects meet the SCP program requirements, pending staff verification for Regional Early Action Program (REAP) guidelines. Approximately $4.8 million in State planning resources are expected to be available to cover anticipated project expenses based on the HSD program’s inclusion in REAP final application to the California Department of Housing and Community Development. Staff is seeking Regional Council approval of all HSD applications and authorization to begin contacting project sponsors in order to develop a program schedule and initiate projects.

BACKGROUND:

Consolidated Call for Proposals
A consolidated SCP Call for Applications framework with associated guidelines and scoring criteria was developed by SCAG staff to support innovative approaches for addressing and solving regional issues. The revised program identified specific project types that provide practical, relevant strategies for meeting SB 375 greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets and queue jurisdictions for future funding opportunities. This approach allows SCAG to maximize benefits from available resources within the restrictive conditions associated with funding sources.

Rather than providing direct grants to jurisdictions, the HSD program provides resources and direct technical assistance to complete projects. Resources will be provided:

- To encourage development and preservation of diverse housing types in areas that are supported by multiple transportation options;
- To create dynamic, connected, built environments that support multimodal mobility, reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles, and reduce VMT;
- To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality;
- To support healthy and equitable communities;
- To complement and increase competitiveness for state funding programs, including by increasing the number of cities with “pro-housing local policies” focusing on location efficient development and access to opportunity to receive preference in designated state programs; and
- To employ strategies to mitigate negative community impacts associated with gentrification and displacement and achieve equitable outcomes.
Following the Regional Council’s approval of guidelines on November 5, 2020, staff released the HSD Call for Applications. A total of twenty-six (26) project proposals were received across all project categories and types by the January 29, 2021 deadline. Staff completed an evaluation of proposals and identified that all twenty-six (26) projects meet the SCP Program requirements, pending staff verification for REAP guidelines.

Evaluation Process
The evaluation process was documented in the program guidelines as follows: For HSD projects, three (3) evaluation teams - one (1) per project type - were established to review, score and rank applications submitted to the SCP. Each team was comprised of State, Regional, and SCAG staff. Projects were evaluated against the approved Guidelines within their respective project types.

Application Recommendation
Staff has completed an evaluation of proposals and is recommending approval of all twenty-six (26) applications. Approximately $4.8 million in State planning resources are expected to be available to cover anticipated project expenses based on the HSD program’s inclusion in SCAG’s REAP final application to the California Department of Housing and Community Development. These proposals reflect stated SCP program goals, including but not limited to:

- Provide needed planning resources to local jurisdictions for active transportation and multimodal planning efforts, sustainability, land use, and planning for affordable housing;
- Promote, address and ensure health and equity in regional land use and transportation planning and to close the gap of racial injustice and better serve our communities of color;
- Encourage regional planning strategies to reduce motorized Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, particularly in environmental justice communities where there is the highest need for air quality improvements;
- Develop local plans that support the implementation of key strategies and goals outlined in Connect SoCal and the Sustainable Communities Strategy;
- Develop resources that support the Key Connections as outlined in Connect SoCal, including Shared Mobility and Mobility as a Service, Smart Cities and Job Centers, Accelerated Electrification, Go Zones, and Housing Supportive Infrastructure;
- Support a resilient region that looks to climate adaptation and public health preparedness as key strategies to address community prosperity, safety and economic recovery and sustainability; and
- Increase the region’s competitiveness for federal and state funds, including, but not limited to the California Active Transportation Program and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds.

The table below lists the twenty-six (26) projects that were evaluated. All the projects will be administered by SCAG through the SCP, and jurisdiction staff will be directly engaged in all key
phases of planning projects. The individual project budgets will be determined through the scoping and procurement process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Communities Program - Housing and Sustainable Development Recommended Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advancing Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Implementation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**
Pending RC approval, staff will contact all applicants to discuss details of their projects, define scopes of work and develop RFPs. A project initiation schedule and expectations regarding period of performance will be determined by mid-June 2021, and will be based on project complexity, funding source, and SCAG staff capacity.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Staff’s work budget for the current fiscal year is included in OWP 310.4874.05 Additional funding is also anticipated to be available through June 2023.

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. PowerPoint Presentation - Housing and Sustainable Development Application Recommendations
Executive Summary

26 applications received

1) Advancing Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Implementation
   • 8 applications

2) Housing Sustainability Districts, Workforce Housing Opportunity Zones, and Housing Supportive Tax Increment Financing Districts
   • 6 applications

3) Objective Development Standards for Streamlined Housing, Prohousing Designation Program and Parking Innovation
   • 12 applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>No. of Apps</th>
<th>Percent of Regional Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

• Seeking CEHD/Regional Council Approval – April 1st, 2021
• Pending approval, staff will contact all applicants to discuss:
  • details of their projects
  • define scope of work
  • and initiate the procurement process
• Projects must be completed by June 2023

Any Questions?

Lyle Janicek
Janicek@scag.ca.gov
www.scag.ca.gov
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve Contract No. 19-066-C06 in an amount not to exceed $300,000 with County of Imperial to provide access to aerial imagery data of its geography, and related products for SCAG. Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, pursuant to legal counsel review, to execute the contract on behalf of SCAG.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies’ planning and operations and promote regional collaboration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Under this Contract No. 19-066-C06, the County of Imperial shall provide access to aerial imagery data and related products of its geography to SCAG. This regional imagery acquisition effort is consistent with SCAG’s evolving role as a regional data clearinghouse. Access to aerial imagery and associated data are part of the development of an authoritative regional data resource to support regional and local planning and other related activities.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor/Requisition #</th>
<th>Contract Purpose</th>
<th>Contract Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Imperial (19-066-C06)</td>
<td>The County of Imperial would provide access to aerial imagery data and related products and services to SCAG.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FISCAL IMPACT:
Funding of $300,000 is available in the FY 2020-21 Overall Work Program (OWP) budget in project number 280-4859.02.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve Contract No. 21-043-C01 in an amount not to exceed $399,966 with Alta Planning + Design to complete the I-710 North Mobility Hubs Plan (Plan). Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, pursuant to legal counsel review, to execute the contract 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 complete the I-710 North Mobility Hubs Plan which involves evaluating existing projects and plans, identifying the availability of different modes of transportation, analyzing multi-modal supportive infrastructure and placemaking strategies, and future mobility trends including Mobility Hub locations and improvements addressing mobility.

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>Alta Planning + Design (21-043-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant shall complete the I-710 North Mobility Hubs Plan</td>
<td>$399,966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISCAL IMPACT:
Funding of $399,966 is available in the FY 2020-21 Overall Work Program (OWP) budget in Project Number 145-4885.01.
ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Contract Summary 21-043-C01
2. Contract Summary 21-043-C01 COI
CONSULTANT CONTRACT NO. 21-043-C01

Recommended Consultant:
Alta Planning + Design Inc.

Background & Scope of Work:
SCAG is partnering with County of Los Angeles, Cal State Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles, and the I-710 North Mobility Hubs Working Group to improve mobility between the South Pasadena Gold Line and Union Stations, Los Angeles County Public Works Headquarters, and Cal State Los Angeles. This study shall address congestion around the I-710N terminus.

The consultant shall develop an I-710N Mobility Hubs Plan (Plan) which includes evaluating existing projects and plans, identifying the availability of different modes of transportation, assessing placemaking strategies and amenities, analyzing multi-modal supportive infrastructure, identifying appropriate locations, and future mobility trends to address mobility improvements. The Plan will encourage multimodal transportation options, propose designs that foster a sense of place, and alleviate traffic congestion in the heavily congested region of the I-710N terminus due to the freeway terminating onto the streets of the City of Alhambra.

Project’s Benefits & Key Deliverables:
The project’s benefits and key deliverables include, but are not limited to:
- Evaluating existing projects and plans, accessibility, mobility, and connectivity at the identified mobility hub locations;
- Identifying ways to support and promote First/Last Mile connections;
- Conducting a robust stakeholder outreach and community engagement to facilitate collective decision public input for Plan development; and
- Evaluating the mobility between the South Pasadena Station, Public Works’ Headquarters, Cal State Los Angeles, Union Station and the surrounding areas.

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 $399,966

Alta Planning + Design Inc. (prime consultant) $199,801
Here Design Studio, LLC $100,013
Transportation Management and Design, Inc. $50,182
Active SGV, a Project of Community Partners $49,970

Contract Period:
Notice to Proceed through June 30, 2023

Project Number(s):
145-4885H1.01 $303,966
145-4885W2.01 $33,000
145-4885W3.01 $15,000
145-4885W4.01 $48,000
Funding source: Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) – Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Partnership Planning, and Cash Match from City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, and Cal State Los Angeles

Funding of $399,966 is available in the FY 2020-21 Overall Work Program (OWP) budget in Project Number 145-4885.01.

Request for Proposal (RFP):

SCAG staff notified 2,500 firms of the release of RFP 21-043 via SCAG’s Solicitation Management System website. A total of 83 firms downloaded the RFP. SCAG received the following four (4) proposals in response to the solicitation:

- **Alta Planning + Design Inc. (3 subconsultants)** $399,966
- IBI Group (3 subconsultants) $384,367
- KOA Corporation (3 subconsultants) $473,821
- M. Arthur Gensler Jr. & Associates, dba Gensler (4 subconsultants) $670,000

Selection Process:
The Proposal Review Committee (PRC) evaluated each proposal in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFP and conducted the selection process in a manner consistent with all applicable federal and state contracting regulations. After evaluating the proposals, the PRC interviewed the three (3) highest ranked offerors.

The PRC consisted of the following individuals:

- Hannah Brunelle, Senior Regional Planner, SCAG
- Katie Mac, Administrative Services Manager, LA County Public Works
- Robin Aksu, Transportation Planner, City of Los Angeles
- Zuhey Espinoza, Director Policy and Government Relations, Cal State Los Angeles
- Siew Mei Tan, Chief, Office of Corridor Management South Division of Traffic Operations, Caltrans District 7

Basis for Selection:
The PRC recommended Alta Planning + Design Inc. (Alta) for the contract award because the consultant:

- Provided the best overall value for the level of effort proposed, for example, Alta proposed 3,576 hours compared to the lowest cost proposal from IBI Group who proposed only 2,218 hours. Alta’s hours are approximately 62% more than IBI’s.
- Provided the best approach to community engagement, including emphasizing interactive engagement, youth engagement, and a mix of digital and low tech strategies;
- Highlighted existing relationships with community stakeholders Alta can leverage for this project to create a sense of trust with the community. Propose one on one meetings to mediate conflict and ensure all stakeholders are engaged at all points in the project. Recognized the disinvestment in this area and understand the need to invest a large portion of the budget toward community engagement;
- Identified strategic ways to overcome challenges to building consensus through multiple levels of engagement. These include a feedback loop for engagement, multiple outlets for communication, and partnering with community-based organizations for creative and innovative engagement strategies to reach nontraditional stakeholders;
• Demonstrated the best qualifications, for example, experience with projects of similar size and scope such as the First/Last Mile Strategic Plan, provided a balance between the proposed quantitative and qualitative approaches Alta will utilize, and detailed the ways in which they will overcome challenges in light of COVID-19; and
• Demonstrated the best project management approach and understanding of the project. Specifically, Alta provided a clear and detailed approach to the schedule, understanding the need to build in buffer time, due to potential conflicts with multiple stakeholders, while simultaneously keeping momentum with stakeholders.

