

**LAS VIRGENES – MALIBU COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
GOVERNING BOARD MEETING**

Tuesday, October 20, 2020, 8:30 AM

MEETING INFORMATION AND ACCOMMODATION

Pursuant to the Governor’s Executive Orders, which waived certain Brown Act meeting requirements, including any requirements to make a physical meeting location available to the public; and, most recently, the March 19, 2020 Executive Order, which ordered all residents to stay at home. As such, the Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments will provide Members of the Public the opportunity to view and participate in the meeting remotely using Zoom.

Join Zoom Meeting: <https://zoom.us/j/4714103699> Meeting ID: 471 410 3699 - Passcode: 1234

A public agenda packet is available on the COG’s website lvmcog.org. Members of the Public who wish to comment on matters before the Governing Board have two options: 1. Make comments limited to three minutes during the Public Comment Period, or 2. Submit an email with their written comments limited to 1,000 characters to terry@lvmcog.org no later than 12:00 p.m. on Monday, October 19, 2020. The email address will remain open during the meeting for providing public comment during the meeting. Emails received during the meeting will be read out loud at the appropriate time during the meeting provided they are received before the Board takes action on an item (or can be read during general public comment). For any questions regarding the virtual meeting, please contact terry@lvmcog.org.

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

Governing Board Members:

Illece Buckley Weber, Agoura Hills, President
Kelly Honig, Westlake Village, Vice President
Karen Farrer, Malibu
Stuart Siegel, Hidden Hills
Alicia Weintraub, Calabasas

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

3. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Public comments are limited to three minutes per speaker. Pursuant to California Government Code Section 54954.2, the Governing Board is prohibited from discussing or taking immediate action on any item not on the agenda unless it can be demonstrated that the item is of an emergency nature, or the need to take action arose subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR

Consent Calendar items will be approved in one motion unless removed for separate discussion or action.

- A. September 15, 2020 Draft Meeting Notes – Attachment (pages 3-5)
- B. October 2020 Financial Statement – Attachment (page 6)

Recommended Action: Approve Consent Calendar

5. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. Metro Update – Ara Najarian, Metro Board
- B. Executive Director’s Report – Attachment (pages 7-9)
- C. Reports from Member Cities on COVID-19
 - Agoura Hills, Calabasas, Hidden Hills, Malibu, and Westlake Village

6. ACTION ITEMS

- A. Measure M 7th Year Project List – Attachment (pages 10-12)
- B. Lobbyist Retention – Attachment (pages 13-14)
- C. SCAG Regional Early Action Planning Grant – Attachment (pages 15-17)

7. PUBLIC SAFETY, LEGISLATIVE AND AGENCY PARTNER UPDATES

- A. Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department
- B. Los Angeles County Fire Department
- C. League of Cities
- D. Updates from Legislative Staff and Agency Partners

8. GENERAL COMMENTS AND REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

9. FUTURE MEETING DATES

- Technical Advisory Committee: Wednesday, November 4, 2020, 8:30 AM
- Governing Board: Tuesday, November 17, 2020, 8:30 AM

10. ADJOURNMENT

**Draft Meeting Notes
Governing Board Meeting
VIRTUAL MEETING - VARIOUS LOCATIONS
September 15, 2020**

The Governing Board conducted the virtual meeting, via Zoom, and in accordance with California Governor Newsom's Executive Orders N-20-20 and N-35-20 and COVID-19 pandemic protocols.

1 – Call to Order: President Buckley-Weber called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.

Roll Call of Governing Board members present:

Illece Buckley Weber, Agoura Hills, President
Kelly Honig, Westlake Village, Vice President
Karen Farrer, Malibu
Stuart Siegel, Hidden Hills
Alicia Weintraub, Calabasas

The following non-voting city elected officials participated in the meeting:

Ned Davis, Councilmember, Westlake Village
Laura McCorkindale, Councilmember, Hidden Hills
Denis Weber, Mayor Pro Tem, Agoura Hills

2 – Approval of Agenda:

ACTION: Governing Board member Siegel moved to approve the Agenda. Governing Board member Weintraub seconded. The Motion carried 5-0, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: President Buckley Weber, and Governing Board members Farrer, Honig, Siegel and Weintraub.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: None.

3 – Public Comment Period: There were no public comments and the Executive Director reported that he did not receive any public comments via email or phone.

4 – Consent Calendar: 4.A Meeting Notes from July 21 and August 3, 2020; 4.B September 2020 Financial Statement.

ACTION: Vice President Honig moved to approve the Consent Calendar. Governing Board member Weintraub seconded. The Motion carried 5-0, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: President Buckley Weber, and Governing Board members Farrer, Honig, Siegel and Weintraub.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: None.

5.A – Assemblymembers Jesse Gabriel and Jacqui Irwin participated in the meeting. They each provided comments on the recent legislative session and answered questions. No action was taken.

5.B – Evacuation Plan: Kevin McGowan, Director, LA County Office of Emergency Management participated in the meeting and provided an update on the County’s efforts to prepare the Evacuation Plan. He committed to engaging the COG cities in the process. He will work with COG staff and provide regular updates. No action was taken.

5.C – Metro Update: The Executive Director informed the Governing Board that Ara Najarian, Metro Board, was ill and unable to participate in the meeting. The item was continued to the October COG meeting. No other action was taken.

5.D – Executive Director’s Report: The Executive Director highlighted his report and answered questions. No action was taken.

5.E – Member Cities Report on COVID-19: The City Managers provided an update from their respective cities on COVID-19 related issues and actions. No action was taken following the individual city reports.

6.A – Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department: Captain Becerra provided an update from the Lost Hills/Malibu Station.

6.C – Los Angeles County Fire Department: Chief Smith provide an update.

6.D – League of Cities: Jeff Kiernan provided an update from the League of Cities.

6.E – Updates from Area Legislators and Agencies. No action was taken.

Governing Board member Weintraub left the meeting at 10:15 AM.

7.A – Lobbyist Proposal: President Buckley Weber continued this item as she wanted all Governing Board members present for the discussion and any action.

8. – Comments and Request for Future Agenda Items: None

9. – Future Meeting Dates: President Buckley Weber announced the dates for the Technical Advisory Committee and Governing Board meetings.

10 – Adjournment: President Buckley Weber asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:23 AM.

- ACTION: Governing Board member Siegel moved to adjourn the meeting. Vice President Honig seconded. The Motion carried 4-0, by the following roll call vote:
- AYES: President Buckley Weber, and Governing Board members Farrer, Honig and Siegel.
- NOES: None.
- ABSENT: Governing Board member Weintraub.

Respectfully submitted,

Terry Dipple
Executive Director

Governing Board Agenda Report

DATE: October 20, 2020
TO: Governing Board Delegates and Alternates
FROM: Terry Dipple, Executive Director
SUBJECT: October 2020 COG Financial Statement

SUMMARY

All of the revenue and expenditures are in accordance with the COG's 20/21 adopted budget.

20/21 Expected Revenue

Dues	100,000
Metro (admin & planning)	57,250
Metro (for consultant)	103,470
LA County Homeless Grant	<u>69,133</u>

Total Expected Revenue **329,853**

20/21 Expenditures to Date **-80,206**

Terry Dipple – 7/20 Ex. Dir.	-12,250
M. Micheline 7/20 Metro	-8,283
G. Graham 7/20	-5,000
Terry Dipple – 8/20 Ex. Dir.	-12,250
M. Micheline 8/20 Metro	-