Although one other firm proposed a lower price, the PRC did not recommend this firm for contract award because this firm:
• Did not propose a community engagement approach with as much detail on how they would approach the engagement, for example, they did not demonstrate how they would engage with youth or other vulnerable and non-traditional stakeholders. Further, the firm did not allocate enough staff hours toward community engagement to successfully implement an effective strategy; and
• Did not demonstrate the interconnections between engagement and technical analysis or fully describe the feedback loops with the community.
Conflict of Interest (COI) Form - Attachment
For April 1, 2021 Regional Council Approval

Approve Contract No. 21-043-C01 in an amount not to exceed $399,966 with Alta Planning + Design to complete the I-710 North Mobility Hubs Plan (Plan). Authorize the Executive Director, or his designee, pursuant to legal counsel review, to execute the contract 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>Alta Planning + Design, Inc. (prime consultant)</td>
<td>No - form attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here Design Studio, LLC (subconsultant)</td>
<td>No - form attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management and Design, Inc. (subconsultant)</td>
<td>No - form attached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active SGV, a Project of Community Partners (subconsultant)</td>
<td>No - form attached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCAG CONFLICT OF INTEREST FORM

RFP No. 21-043

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: Alta Planning + Design, Inc.
Name of Preparer: Greg Maher, Vice President
Project Title: SCAG I-710 North Mobility Hubs Plans
RFP Number: 21-043 Date Submitted: 2/26/21

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 21-043-C01 COI (Contracts $200,000 or Greater: Contract No. 21-043-C01, I-710 North Mobility Hubs Plan)
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) Greg Maher, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Vice President of (firm name) Alta Planning + Design, 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 2/26/21 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  2/26/21

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. 21-043

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: Here Design Studio, LLC
Name of Preparer: Shannon Davis
Project Title: SCAG I-710 North Mobility Hubs
RFP Number: 21-043 Date Submitted: 02/18/21

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>
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) Shannon Davis, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Co-Director of (firm name) Here Design Studio, 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 02/18/21 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)  02/18/21

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. 21-043

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: Community Partners
Name of Preparer: Daphne Wong, Grants Manager
Project Title: I-710 North Mobility Hubs Plan
RFP Number: 21-043 Date Submitted: 2/16/21

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>
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 21-043-C01 COI (Contracts $200,000 or Greater: Contract No. 21-043-C01, I-710 North Mobility Hubs Plan)
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) Mamie Funahashi, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) Chief Financial Officer of (firm name) Community Partners, 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 02/16/2021 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)

2/18/21
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. 21-043

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:  Transportation Management & Design, Inc. (TMD)
Name of Preparer:  China Langer, President
Project Title:  I-710 North Mobility Hubs Plan
RFP Number:  RFP No. 21-043  Date Submitted:  03/02/2021

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>
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) China Langer, hereby declare that I am the (position or title) President of (firm name) Transportation Management & Design, 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 02/15/2021 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) 02/15/2021 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.
AGENDA ITEM 7
REPORT

Southern California Association of Governments
Remote Participation Only
March 31, 2021

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

From: Art Yoon, Director of Policy and Public Affairs
(213) 236-1840, ArtYoon@scag.ca.gov

Subject: AB 687 (Seyarto) - Riverside County Housing Finance Trust

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Support

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:
Assembly Bill (AB) 687 (Seyarto, R-Murrieta) would authorize the creation of the Western Riverside County Housing Trust Fund (HTF) through a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) to fund housing projects for homeless and low-income populations in Western Riverside County. This bill would implement one of Western Riverside Council of Governments’ (WRCOG) approved projects, pursuant to the SCAG Regional Early Action Plan “Subregional Partnership Program.”

At its meeting on March 16, 2021, the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) unanimously voted to forward a “support” position on AB 687 to the Regional Council.

BACKGROUND:
A Housing Trust Fund (HTF) is a program or independent organization created by a city, county, or group of cities and the county to raise funds for affordable housing or homelessness-related needs. HTFs are funded through various sources, including dedicated funding from local jurisdictions, state and federal grants, bonds, and private donations. Typically, HTFs establish revolving loan funds that provide low-interest loans for approved activities that support the overall goal of providing affordable and supportive housing. Other HTFs fund activities such as new construction, predevelopment, preservation or restoration of affordable housing, and down payment assistance for first-time buyers, as well as to establish supportive housing for persons experiencing homelessness.
According to the Center for Community Change, in 2016, there were HTFs in 47 states and more than 700 cities providing over $1.2 billion in funding to address critical housing issues across the nation. A report by the WRCOG stated that California has at least 48 Housing Trust Funds, with many in the SCAG region including the Orange County Housing Finance Trust, the Housing Trust Fund of Ventura County, the San Gabriel Valley Regional Housing Trust, the West Hollywood Affordable Housing Trust Fund, the Skid Row Housing Trust, and the Santa Monica Citywide Housing Trust Fund, among others.

Establishing a Housing Trust Fund allows local jurisdictions to make ongoing investments using direct revenues and state and federal matching funds available only to HTFs to support affordable and supportive housing projects, rather than relying on one-time appropriations. These fund sources are not accessible to local and county housing authorities.

Recognizing the efficacy and prevalence of HTFs and the need for additional local tools and funding to address affordable housing and homelessness issues in Riverside County, especially as homelessness in the county increased by 35% in the last four years, Assemblymember Kelly Seyarto introduced AB 687.

**AB 687**
Assemblymember Kelly Seyarto (R-Murrieta) introduced AB 687 on February 16, 2021. AB 687 would authorize the creation of the Western Riverside County Housing Finance Trust through a joint powers authority open to WRCOG member jurisdictions.

AB 687 does not provide funding for the new Housing Trust Fund. Instead, it allows WRCOG member jurisdictions to access another tool available for cities and counties to provide funding to projects that address local housing needs. The HTF would primarily focus on assisting homeless and low-income populations in Riverside County, as defined by the California Health and Safety Code.

WRCOG seeks to administer the HTF, as it has existing staff infrastructure and experience operating as JPA for almost 30 years. A Board of Directors would govern the HTF with representatives from Riverside County and WRCOG member jurisdictions that choose to participate. Eligible jurisdictions would not be required to participate and could opt-out at any time. Lastly, AB 687 would require the HTF to include annual financial reporting and auditing requirements in the joint powers agreement.

As the primary proponent, WRCOG estimates that the HTF would require approximately $230,000 in annual contributions from participating jurisdictions for about five to ten years when they predict the fund would achieve financial independence. Further, WRCOG stated that participating jurisdictions would be required to pay membership dues ranging from $1,500 to $50,000, based on various factors such as population, jobs, anticipated growth rates, or others. However, these are
estimates, and the final numbers and factors are subject to change. These revenues would pay for operating and administrative costs associated with building up the HTF and administering programs and funding.

In short, AB 687 would authorize the Western Riverside County Housing Finance Trust to:
1. Fund the creation of housing for homeless and low-income populations, including permanent supportive housing;
2. Receive public and private funding; and
3. Authorize and issue bonds, certificates of participation, or other debt instruments to be repaid from HTF revenues.

AB 687 currently does not have any cosponsors, but it has been referred to the Assembly Local Government Committee and was heard on March 24, 2021.

Prior Committee Action
Staff presented AB 687 to the LCMC at its meeting on March 16, 2021, with a recommendation to “support,” consistent with the 2021 State Legislative Platform that includes the following point:

- While providing local jurisdictions with additional tools and funding, preserve local authority to address housing production, affordability, and homelessness challenges.

Members of the LCMC voted to forward a “support” position on AB 687 to the Regional Council as part of its consent calendar.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with the AB 687 staff report is contained in the Indirect Cost budget, Legislation 810-0120.10.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Support

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:
Senate Bill (SB) 15 (Portantino, D-La Cañada Flintridge) would establish a new grant program administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to award funds to local governments that rezone idle big-box retail and commercial shopping centers to allow for the development of affordable housing projects. Grant awards would be equivalent to sales tax revenue generated by the site in the seven years prior to when a local government applies for grant funding.

At its meeting on March 16, 2021, the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) unanimously voted to forward a "support" position on SB 15 to the Regional Council.

BACKGROUND:
The Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) estimates that California needs more than 200,000 new housing units per year to meet demand. However, less than half of that amount is being built annually in the state. The continued undersupply of housing poses challenges to providing sufficient affordable housing units for low- and moderate-income workers in education, public safety, healthcare, and other essential occupations.

Simultaneously, the pandemic facilitated significant e-commerce growth, which led to an increase in idle big box retail and commercial shopping center sites. The closure of a Walmart site in Irvine last month is one of the latest examples of a pandemic-accelerated transition away from brick-and-
However, it may present an opportunity for local governments to shift land-use towards developing workforce housing that would offer low- and moderate-income essential workers more opportunities to access affordable housing.

The concept of "fiscalization of land use" describes the trade-offs to revenues under different land-use types. The trade-offs between residential and retail spaces are significant because of the 1978 Proposition 13, which reduced and stagnated property taxes as a revenue source for local governments. According to the Senate Housing Committee, the revenue generated by new housing units is often not sufficient to cover additional infrastructure costs. Thus, big-box retail and commercial shopping centers and the sales tax revenue they bring are essential for local government budgets. Yet, empty storefronts resulting from changing consumer behavior, and exacerbated by the pandemic, generate zero sales tax revenue and creates significant long-term challenges for local governments.

Recognizing this issue, Senator Portantino authored SB 1299 in the 2019-2020 legislative session, which would have required HCD to administer a grant program to provide funding for local governments that rezone idle big-box retail or commercial shopping center sites to allow affordable housing development. Qualified local governments that applied for grant funding would have received an award equivalent to the rezoned site's sales tax revenue in the seven years prior to submitting an application. The award would offset lost revenue resulting from a site sitting idle and future revenue lost from rezoning for new housing developments, which generate less revenue than commercial zones.

SB 1299 received unanimous votes in policy committees in both chambers and on the Senate Floor, but a vote on the Assembly floor was not achieved before the clock expired on the 2019-20 legislative session. However, Senator Portantino reintroduced this concept as SB 15 in the 2020-21 legislative session.

**SB 15**

Senator Anthony Portantino introduced SB 15 on December 7, 2020, the first day of the 2021-22 legislative session. SB 15 would require HCD to administer a grant program to provide funding for local governments that rezone idle big-box retail or commercial shopping center sites to develop housing for low- and moderate-income workers. If signed into law, SB 15 would not go into effect until January 1, 2023, and projects for which cities have already agreed to a project labor agreement would not be eligible for grant funding under the new program.

SB 15 provides that eligible local governments would receive a lump sum grant equivalent to the sales tax revenue generated by the site over the seven years prior to submitting a grant application. The state would fund the new HCD grant program through general fund appropriations.
SB 15 defines housing as "an owner-occupied or rental housing development in which 100% of the units are affordable to low- or moderate-income households. The rent or sales price for a moderate-income unit shall be at least 20% below the market rate for a unit of similar size and bedroom count in the same neighborhood in the jurisdiction where the development is located. All units shall be restricted to 55 years for rental units and 45 years for owner units."

SB 15 defines a big box retailer or commercial shopping center as "idle" if "at least 80% of the leased or rentable square footage of the big box retailer or commercial shopping center site is not occupied for at least 12 months." A "big-box retailer" is "a store of greater than 75,000 square feet of gross buildable area that generates or previously generated sales or use taxes." A "commercial shopping center" is "a group of two or more stores that maintain a common parking lot for patrons of those stores."

SB 15 states that for a city or county to be eligible for funding under this new grant program, the local government must have:

- Rezoned at least one "idle" site to allow for affordable housing development, by right;
- Required that any project on the site be subject to certain labor standards;
- Approved and issued a certificate of occupancy for a workforce housing development; and
- Submitted a grant application to HCD with proof of compliance with the above requirements.

SB 15 provides that if an idle big-box retail or commercial shopping center site is rezoned to allow for mixed-uses, grant awards shall be reduced in proportion to the amount of square footage used for purposes other than affordable housing. Further, if the state does not allocate sufficient funding to cover all qualified applicants' full awards, HCD would reduce each award proportionally until the awards match the available funding.

SB 15 currently does not have any cosponsors but was re-referred to the Senate Housing Committee and heard on March 18, 2021.

**Prior Committee Action**

Staff presented SB 15 to the LCMC at its meeting on March 16, 2021, with a recommendation to take a position of "support," consistent with the 2021 State Legislative Platform that includes the following point:

- While providing local jurisdictions with additional tools and funding, preserve local authority to address housing production, affordability, and homelessness challenges.

After receiving a staff report, Members of the LCMC unanimously voted to forward a "support" position to the Regional Council for SB 15.
FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with the SB 15 staff report is contained in the Indirect Cost budget, Legislation 810-0120.10.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Support

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:
Senate Bill (SB) 623 (Newman, D-Fullerton) would change various provisions surrounding privacy protections, use, sharing, and storage of personally identifiable information collected from motorists who use or subscribe to toll facilities by transportation agencies.

Staff presented SB 623 to the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) at its meeting on March 16, 2021, after which the LCMC unanimously voted to forward a “support” position to the Regional Council.

BACKGROUND:
Current law codifies uniform standards across the state’s tolling agencies to protect the personally identifiable information of motorists who use or subscribe to toll facilities and prohibits toll operators from selling or otherwise providing information to companies or organizations for marketing or inappropriate uses. In recent years, a growing list of litigants, some petitioning for class-action status, have filed claims against transportation agencies and subcontractors throughout California. These lawsuits exploit the “otherwise provided” clause in existing law alleging that toll operators are violating the privacy restrictions placed on them when carrying out core aspects of operating toll facilities. Some examples include transportation agencies sharing names and addresses of motorists as they travel through different jurisdictions to ensure interoperability of toll collection devices and technologies or communicating with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to find appropriate contact information to notify toll violators.
SB 623

Senator Josh Newman introduced SB 623 on February 18, 2021. SB 623 would clarify that a toll operator may use personally identifiable information to perform specific business functions like billing, account settlement, account maintenance, collection, enforcement, device distribution, auditing, and conducting customer satisfaction surveys.

SB 623 would repeal a narrow provision that allows toll operators to collect the license plate number, transponder identification number, date and time of transaction, and an agency’s identity to conduct business. Instead, the bill would allow the collection of specified information and standards adopted by Caltrans and the tolling agencies. This restriction has hampered efforts in coordinating with other states to build a seamless national toll system. For example, California toll operators may need to share other information like the toll amount, the number of vehicle axels, or the number of individuals in the car, as these factors sometimes lead to a different toll rate.

Currently, toll operators are prohibited from selling or sharing personally identifiable information of a motorist that uses or subscribes to a toll facility. Furthermore, it requires transportation agencies establish a privacy policy regarding the collection and use of a subscriber’s personally identifiable information. SB 623 would specify that transportation agencies must make their privacy policies readily available through hard copy or internet link. The bill would establish a process by which a subscriber can opt-in or revoke consent to the use of their name, address, and e-mail address to receive information about products and services offered by a toll operator or contracted third-party vendor. SB 623 would allow a transportation agency to include toll-related marketing on an invoice or payment receipt sent to toll users and subscribers.

Under current state law, transportation agencies can store personally identifiable information for up to four and a half years. SB 623 would allow transportation agencies to retain the information to comply with litigation requirements.

SB 623 is cosponsored by Senators Dave Cortese (D-San Jose) and Bill Dodd (D-Napa) and Assemblymember Kevin Mullin (D-San Mateo). The bill has been referred to the Senate Transportation Committee and Senate Judiciary Committee. On February 22, 2021, a vote was taken in the Senate to suspend Joint Rule 55, which allows Senate bills to be heard in committee and amended before the 30-day waiting period, by a vote of 32 to 4. SB 623 will now be considered by the Senate Transportation Committee at a hearing on April 13, 2021.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support

Transportation Corridor Agencies (TCA)

Opposition

N/A
SB 623 is similar to legislation, SB 664, that was introduced by Senator Ben Allen (D-Redondo Beach) during the 2019 – 2020 Regular Session. On August 20, 2019, the LCMC unanimously voted to recommend a support position on SB 664 to the Regional Council. Subsequently, the Regional Council voted to adopt support for SB 664 at its meeting on September 5, 2019.

Prior Committee Action
Staff presented SB 623 to the LCMC at its meeting on March 16, 2021, after which the LCMC unanimously voted to forward a support recommendation to the Regional Council. Support for SB 623 is consistent with Regional Council-adopted policy and legislative priorities to support and preserve all existing sources of transportation funding and revenue.

SB 623 will clarify perceived gray areas in state law to continue to allow transportation agencies to use personal data efficiently and responsibly while maintaining appropriate prohibitions against the improper sharing of that information. SB 623 responsibly defends the vital public interest in the operation and maintenance of a comprehensive transportation infrastructure.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with the staff report on SB 623 is contained in the Indirect Cost budget, Legislation 810-0120.10.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Oppose Unless Amended

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:
Senate Bill (SB) 261 (Allen, D-Santa Monica) would update the State’s greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals for the transportation sector, create new vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction goals, increase the scrutiny of a Metropolitan Planning Organization’s (MPO) Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), and create new requirements for local governments to report on the number of housing, jobs, and transit-supportive infrastructure that demonstrates the implementation of an SCS’s strategies.

At its meeting on March 16, 2021, the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) unanimously voted to forward an “oppose unless amended” position on SB 261 to the Regional Council.

BACKGROUND:
In 2005, then Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger issued Executive Order S3-05 that called for statewide GHG emissions reductions to 1990 levels by 2020 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. One year later, the legislature approved, and Governor Schwarzenegger signed AB 32 (Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006), which created the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 granted CARB authority over greenhouse gas emissions sources and codified the State’s goal to reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.
AB 32 also required CARB to prepare and adopt a “Scoping Plan” to identify and make recommendations on measures that would reduce GHG emissions. The State’s first Scoping Plan was adopted in 2008, and CARB adopted subsequent updates in 2013 and 2017.

SB 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) directed CARB to set regional targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the automobile and light-duty truck sector for 2020 and 2035. In setting regional GHG emissions reduction targets, SB 375 established a Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) that included local and regional officials to advise CARB on the target-setting. SB 375 requires MPOs to create SCSs in conjunction with their Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and establishes a “bottoms up” approach to ensure that cities, counties, and county transportation commissions are involved in the development of regional plans to achieve those GHG reduction targets. The SCS is a growth strategy for the region that, combined with transportation policies and programs, strives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and help meet CARB’s targets for the region.

In 2015, then Governor Jerry Brown issued EO-B-30-15, which extended AB 32’s statewide GHG reduction goals to 40% below 1990 by 2030. The following year, the legislature passed, and Governor Brown signed SB 32 (Chapter 249, Statutes of 2016), which codified the statewide goals to reduce GHG emissions to 40% below the 1990 level by 2030.

In 2018, Governor Brown issued EO-B-55-18, establishing a statewide goal to achieve carbon neutrality no later than 2045 and to achieve and maintain negative emissions thereafter. Also that year, the legislature passed, and Governor Brown signed, SB 100 (Chapter 312, Statutes of 2018) that requires renewable energy resources and zero-carbon resources to supply 100% of retail sales of electricity to California end-use customers and 100% of electricity procured to serve all state agencies by December 31, 2045.

To date, the State’s 2050 GHG reduction target, first established by Governor Schwarzenegger’s 2005 executive order, has not been codified. In addition, the AB 32/SB 32 GHG reduction targets have not been statutorily extended beyond 2030, nor have SB 375’s targets for regional GHG reduction been statutorily extended beyond 2035.

SB 261
SB 261 was introduced by Senator Ben Allen (D-Santa Monica) on January 27, 2021. This bill can be divided into three main components. First, SB 261 would extend CARB’s authority to establish regional GHG reduction goals for the transportation sector, pursuant to the SB 375 program. In addition, the bill would authorize CARB to create new regional VMT reduction goals. Second, SB 261 would increase the scrutiny on an MPO’s SCS by CARB. Third, SB 261 would create new requirements on local governments to report the number of housing, jobs, and transit-supportive infrastructure, existing and planned, that demonstrates the implementation of the SCS’s strategies. Further detail on these three components is included below.
1. **Extends GHG reduction targets and adds new VMT reduction targets:** SB 261 would require CARB to set **regional** targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from automobile and light trucks for 2045 and 2050. In addition, the bill would require CARB to provide each region with VMT reduction targets for 2035, 2045, and 2050.

2. **Increased Scrutiny and Double-Checking an MPO’s SCS by CARB:** This bill would provide vague justifications for CARB to reject an MPO’s SCS and subject the MPO’s SCS to increased levels of scrutiny and double-checking by CARB.

   Under the proposal, the MPO would be required to submit a draft SCS to CARB for review at least 90 days before adopting the SCS. Then, within 45 days of receiving the draft SCS, CARB would be allowed to comment on the draft to identify issues affecting the SCS’s ability to produce accurate GHG and VMT reduction estimates. SB 261 would require the MPO to provide written responses to any comments made by CARB on the draft SCS, and those responses would have to indicate and explain how the MPO incorporates or rejects the particular CARB comments.

   SB 261 would require the MPO to submit an SCS to CARB within 60 days of the MPO’s adoption of the document and then doubles the time CARB has to accept or reject an MPO’s SCS from 60 to 120 days.

   In evaluating an MPO’s SCS, SB 261 would allow CARB to consider “reasonable progress” toward achieving the region’s GHG and VMT reduction targets, however, no definition of “reasonable progress” is provided. In addition, SB 261 mandates CARB to reject an MPO’s SCS if, “based on evidence,” CARB determines that the technical methodology, data provided by the MPO, VMT/GHG reduction claims or estimates, or SCS strategies did not meet the GHG and VMT reduction goals.

3. **New Reporting Requirements:** SB 261 would require each city or county to report to the MPO on the number of housing, jobs, and transit-supportive infrastructure, existing and planned, that demonstrates the implementation of the SCS’s strategies. Cities and counties would be required to report this information every other year.

SB 261 was double referred to the Senate Committee on Environmental Quality, of which Senator Allen is Chair, and to the Senate Committee on Transportation. SB 261 was passed out of the Senate Environmental Quality Committee on a vote of 5 to 2 on March 15, 2021, with Chair Allen and Senators Lena Gonzalez (D-Long Beach), Nancy Skinner (D-Berkeley), Henry Stern (D-Agoura Hills), and Bob Wieckowski (D-Santa Clara) voting “aye” and Senators Patricia Bates (R-Laguna...
Niguel) and Brian Dahle (R-Redding) voting “no.” As of the March 15, 2021 hearing, the following organizations and agencies had registered their official support or opposition to the bill.

**Support (partial list)**
- Climateplan
- Coalition for Clean Air
- Safe Routes to School National Partnership

**Opposition (partial list)**
- California Association of Councils of Governments (CalCOG)
- California Building Industry Association
- California Chamber of Commerce
- Fresno Council of Governments
- Kern Council of Governments
- Rural County Representatives of California

A hearing in the Senate Transportation Committee has not yet been scheduled.

**Staff Recommendation**
After careful evaluation of SB 261 with internal program staff and external partners, staff recommended an “oppose unless amended” position on SB 261 to the LCMC. Further detail on the concerns associated with this recommended position, as well as specific recommendations to the bill, are included below.

1. **Extends GHG reduction targets and adds new VMT reduction targets:** CARB’s current Scoping Plan, adopted in 2017, calls for a 25% reduction in GHG emissions from the transportation sector. Strategies that were part of CARB’s 2010 regional targets (including SCAG’s SCSs from 2012 and 2016) count for 13% of that 25% reduction. Then, strategies from the 2018 regional targets (including the recently adopted 2020 Connect SoCal) count for another 5% toward the statewide goal. That leaves a 7% GHG reduction gap from the transportation sector for which the State has not identified or adopted a comprehensive plan to reduce GHG. Therefore, staff recommends that SB 261 be amended to hold the State accountable for its portion of strategies needed to meet the 25% GHG reduction goal from the transportation sector.

While SB 261 would extend the SB 375 program, which provides *regional* targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the automobile and light-duty truck sector, the State has not yet extended the AB 32/SB 32 program, which provides targets for the *statewide* targets for the reduction in GHG emissions. Nor has the State codified the Schwarzenegger-era executive order, which establishes the 2050 target. Because the statewide program greatly impacts the regional program, SB 261 puts the cart before the horse by extending the regional program before the statewide program. SCAG staff recommends that the AB 32/SB 32 statewide targets be extended before or in concert with the SB 375 regional targets.
SCAG’s GHG reduction strategies do not sunset in 2035, and SCAG remains committed to developing the bottoms-up vision for reducing our regional GHG footprint pursuant to SB 375. SB 261 provides GHG reduction goals for both 2045 and 2050. Requiring two goals that are so close can overburden the SCS development process since MPOs are forecasting the long-term impacts of GHG reduction strategies over at least a two-decade time frame. Staff recommends that SB 261 be amended to set only a 2050 GHG reduction goal, to establish a meaningful and achievable 15-year cycle building off the 2020 and 2035 targets.

In addition, there is a clear and established basis for establishing greenhouse gas reduction as the metric to address climate change. VMT reduction, on the other hand, does not have the same relationship. Electric Vehicles and Zero-Emission Vehicles do not generate emissions, however, they do produce VMT. By considering induced demand, a phenomenon whereby as the cost of a product is reduced, the consumption of that good may actually increase, VMT is likely to increase as EVs and ZEVs become less expensive to operate more common. Therefore, staff recommends SB 261 be amended to remove the VMT reduction goal.

Lastly, SB 375 established the RTAC, mentioned above, of local and regional officials who advised CARB on the target setting process. Staff recommends that CARB restore the RTAC to establish any new targets in a public, collaborative, and inclusive manner.

2. Increased Scrutiny and Double-Checking an MPO’s SCS by CARB: As mentioned in the previous section, SB 261 would subject an MPO’s SCS to increased levels of scrutiny and double-checking by CARB. Clarification is needed on how the advance copy of a draft SCS, special comment opportunity for CARB, and then specialized responses are different from the already required public comment period. To avoid establishing redundancies, staff recommends SB 261 be amended to remove this requirement.

Requiring the MPO to submit an SCS to CARB within 60 days of the MPO’s adoption of the document is not concerning to SCAG. On the other hand, doubling the review period from 60 to 120 days before CARB is required to accept or reject an MPO’s SCS may have unintended consequences. Several state grant programs require that a particular project be consistent with a region’s SCS. As a result, additional delays in acceptance of the SCS could impact a city, county, or county transportation commission’s application for a state-funded competitive grant program. For this reason, SCAG staff recommends SB 261 be amended to remove this provision.

Additionally, SB 261 provides vague justifications for CARB to reject an MPO’s SCS. The language would allow CARB to reject the SCS based upon subjective standards such as
“reasonable progress” toward achieving the region’s GHG and VMT reduction targets or based upon saying that data provided by the MPO were “insufficient” for CARB’s review. CARB may consider “reasonable progress” toward achieving the region’s GHG and VMT reduction targets, however, no definition of this term is included in the bill. CARB would be required to reject an MPO’s SCS if “based on evidence” CARB determined that the technical methodology, data provided by the MPO, VMT/GHG reduction claims or estimates, or strategies did not meet the GHG and VMT reduction goals. SCAG staff recommends SB 261 be amended to require CARB to promulgate and adopt a list of all data sources needed to evaluate a region’s SCS and would recommend that all other requirements in this section be removed.

3. **New Reporting Requirements:** Acquiring data on housing, jobs, and transit-supportive infrastructure could have the effect of benefiting SCAG in terms of monitoring implementation and performance assessments of the adopted SCS and informing refinements in future GHG reduction strategies. However, requiring local agencies to report this data to SCAG would create a new administrative burden on the individual agencies and SCAG.

At the same, local jurisdictions are already required to report on an annual basis their city-level growth in new households and household demolitions to the Department of Finance. Additionally, local jurisdictions are required to report their annual housing production figures to the Department of Housing and Community Development. While some employment-level data may be more challenging to obtain, it is possible to procure jobs-level data from the Employment Development Department.

To reduce the administrative burden on local agencies and SCAG, SCAG staff recommends that SB 261 be amended to require state agencies that already collect these data to provide them to the MPOs on an annual basis.

In advance of the March 16, 2021 LCMC meeting, SCAG legislative and planning staff met with staff to Senator Allen to convey informal feedback outlining the agency’s early concerns.

**Prior Committee Action**
Staff presented SB 261 to the LCMC at its meeting on March 16, 2021 with a recommendation to take a position of “oppose unless amended” due to concerns outlined above and consistent with the following two principles included in the Regional Council-adopted legislative platform:

- In collaboration with other metropolitan planning organizations and stakeholders, explore potential updates to SB 375 (Steinberg, 2008) with the goal of focusing on ambitious yet achievable actions that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in partnership with the State.
- Protect all existing and new sources of transportation funding from borrowing, use for any purpose other than transportation, or new conditions on the distributions of funds that reprioritize transportation projects.

After receiving a staff report, Members of the LCMC unanimously voted (16-0) to forward an “oppose unless amended” position to the Regional Council for SB 261 to continue a constructive dialogue on how to amend and improve this bill and the SB 375 program.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with the SB 261 staff report is contained in the Indirect Cost budget, Legislation 810-0120.10.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Support

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:
Senate Bill (SB) 266 (Newman, D-Fullerton) directs the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to assist Chino Hills State Park in acquiring and accepting three properties adjacent to expand the Park. DPR would agree to manage and maintain those properties as part of Chino Hills State Park.

At its meeting on March 16, 2021, the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) unanimously voted to forward a “support” position on SB 266 to the Regional Council.

BACKGROUND:
Chino Hills State Park became a part of the state park system in 1984 after DPR acquired approximately 2,200 acres for the Park. Since 1984, the Park has grown by over 14,000 acres. Chino Hills State Park is of great cultural significance, with approximately 300,000 annual visitors, and provides a critical nature and wildlife corridor, linking the 31-mile-long Puente-Chino Hills biological corridor to provide a pathway between undeveloped wildlife habitats in a heavily urbanized region. Chino Hills State Park houses more than 200 species of aquatic and land-based animals, as well as over 1,000 species of insects. Several flora and fauna species that live in the Park are threatened, endangered, or specially protected.

The 1979 Chino Hills Feasibility Study identified 30,000 acres that should be acquired in the State Park General Plan. The 1979 study and the Park’s General Plan from 1999 identified various
properties totaling more than 1,500 acres bordering the Park, which are a top priority to protect various flora and fauna species. Hills for Everyone, a 501(c)(3) organization seeking to preserve Chino Hills State Park and surrounding lands, stated that DPR agreed to work with Chino Hills State Park 10 years ago to acquire and manage the various properties. However, due to budget cuts and DPR’s historic low rates of acquiring new lands, the properties remain separate from the Park.

Several legislators introduced bills that would require DPR to accept and manage the three properties that expand Chino Hills State Park to address this issue. Hills for Everyone identified funding for the acquisition and management of the properties. Former Senator Ling Ling Chang (R-Diamond Bar) introduced SB 404 in 2019, and Assemblyman Philip Chen (R-Brea) introduced AB 2021 in 2020. Both bills would have directed DPR to assist Chino Hills State Park in acquiring, managing, and maintaining critical properties as part of the Park. SB 404 included four land parcels, but one of the four has since been sold and is no longer available. Thus, AB 2021 included the three remaining parcels for acquisition. Funding to acquire and maintain the properties would come, in part, from a settlement agreement with the Metropolitan Water District.

While both bills received unanimous votes in their relevant policy committees, they failed to reach a vote in their respective appropriations committees. Senator Newman (D-Fullerton) introduced the current iteration of this legislation, SB 266, in the 2021-22 Legislative Session.

**SB 266**

Senator Josh Newman (D-Fullerton) introduced SB 266 on January 28, 2021. SB 266 directs the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) to help Chino Hills State Park acquire and accept three properties adjacent to the park. The legislation would require that DPR manage and maintain those properties as part of Chino Hills State Park with funds held for that purpose or obtained through a settlement agreement.

The three properties and four parcels include:

1. Beattie [11 acres];
2. First National Investment Properties [1,120 acres]; and
3. Eastbridge/MRCA [400 acres, 2 parcels].
DPR estimated a cost of $1.4 million to meet AB 2021’s requirements. SB 266 remains virtually unchanged from its previous iteration as AB 2021. However, new cost estimates for SB 266 are not yet available. The parcels would add 1,878 acres to the Park. All three parcels have willing sellers, and the Beattie parcel owner is willing to donate it to the State Park.

According to Hills for Everyone, funding for the acquisition and maintenance of the three properties has already been identified or is moving through an approval process. Approximately $700,000 remains in a trust established to acquire walnut woodlands and expand the Park. The original $1.4 million settlement agreement resulted from the Metropolitan Water District’s (MWD) failure to assess a project’s impacts on walnut woodlands in Chino Hills State Park. SB 266 would require DPR to utilize funding from the MWD settlement agreement to acquire and maintain 130 acres consisting of the 11-acre Beattie property and the northernmost 120-acre parcel of the First National Investment Property. Hills for Everyone is in negotiations with the current landowners and other partners to expand the endowment created from the MWD settlement agreement to cover DPR’s long-term management and maintenance costs.

The Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) is working with the Eastbridge property owners to acquire and maintain the property in two phases. Hills for Everyone is working with the First National Investment Properties owners to obtain the parcels not covered by MWD.
funds in three phases. The Wildlife Conservation Board (WCB) will consider MRCA’s application to fund the final acquisition phase for the Eastbridge property and Hills for Everyone’s application to fund the first acquisition phase for the First National Investment Properties in April 2021. The WCB approved MRCA’s application for the Eastbridge property’s first acquisition phase in February 2020. Hills for Everyone and MRCA intend to acquire and manage the properties until they have obtained all three, at which point they would work with DPR to integrate them into Chino Hills State Park.

SB 266 is co-sponsored by Assemblyman Philip Chen. After receiving a unanimous vote in the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee, SB 266 has been re-referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee. No entity has registered opposition to the legislation. Various local elected officials have filed support for the legislation, including:

- Curt Hagman, Chairman, San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors
- Doug Chaffee, Vice Chairman, Orange County Board of Supervisors
- City of Brea
- City of Chino Hills

Prior Committee Action
Staff presented SB 266 to the LCMC at its meeting on March 16, 2021, with a recommendation to “support,” consistent with the following priorities adopted in the Sustainable Communities Strategy:

- Connect SoCal plan’s integrated land use and conservation planning approach seeks to protect the environment and reduce greenhouse gas emissions while meeting the needs of current and future populations.
- The SCS includes natural and farm land conservation as a strategy for greenhouse gas reduction, consistent with the intent of SB 266 to acquire and preserve natural lands for posterity.

Members of the LCMC voted to forward a “support” position to the Regional Council for SB 266 as part of its Consent Calendar.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with the SB 266 staff report is contained in the Indirect Cost budget, Legislation 810-0120.10.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve up to $20,000 in annual memberships for the Southern California Leadership Council ($20,000).

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 March 16, 2021 meeting, the Legislative/Communications and Membership Committee (LCMC) recommended approval of up to $20,000 in annual memberships for the Southern California Leadership Council ($20,000).

BACKGROUND:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 1:</th>
<th>Southern California Leadership Council (SCLC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type:</td>
<td>Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount:</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Established in 2005, 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 Board officers and executive leadership regularly attend SCLC meetings.
FISCAL IMPACT:
$20,000 for membership in the Southern California Leadership Council is included in the approved FY 21-22 General Fund budget.
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) 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>Zoom Video Communications Inc.</td>
<td>FY21 Zoom Renewal and Upgrade</td>
<td>$12,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparkgeo Consulting Inc</td>
<td>FY21 Mapticks Enterprise Plan Subscription</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCAG executed the following Contract 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>1. Alta Planning + Design, Inc. (20-054-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant shall provide services for the City of San Gabriel by complementing and building upon the existing San Gabriel Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) by investigating and evaluating the physical conditions, traffic control devices, pedestrian volumes, vehicular traffic patterns, volumes and speeds</td>
<td>$194,993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCAG executed the following Contract 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>2. The Regents of the University of California, Riverside (UCR) (21-018-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant shall build a linkage between SCAG’s existing economic analysis and Economic Summit as these emerging equity-oriented initiatives, support the development of the SCAG Region’s Inclusive Economic Recovery Strategy (IERS) and set the foundation and framework for SCAG’s work on inclusive economic recovery moving forward, including integration with the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (Connect SoCal).</td>
<td>$151,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cambridge Systematics, Inc. (21-026-C01)</td>
<td>Consistent with the requirements of the State of California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) grant, as well as the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program grant that funds this project, the consultant shall host a series of peer exchanges for traffic safety practitioners within the SCAG region. The purpose of the peer exchanges is to encourage stakeholders in the region to develop safety plans and implement safety strategies to reduce fatalities and serious injuries, in particular for vulnerable populations (e.g., bicyclists, pedestrians, older adults, and youth) while prioritizing the intersection of equity and social</td>
<td>$148,022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCAG executed the following Contract 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>4. The Regents of the University of California, Davis (UC Davis) (21-024-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant shall conduct a study to better assess changes in travel behavior due to the pandemic and corresponding economic and living situation changes.</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. DLT Solutions (21-054-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant shall provide infrastructure to assist SCAG to fulfill its mission through the implementation of a modern and comprehensive Regional Data Platform that will promote more efficient, cost-effective, and transparent planning across the SCAG region.</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Taylor Walk Inc., DBA Pacific Office Interiors (21-045-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant will install protective glass for staff cubicles in the 900 Wilshire Blvd. Headquarters building to provide a barrier of protection against the spread of COVID-19 and other viruses.</td>
<td>$81,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cornerstone On Demand Inc. (21-056-C01)</td>
<td>In order to support SCAG’s strategic goal to recruit, support, and develop a world-class workforce, staff is leveraged its Learning Management Systems (LMS) that build off SCAG’s current software.</td>
<td>$70,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Matta Construction Services (21-021-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant shall install badge readers in the stairwell on the 16th Floor.</td>
<td>$48,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SCAG executed the following Contract 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></td>
<td>and 17th floors of SCAG’s 900 Wilshire Headquarters building.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCAG executed the Amendment more than $5,000 but less than $75,000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant/Contract #</th>
<th>Amendment’s Purpose</th>
<th>Amendment Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. StreetLight Data, Inc. (21-020-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant shall customize data related to truck trips to help increase the accuracy of SCAG’s Travel Demand Model.</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Institute of Transportation Studies (19-024-C01)</td>
<td>The consultant shall replace a survey they were unable to perform due to the COVID-19 pandemic and replaces it with purchasing a license to access statistical third-party data, allowing the consultant to perform a similar analysis as was originally planned.</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Alta Planning + Design (19-019-C01)</td>
<td>As part of developing a Multimodal Regional Corridor Plan in the San Gabriel Valley (SGV) Region, the consultant shall conduct additional engagements in the City of Claremont and provide additional presentations to the Cities of San Dimas, La Verne, Claremont, and Pomona due to COVID-19 related cancellation of engagements in other cities.</td>
<td>$14,685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENT(S):**

1. Contract Summary 20-054-C01
2. Contract Summary 21-018-C01
3. Contract Summary 21-026-C01
4. Contract Summary 21-024-C01
5. Contract Summary 21-054-C01
6. Contract Summary 21-045-C01
7. Contract Summary 21-056-C01
8. Contract Summary 21-022-C01
9. Contract Summary 21-020-C01 Amendment 1
10. Contract Summary 19-024-C01 Amendment 2
11. Contract Summary 19-019-C01 Amendment 5
Recommended Consultant: Alta Planning + Design, Inc.

Background & Scope of Work: The development of the San Gabriel Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Plan is intended to guide the implementation of a comprehensive network of safe streets for students. The SRTS Plan will provide a vision to improve conditions for non-motorized forms of travel throughout San Gabriel City schools to create safe, accessible connectivity. The SRTS Plan will combine planning efforts with pedestrian safety education to promote and increase multimodal travel for all ages and all levels of ability.

The Consultant shall provide services for the City of San Gabriel by complementing and building upon the existing San Gabriel Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) by investigating and evaluating the physical conditions, traffic control devices, pedestrian volumes, vehicular traffic patterns, volumes and speeds around private and public elementary and middle schools in the City. They will provide a final adopted plan that will include project recommendations for active transportation safety improvements to schools.

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

- Improving mobility for parents, school-age students and the school community walking and biking in and around the City by providing a comprehensive Safe Routes to School Plan;
- Improving access to walking and bicycling for recreation or commuting and infrastructure for non-motorized transportation to schools;
- Providing a variety of safety improvements and connectivity to transit facilities, points of interest, and parks within the school boundary limits; and
- Providing multilingual inclusive community engagement, using traditional and non-traditional approaches, by determining and identifying solutions that meet the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists connecting to the surrounding region.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians; Goal 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy; and Goal 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies’ planning and operations and promote regional collaboration.

Contract Amount: Total not to exceed $194,993

Alta Planning + Design (prime consultant) $125,015
Active SGV (subconsultant) $69,978

Note: Alta Planning + Design originally proposed $297,054, but staff negotiated the price down to $194,993 without reducing the scope of work.

Contract Period: March 2, 2021 through February 27, 2022
Project Number(s): 225-4837X3.01 $194,993
Funding source(s): FY19 ATP Local Planning Initiative

Request for Proposal (RFP):
SCAG staff notified 3008 firms of the release of RFP 20-054 via SCAG’s Solicitation Management System. A total of 43 firms downloaded the RFP. SCAG received the following three (3) proposals in response to the solicitation:

- **Alta Planning + Design, Inc. (1 subconsultant)** $297,054
- **Toole Design Group, LLC (2 subconsultants)** $316,746
- **KOA Corporation (2 subconsultants)** $369,266

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

The PRC consisted of the following individuals:
Dorothy Le Suchkova, Senior Regional Planner ATSP, SCAG
Angela Cheng, Senior Civil Engineer, City of San Gabriel
Greg de Vinck, Public Works Director City Engineer, City of San Gabriel

Basis for Selection:
The PRC recommended Alta Planning + Design, Inc. for the contract award because the consultant:
- Demonstrated the best understanding of the project, specifically assets, constraints and opportunities in City of San Gabriel; regional transportation context; understanding of City of San Gabriel background, history and goals; and a strong track record of similar projects and in the region (San Gabriel Valley Regional Bicycle Master Plan, Pasadena Safe Routes to School Plan, El Monte Walking School Bus Program);
- Recognized by all PRC members for innovative public outreach methods; all public outreach is proposed to be in Chinese, Spanish and English, and utilizes innovative traditional and non-traditional methods including pop-ups and existing community events and festivals; and
- Proposed lowest price.
Recommended Consultant: Regents of the University of California, Riverside Campus (UCR)

Background & Scope of Work: The Consultant shall build a linkage between SCAG’s existing economic analysis and Economic Summit as these emerging equity-oriented initiatives, support the development of the SCAG Region’s Inclusive Economic Recovery Strategy (IERS) and set the foundation and framework for SCAG’s work on inclusive economic recovery moving forward, including integration with the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS or Connect SoCal).

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

- Supporting development of the Inclusive Economic Recovery Strategy (IERS), including a best practices literature review, creating lists of resources and organizations, initial framing of the strategy, support for identifying convening participants, and support for development of the final strategy document;
- Developing an equity framework for measuring the impact/success of the IERS, and identifying mechanisms to integrate the IERS with the SCAG workplan and the future 2024 RTP/SCS process;
- Collaborating with the SCAG Economic Recovery and Resiliency Bench to develop the materials for the 2021 Economic Summit; and
- Providing research and analysis on a regional policy topics and how it connects to equity outcomes.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians and Goal 3: Be the foremost data information hub for the region.

Contract Amount: Total not to exceed $151,146 UCR (prime consultant)

Note: UCR originally proposed $171,000, but staff negotiated the price down to $151,146 without reducing the scope of work.

Contract Period: February 23, 2021 through June 30, 2022

Project Number(s): 055-1531B.01 $151,146 Funding source(s): Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) – Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

Funding of $46,000 is available in the FY 2020-21 budget, and the remaining $105,146 is expected to be available in the FY 2021-22 budget in Project Number 055-1531B.01, subject to budget availability.

Request for Proposal (RFP) Not applicable – sole source contract

Selection Process Not applicable – sole source contract
Basis for Selection: The SCAG staff recommended UCR for the contract award because they demonstrated excellent research developing policy recommendations and engaging stakeholders on prior relevant collaborative projects, such as, their work on the Inland Empire Roadmap for an Inclusive and Sustainable Economy (IE RISE).

Given UCR’s established expertise, staff awarded the contract pursuant to Section 3.06 of the State of California Contracts Manual, Contracts with Other Governmental Entities and Public Universities, which allows sole sourcing a contract to a public university or colleges. Staff also awarded the contract in accordance with the Regional Council Policy Manual, Article VIII, Section 1.2 (updated September 2009, pg. 26), and the SCAG Procurement Manual (January 2021, section 3.3) which authorizes the Executive Director or his designee (the Chief Financial Officer) to approve a consultant contract without competition, if the contract is less than $200,000.
CONSULTANT CONTRACT NO. 21-026-C01

Recommended Consultant: Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

Background & Scope of Work: Consistent with the requirements of the State of California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) grant, as well as the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program grant that funds this project, the consultant shall host a series of peer exchanges for traffic safety practitioners within the SCAG region. The purpose of the peer exchanges is to encourage stakeholders in the region to develop safety plans and implement safety strategies to reduce fatalities and serious injuries, in particular for vulnerable populations (e.g., bicyclists, pedestrians, older adults, and youth) while prioritizing the intersection of equity and social justice issues, including the impacts of racial violence related to enforcement, and emerging safety issues due to COVID-19.

The peer exchanges will help to further SCAG’s regional transportation goals and strategies, including those outlined in the 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (Connect SoCal) in the Transportation Safety & Security Transportation Technical Report. The peer exchanges will also align with the Connect SoCal regional goal of improving mobility, accessibility, reliability, and travel safety for people and goods, and the recommendations that local jurisdictions develop pedestrian safety action plans and consider pedestrian needs in all roadway and transit projects.

Project’s Benefits & Key Deliverables: The project’s key benefit is hosting a dozen (12) peer exchanges for traffic safety practitioners from across the region. The purpose of the peer exchanges is to encourage stakeholders to develop safety plans and implement safety strategies to reduce fatalities and serious injuries, in particular for vulnerable populations (e.g., bicyclists, pedestrians, older adults, and youth) while prioritizing the intersection of equity and social justice issues.

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 $148,022
Cambridge Systematics (prime consultant) $95,519
Nelson\Nygaard (subconsultant) $52,503

Contract Period: February 10, 2021 through August 31, 2021

Project Number: 225-3564J6.16 $148,022
Funding source: State of California, Office of Traffic Safety

Funding of $148,022 is available in the FY 2020-21 Overall Work Program (OWP) in Project Number 225-3564J6.16.

Request for Proposal (RFP): SCAG staff notified 2,578 firms of the release of RFP 21-026-C01 via SCAG’s Solicitation Management System website. A total of 33 firms downloaded the RFP. SCAG received the following two (2) proposals in response to the solicitation:
Selection Process: The Proposal Review Committee (PRC) evaluated each proposal in accordance with the criteria set forth in the RFP and conducted the selection process in a manner consistent with all applicable federal and state contracting regulations. After evaluating the proposals, the PRC did not conduct interviews because the proposals contained sufficient information on which to base a contract award.

The PRC consisted of the following individuals:

Courtney Aguirre, Program Manager II, SCAG
Hina Chanchlani, Associate Regional Planner, SCAG
Dorothy Le Suchkova, Senior Regional Planner, SCAG

Basis for Selection: The PRC recommended Cambridge Systematics, Inc. for the contract award because the consultant:

- Demonstrated the most relevant transportation safety planning expertise at all levels of government, specifically through their work developing, implementing, and evaluating Strategic Highway Safety Plans across 21 states, including California, developing the California State Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, and supporting the development of Caltrans’ active transportation district-level plans, including designing the data collection and prioritization framework for recommended improvements;
- Demonstrated the most relevant experience organizing peer exchanges, specifically through their work for the FHWA Office of Safety organizing peer exchanges across the country and US DOT’s Pedestrian Safety Summit in July 2020;
- Demonstrated the most experience on transportation equity analysis, specifically through their work on Los Angeles Metro’s “Equity Focus Communities,” or those that have experienced a higher degree of various negative outcomes in public health, education, economic achievement, mobility, safety, and other factors;
- Demonstrated the best understanding of effective approaches for mobilizing safety practitioners to be involved in developing and implementing solutions to transportation safety problems;
- Provided the best technical approach, for example, including a website feature showing a running tally of jurisdictions signing the Go Human safety pledge; incorporating a crowd sourced safety crash feature; and an ESRI map to promoting the work of local jurisdictions on safety efforts; and
- Proposed the lowest price.
CONSULTANT CONTRACT NO. 21-024-C01

Recommended Consultant:
The Regents of the University of California, Davis (UC Davis)

Background & Scope of Work:
SCAG is seeking to understand travel behavior within the SCAG region, particularly as travel patterns have evolved and will continue to do so during COVID-19 recovery and beyond. In recognition of potential future impacts of COVID-19 and the likelihood of uneven recovery, sampling of existing conditions will be carefully considered to provide the most accurate understanding of baseline conditions and to more broadly inform current and future studies, particularly about perceptions and preferences.

UC Davis has been conducting a longitudinal study on travel behavior beginning in 2018. Since the onset of the pandemic, UC Davis has been using their survey to understand changes in travel behavior due to the pandemic and corresponding economic and living situation changes. Through partnering with UC Davis, SCAG can leverage their survey construction and infrastructure to administer the survey extensively throughout the SCAG region. The survey covers the following topics:

1. Attitudes and preferences on transportation, residential location, environmental topics, etc.
2. Impacts of COVID-19 pandemic on lifestyle, including use of technology
3. Employment status, work and study activities
4. Household organization and child-care
5. Online and in-person shopping patterns (for groceries, food delivery services, visits to restaurants, etc.)
6. Current travel choices (by trip purposes and modes)
7. Use of emerging transportation services
8. Household vehicle ownership and eventual plans for vehicle purchase
9. Household and individual sociodemographics

Also, there is potential to administer an additional round of the survey next spring to further understand the pandemic recovery trajectory and long-term implications for travel in our region.

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

• This project will help provide a baseline understanding of travel behavior, particularly as travel patterns have evolved and will continue to do so during COVID-19 recovery and beyond;
• In recognition of potential future impacts of COVID-19 and the likelihood of uneven recovery, sampling of existing conditions will be carefully considered to provide the most accurate understanding of baseline conditions and inform current and future studies;
• The results are anticipated to provide a rich set of data to support SCAG’s ongoing travel demand modeling work; and
• Deliverables will include a final report analyzing survey results, and underlying raw survey data.
This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians; and Goal 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies’ planning and operations and promote regional collaboration.

**Contract Amount:** Total not to exceed $130,000

The Regents of the University of California, Davis (prime consultant)

**Contract Period:** December 28, 2020 through August 31, 2021

**Project Number(s):**
- 290-4827U5.02 $25,584
- 290-4827E.02 $39,416
- 290-4828U5.02 $25,584
- 290-4828E.02 $39,416

Funding source(s): Senate Bill 1 (SB1); Transportation Development Act (TDA)

**Request for Proposal (RFP):** Not Applicable: Sole Source Contract

**Selection Process:** Not Applicable: Sole Source Contract

**Basis for Selection:**
SCAG identified UC Davis through their ongoing efforts in conducting a longitudinal study on travel behavior, beginning in 2018. Since the onset of the pandemic, UC Davis has been using their survey to understand changes in travel behavior due to the pandemic and corresponding economic and living situation changes. Through partnering with UC Davis, SCAG can leverage their survey construction and infrastructure to administer the survey extensively throughout the SCAG region. We would then work with UC Davis to analyze results to compare responses across the diverse population within the SCAG region. This would also allow comparisons between survey results from other geographies, for example the state of California or other urban regions. The longitudinal nature of UC Davis study data would allow us to observe how the pandemic has impacted travel choices. Further rounds of the survey could be administered to understand the continually evolving impacts of COVID-19 on our travel behaviors and perceptions throughout recovery.

Given the established expertise of UC Davis and their excellent research proposal, staff awarded the contract pursuant to Section 3.06 of the State of California Contracts Manual, Contract with Other Governmental Entities and Public Universities, which allows sole sourcing a contract to a public university or colleges. Staff also awarded the contract in accordance with the Regional Council Policy Manual, Article VIII, Section 1.2 (updated September 2009, pg. 26), and the SCAG Procurement Manual (January 2021, section 3.3) which authorizes the Executive Director or his designee (the Chief Financial Officer) to approve a consultant contract without competition, if the contract is less than $200,000.
**Recommended Consultant:**
DLT Solutions

**Background & Scope of Work:**
SCAG has the critical mission of supporting 191 cities and six counties in Southern California with regional governance of transportation, planning and economic development. A significant component of this mission is providing complete and up-to-date data, methods and tools to member agencies to support local planning activities. The Amazon Web Services (AWS) Infrastructure will enable SCAG to fulfill this mission through the implementation of a modern and comprehensive Regional Data Platform that will promote more efficient, cost-effective, and transparent planning across the SCAG region.

**Project’s Benefits & Key Deliverables:**
This project directly supports the development and implementation of the Regional Data Platform. Key benefits include flexibly to increase SCAG’s computing capacity to meet the specialized needs of the Regional Data Platform, flexible high-capacity data storage, efficient and cost-effective computing resources.

**Strategic Plan:**
This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 3: Be the foremost data information hub for the region; Objective F. 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:**
Total not to exceed $120,000

**Contract Period:**
March 18, 2021 through March 31, 2022

**Project Number(s):**
280-4832.04 $120,000

Funding source(s): $40,000 is available in the FY 2020-21 budget in Project Number 280-4832.04. Funding for FY2021-22 will be included in Project 280-4832.04.

**Basis for Selection:**
In accordance with SCAG’s Contract Manual Section 6.3, dated 12/01/16, 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 U.S. Communities Contract Number 4400006643 that was competitively procured. This MSA is specifically designed for use by local agencies to leverage combined purchasing power for discounted volume pricing.

As previously stated, this project directly supports the development and implementation of the Regional Data Platform. The AWS infrastructure will enable SCAG to develop and implement a modern and comprehensive Regional Data Platform that will promote more efficient, cost-effective, and transparent planning across the SCAG region.
CONSULTANT CONTRACT NO. 21-045-C01

Recommended Consultant: Taylor Walk Inc., DBA Pacific Office Interiors

Background & Scope of Work: The consultant will install protective glass for staff cubicles in the 900 Wilshire Blvd. headquarters building to provide a barrier of protection against the spread of COVID-19 and other viruses.

Project’s Benefits & Key Deliverables: • Protective glass for staff cubicles to provide a barrier of protection against the spread of COVID-19 and other flu-like viruses.
• Protective glass for staff using standing desks to be protected against the spread of COVID-19 and other flu-like viruses.
• Protective glass will also provide a noise barrier for staff working in cubicles.

Strategic Plan: Goal #5: Recruit, support, and develop a world-class workforce and be the workplace of choice. The glass protection will make an impact as a value-added resource to SCAG’s workplace. This resource will be a model for the best practice of prioritizing continuous safety improvements.

Contract Amount: Total not to exceed $81,833

Taylor Walk Inc., DBA Pacific Office Interiors (prime consultant)

Contract Period: January 29, 2021 through June 30, 2021

Project Number(s): 810-0120.17 $81,833

Funding source: Indirect Cost (IC)

Request for Proposal (RFP): Not applicable – sole source contract

Selection Process: Not applicable – sole source contract

Basis for Selection: Pacific Office Interiors is the manufacturer of SCAG office furniture (cubicles and workstations). As such they do not allow any other firms to alter their furniture as doing so would void SCAG warranty on the furniture. Accordingly, Staff awarded a sole source contract to Pacific Office Interiors. Staff also awarded the contract in accordance with the Regional Council Policy Manual, Article VIII, Section 1.2 (updated September 2009, pg. 26), and the SCAG Procurement Manual (January 2021, section 3.3) which authorizes the Executive Director or his designee (the Chief Financial Officer) to approve a consultant contract without competition, if the contract is less than $200,000.

If SCAG does not upgrade the existing furniture, staff would remain vulnerable to COVID-19, flu-like viruses and noise making the return to the office more difficult to staff who occupy cubicles.
Recommended Consultant: Cornerstone OnDemand, Inc.

Background & Scope of Work: SCAG has utilized SABA for our performance management system since 2009. In order to support our strategic goal to recruit, support, and develop a world-class workforce, staff is leveraged its Learning Management Systems (LMS) that build off SCAG’s current software. In 2020, Cornerstone acquired SABA and merged companies and clients. In order to ensure compatibility with SCAG’s existing software, Cornerstone is the only LMS option as it is proprietary to SABA. SCAG has developed and implemented annual evaluation processes with SABA and already has dedicated client support given the existing contract and relationship. Given the latter staff awarded a sole source contract to Cornerstone.

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

- Implementing a learning management system that enables SCAG’s Human Resources Division to design training curriculum, deliver courses, and track training provided to SCAG employees; and

- Providing on-demand learning materials to all SCAG staff that support their professional development objectives on a wide variety of different topics, such as, diversity and equity, compliance, leadership development, and communications.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 5: Recruit, support, and develop a world-class workforce and be the workplace of choice.

Contract Amount: Total not to exceed $70,702

Cornerstone OnDemand, Inc. (prime consultant)

Contract Period: January 4, 2021 through January 3, 2024

Project Number(s): 810.0120.04 $22,538

Funding source: Indirect Cost

Funding of $22,538 is available in the FY 2020-21 budget, and the remaining $48,164 is expected to be available in the FY 2021-22, FY 2022-23 and FY 2023-24 budgets in Project Number 810.0120.04, subject to budget availability

Request for Proposal (RFP): Not Applicable - Sole Source Contract

Selection Process: Not Applicable - Sole Source Contract

Basis for Selection: SCAG staff selected Cornerstone OnDemand, Inc. for the contract award because the consultant:

- Is a leading people development company and the leader in the learning market. Cornerstone’s LMS offers a variety of learning formats so people can learn most effectively and the software is proprietary;

- Provided on-demand content can be customized and curated for learners based
on their job and professional development objectives. Human Resources will also utilize this software to create training paths for advancement and growth for employees and upload customized SCAG training content; and

- Demonstrated an excellent understanding of staff’s technical requirements.

The subject contract award is in accordance with the Regional Council Policy Manual, Article VIII, Section 1.2 (updated September 2009, pg. 26), and the SCAG Procurement Manual (January 2021, section 3.3) which authorizes the Executive Director or his designee (the Chief Financial Officer) to approve a consultant contract without competition, if the contract is less than $200,000.
Recommended Consultant: Mata Construction Services, Inc.

Background & Scope of Work: As required by the operator of SCAG’s headquarter building, the Wilshire Grand Center, stairwell doors remain locked except during a fire alarm when all stairwells doors are unlocked for evacuation. Staff must use the elevators for all travel including to and from the 16th and 17th SCAG assigned floors in the 900 Wilshire Blvd building. When the building is at full capacity the wait time for elevators can be long.

Accordingly, the consultant shall install badge readers in the stairwell on the 16th and 17th floors of SCAG’s headquarters building to enable SCAG staff to travel between these floors via the stairwell. Security badge readers will also allow access from the ground floor for staff who wish to utilize the stairwells for exercise or as an alternative to riding the elevator during or after the COVID-19 pandemic.

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

• Enhancing the workplace experience and for the health of SCAG employees who wish to utilize the stairwells, SCAG seeks a contractor to install necessary security badge readers for the 16th and 17th floor stairwell entrances at the Wilshire Grand Center.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal ?:

Contract Amount: Total not to exceed $48,820
Mata Construction Services, Inc. (prime consultant)

Contract Period: December 31, 2020 through June 30, 2021

Project Number(s): 810-0120.17 $48,820
Funding source: Indirect Costs (IC)

Request for Quote (RFQ): SCAG staff notified two (2) firms that the Wilshire Grand Building authorized to provide the services. SCAG received the following two (2) bids in response to the solicitation:

Mata Construction Services, Inc. (no subconsultants) $48,820
JDM Contractors (no subconsultants) $28,209

Selection Process: Consistent with SCAG’s Simplified Acquisition Procedures (for procurements estimated to be less than $50,000) staff solicited quotes (bids) from the two (2) previously mentioned firms that the Wilshire Grand Building authorized.

Basis for Selection: Given staff issued an RFQ staff awarded the contract to Mata Construction Services, the lowest responsive and responsible bidder as they provided all the requested information listed in the Scope of Work.
CONSULTANT CONTRACT NO. 21-020-C01 AMENDMENT 1

Consultant: StreetLight Data, Inc.

Background & Scope of Work: On January 11, 2021, SCAG awarded Contract No. 21-020-C01 to StreetLight Data, Inc. (Streetlight) for a one-year subscription period, allowing SCAG access to transportation planning analysis data on their StreetLight InSight platform. Streetlight can also support custom data services at an additional cost. This amendment is to add one custom data service which will allow SCAG to analyze external trips throughout the SCAG region.

SCAG’s Regional Travel Forecasting Model includes 40 external cordon stations on freeways and arterials. For each cordon station, the regional model estimates the origin-destination distribution of external trips passing through the cordon station for both passenger autos and freight trucks. It is important to gather accurate information for passenger and freight external trips (from, to, and pass through the SCAG region) that are defined as a long-haul trip in the regional model. Intermediate stops (stopping for meal or rest) should not be considered when defining an external trip. However, by default, in-platform trips break when a device does not move more than five meters in five minutes. As a result, staff requires the consultant to customize the break criteria to increase the accuracy of the model output.

This amendment also increases the contract value $74,000, from $586,000 to $660,000.

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

- Obtaining access to accumulated big data collected from a local sample population within the region which is representing travel behaviors using anonymized data;
- Providing key metrics for use in planning and evaluating transportation projects and identifying travel behavior to and from specific transportation analysis zone (TAZ) system in the region; and
- Providing unlimited use of the platform’s analytical tools, as they are developed and available during the period of the contract license.

Strategic Plan: This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians; Goal 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy; and Goal 4: Provide innovative information and value-added services to enhance member agencies’ planning and operations and promote regional collaboration.

Amendment Amount:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment 1</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original contract value</td>
<td>$586,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total contract value is not to exceed</strong></td>
<td><strong>$660,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This amendment does not exceed $75,000 or 30% of the contract’s original value. Therefore, in accordance with the SCAG Procurement Manual (dated 04/17/20) Section 9.3, it does not require the Regional Council’s approval.
**Contract Period:** January 11, 2021 through January 10, 2022

**Project Number:**
- 290-4827U5.02 $16,480
- 290-4828U5.02 $35,833
- 055-0704A.02 $21,687

Funding source(s): FY19 SB1 Formula Funds and Transportation Development Act (TDA)

Funding in the amount of $74,000 is available in the FY 2020-21 Overall Work Program (OWP) budget in project numbers: 290-4827U5.02 ($16,480); 290-4828U5.02 ($35,833); and 290-4827E.02 ($21,687).

**Basis for the Amendment:**

Through this amendment the consultant will provide more accurate external travel trips of passenger vehicles and freight vehicles with additional customized technical service and support. This will improve the quality of regional travel demand model input data.
CONSULTANT CONTRACT NO. 19-024-C01 AMENDMENT 2

Consultant: University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Institute of Transportation Studies (ITS)

Background & Scope of Work: On May 17, 2019, SCAG awarded Contract 19-024-C01 to UCLA ITS to provide research and analysis as to whether neighborhood change is associated with declining transit ridership. This research includes data collection on neighborhood change including a survey of travel behavior over time, comparing differences between long-term residents and those who may be relatively new residents of a neighborhood. The COVID-19 pandemic has negatively impacted UCLA’s ability to conduct the survey and obtain useful results, due to stay-at-home orders and physical distancing requirements.

This amendment replaces the survey with the purchase of a license to access third-party data on individual migration over time, allowing UCLA to do the same or equivalent analysis of changes in residential location.

This amendment increased the contract value $15,000, from $105,033 to $120,033 and extended the contract term from 12/30/20 to 3/30/21. The increased amount reflects the net additional cost to purchase the data rather than conduct the survey.

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

- Detailed data and analysis of recent transit ridership change and neighborhood change; and
- Enhanced understanding of the effects of neighborhood change on transit ridership in the SCAG region, leading to identification of potential policies and strategies to improve transit system performance.

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

Amendment Amount:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment 2</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment 1 (administrative - no change to contract’s value)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original contract value</td>
<td>$105,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total contract value is not to exceed</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120,033</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This amendment does not exceed $75,000 or 30% of the contract’s original value. Therefore, in accordance with the SCAG Procurement Manual (dated 04/17/20) Section 9.3, it does not require the Regional Council’s approval.

Contract Period: May 17, 2019 through March 30, 2021

Project Number: 140-4849.01 $120,033

Funding source: Consolidated Planning Grant – Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

A total of $45,135 was expended in FY 2019-20, and the remaining $74,898 is available in the FY 2020-21 budget in Project Number 140-4849.01.

Basis for the Amendment: The amendment is needed to provide additional funding to purchase migration data allowing UCLA to estimate and compare changes in travel behavior over time,
between long-term neighborhood residents and residents that may be relatively new. Without the amendment, UCLA would not be able to proceed with the data collection as originally planned, due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.
Consultant: Alta Planning + Design

Background & Scope of Work: On April 22, 2019, SCAG awarded Contract 19-019-C01 to Alta Planning + Design, Inc. to develop a Multimodal Regional Corridor Plan for the Arrow Highway, a 10-mile major arterial spanning several cities in the San Gabriel Valley (SGV) Region.

As part of developing a Multimodal Regional Corridor Plan in the San Gabriel Valley (SGV) Region, the consultant shall conduct additional engagements in the City of Claremont and provide additional presentations to the Cities of San Dimas, La Verne, Claremont, and Pomona due to COVID-19 related cancellation of engagements in other cities.

This amendment also increases the contract value $14,685, from $267,820 to $282,505.

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

- Assess active transportation opportunities to evaluate Arrow Highway to develop as a multimodal corridor in the San Gabriel Valley; and
- Deliver a Go Human demonstration project in the City of San Dimas; Improve access to active transportation, improve air quality and increase safety for all roadway users through providing a safe active transportation corridor in the San Gabriel Valley.

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

Amendment Amount:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment 5</td>
<td>$14,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment 4</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment 3</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment 2</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment 1</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original contract</td>
<td>$267,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contract</td>
<td>$282,505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This amendment does not exceed $75,000 or 30% of the contract’s original value. Therefore, in accordance with the SCAG Procurement Manual (January 2021) Section 9.3, it does not require the Regional Council’s approval.

Contract Period: April 22, 2019 through February 28, 2021

Project Number: 275-4823U5.02 $13,000
                275-4823E.02 $1,685

Funding sources: Consolidated Planning Grant – Transportation Development Act (TDA), and SB1 19

Basis for the Amendment: As part of developing a Multimodal Regional Corridor Plan in the San Gabriel Valley (SGV) Region, the consultant shall conduct additional engagements in the
City of Claremont and provide additional presentations to the Cities of San Dimas, La Verne, Claremont, and Pomona due to COVID-19 related cancellation of engagements in other cities.
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To: Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)
    Regional Council (RC)
From: Cindy Giraldo, Chief Financial Officer
       (213) 630-1413, giraldo@scag.ca.gov
Subject: CFO Monthly Report

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S APPROVAL

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.

CFO REPORT UPDATES:
Staff completed the development of the FY 2021-22 Draft Comprehensive Budget and Overall Work Program (OWP). The proposed Comprehensive Budget of $147.8 million was approved by the Executive Administration Committee (EAC) on March 3, 2021 and the Regional Council (RC) on March 4, 2021. The Draft OWP was released for a 30-day public comment period ending April 5, 2021. The Final Budget will be presented to the EAC and RC for approval in May.

MEMBERSHIP DUES:
As of March 19, 2021, 175 cities and 5 counties have paid their FY21 dues. After adjusting for elected eligible fee waivers, this represents 94% collection of total revenues. This leaves 13 cities and 1 county yet to renew. SCAG is in the process of reaching out to all members with outstanding dues.

BUDGET & GRANTS (B&G):
Caltrans approved Amendment 3 to the FY 2020-21 OWP in the amount of $3.6 million on February 18, 2021. This amendment includes the programming of unexpended Consolidated Planning Grant (CPG) funds and Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds for ongoing regional transportation projects, adjusting balances for various federal and state grants; and adjusting staff time allocations for various OWP projects.

CONTRACTS:
In February 2021, the Contracts Department issued three (3) Request for Proposals; awarded six (6) contracts; issued six (6) contract amendments; and processed 26 Purchase Orders to support ongoing business and enterprise operations. Staff also administered 158 consultant contracts. Contracts staff continued to negotiate better pricing as well as reduced costs for services. This month Contract staff negotiated $4,854 in budget savings, bringing the Fiscal Year total to $820,420 in savings.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. CFO Charts
As of March 19 2021, 175 cities and 5 counties had paid their FY21 dues. This represents 94.10% of the dues assessment. 13 cities and 1 county had yet to pay their dues. Three cities are being recruited for membership.

**SUMMARY**

- FY21 Membership Dues: $2,172,468
- Waivers Exercised: $(273,281)
- Total Collected: $1,899,186
- Percentage Collected: 94.10%
Office of the CFO
Indirect Cost Recovery

FY21 INDIRECT COST & RECOVERY

OVERVIEW
A comparison of Indirect Cost (IC), incurred by SCAG vs. IC recovered from SCAG's grants.

SUMMARY
Through February 2021, SCAG was over-recovered by $1,330,170.06 due to unspent Indirect Cost budget. This is in line with the over-recovery built in to the FY21 IC rate.
### Consolidated Balance Sheet

**Office of the CFO**

**1/31/2021** | **2/28/2021** | **Incr (decr) to equity**
---|---|---
Cash at Bank of the West | $7,443,748 | $5,660,676 | $(1,783,072)
LA County Investment Pool | $11,724,409 | $11,841,940 | $(117,531)
Cash & Investments | $19,168,157 | $17,502,617 | $(1,665,541)
Accounts Receivable | $12,202,718 | $14,119,819 | $1,917,101
Other Current Assets | $3,098,689 | $2,627,893 | $(470,796)
Fixed Assets - Net Book Value | $5,433,945 | $5,433,945 | $0

**Incr (decr) to working capital**

**1/31/2021** | **2/28/2021** | **Incr (decr) to working capital**
---|---|---
Cash | $19,168,157 | $17,502,617 | $(1,665,541)
Accounts Receivable | $12,202,718 | $14,119,819 | $1,917,101
Accounts Payable | $(856,102) | $(679,582) | $176,521
Employee-related Liabilities | $(751,365) | $(757,542) | $(6,178)
Deferred Revenue | $(12,739,837) | $(12,666,098) | $73,740
Total Liabilities and Deferred Revenue | $(14,347,304) | $(14,103,221) | $244,083
Fund Balance | $25,556,205 | $25,581,052 | $24,848

**COMMENTS**

- Revenues of $5.69M and Expenses of $7.35M both on cash basis.
- Billings of $1.37M to SB1, $494K to FTA5303, $290K to REAP, and $50K to ATP offset by payments of $158K from Cerritos, $93K from FHWA PL and $42K from SHA SCC.
- Net amortization of $295K in prepaid expenses plus IC fund over-recovery of $176K.
- Paydown of outstanding invoices.
- January had 10 unpaid working days while February also had 10.
- Reclass of GF Def Rev of $40K plus VCTC US101 of $33K.
## Office of the CFO  
**Fiscal Year-To-Date Expenditure Report Through February 28, 2021**

### COMPREHENSIVE BUDGET

<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><strong>1</strong> Staff &amp; Allocated Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>237,765</td>
<td>237,765</td>
<td>43,878</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>193,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Allocated Indirect Costs</td>
<td>311,548</td>
<td>311,548</td>
<td>57,472</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>SCAG Consultants</td>
<td>327,000</td>
<td>327,000</td>
<td>138,602</td>
<td>183,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td>Legal costs</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>68,440</td>
<td>31,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>76,400</td>
<td>76,400</td>
<td>12,502</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td>Payroll, bank fees</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>6,248</td>
<td>8,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td>SCAG Memberships</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>132,706</td>
<td>132,706</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td>Professional Membership</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>3,742</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td>Res mat/sub</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td>RC/Committee Mgs</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td>RC Retreat</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td>RC General Assembly</td>
<td>611,500</td>
<td>611,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td>Demographic Workshop</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td>Economic Summit</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>46,740</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td>Housing Summit</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td>Other Meeting Expense</td>
<td>86,500</td>
<td>61,794</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>19,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td>Miscellaneous other</td>
<td>67,260</td>
<td>67,260</td>
<td>9,966</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td>Stipend - RC Meetings</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>149,090</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td>Travel - outside SCAG region</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td>Travel - local</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td>Mileage - local</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>Travel Lodging</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td>RC Sponsorships</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>48,713</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td>Total General Fund</td>
<td>2,683,973</td>
<td>2,683,973</td>
<td>763,932</td>
<td>273,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Office of the CFO

- **Amended Budget:** 95,425,978  
- **Expenditures:** 146,237,055  
- **Commitments:** 34,395,239  
- **Budget Balance:** 23,736,032  
- **% Budget Spent:** 88,105,784  

**Comprehensive Budget**

---

*Attachment: CFO Charts [Revision 3]  (CFO Monthly Report)*
## INDIRECT COST EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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</td>
<td>50010 Regular Staff</td>
<td>6,964,795</td>
<td>4,420,813</td>
<td>2,543,982</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50013 Regular OT</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50014 Interns, Temps, Annuit</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>75,003</td>
<td>2,997</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50030 Severance</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>51xxx Allocated Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>5,573,893</td>
<td>3,309,241</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>54300 SCAG Consultants</td>
<td>477,464</td>
<td>179,693</td>
<td>166,558</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>54301 Consultants - Other</td>
<td>1,268,000</td>
<td>643,173</td>
<td>624,827</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>54340 Legal</td>
<td>159,767</td>
<td>159,766</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>55210 Software Support</td>
<td>1,333,100</td>
<td>445,162</td>
<td>391,781</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>55220 Hardware Supp</td>
<td>2,622,200</td>
<td>243,924</td>
<td>1,741,317</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>55240 Repair &amp; Maint Non-IT</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>7,133</td>
<td>14,367</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>55270 Payroll / Bank Fees</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>7,265</td>
<td>7,735</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>55310 Office Rent DTLA</td>
<td>2,192,805</td>
<td>1,528,181</td>
<td>664,624</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>55315 Office Rent Satellite</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>77,883</td>
<td>92,317</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>55330 Offsite Storage</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>55350 Office Supplies</td>
<td>78,800</td>
<td>11,439</td>
<td>67,360</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>55355 Graphic Supplies</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>55360 Telephone</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>112,235</td>
<td>57,010</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>55380 Postage</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>4,602</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>55540 Recruitment Notices</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>5,931</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>55600 SCAG Memberships</td>
<td>92,200</td>
<td>29,155</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>55610 Prof Memberships</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>55611 Prof Dues</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>55620 Res Mats/Subscription</td>
<td>57,100</td>
<td>33,043</td>
<td>7,086</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>55630 COVID Facility Expenses</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>4,415</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>55660 Deprec - Furn &amp; Fixt</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>103,669</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>55670 Amortiz - Leasehold Improvements</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>49,465</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>55900 Recruitment Notices</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>15,385</td>
<td>9,614</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>55905 Recruitment - other</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>26,966</td>
<td>2,534</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>55910 Public Notices</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>55920 In House Training</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>55930 Networking Meetings/Special Events</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>55940 Training Registration</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>40,210</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>55950 Other Mgt Exp</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>55955 Temp Help</td>
<td>124,205</td>
<td>124,205</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>55960 Miscellaneous - other</td>
<td>71,856</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71,856</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>56100 Printing</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>8,384</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>56110 Travel - Outside</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>56120 Mileage - Local</td>
<td>23,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>56125 Travel Agent Fees</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Total Indirect Cost</td>
<td>22,877,319</td>
<td>11,987,148</td>
<td>4,025,980</td>
<td>6,864,191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview
This chart shows the number of contracts administered by the Contracts division, by month, from January 2020 thru February 2021.

Summary
As illustrated on the chart, the Contracts Department is currently managing a total of 158 contracts. Fifty-one (51) are Cost Plus Fee contracts; sixty-nine (69) 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). The Contracts Department anticipates issuing approximately twenty (20) contracts for FY 2020-21. 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 Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Authorized Positions</th>
<th>Filled Positions</th>
<th>Vacant Positions</th>
<th>Interns/Volunteers</th>
<th>Temp Positions</th>
<th>Agency Temps</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Office</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</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>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Programs</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Classic Employees**: 48% - 80
- **PEPRA* Employees**: 52% - 87
- **100%**: 167

*hired into CalPERS after 01/01/2013

### Vacation Cash Out Pilot Policy Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement</th>
<th>Hours Used</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>$70,703.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1,352.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>40 (maximum)</td>
<td>$5,568.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>39.23</td>
<td>$2,719.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Participants**: 26 (15.66%)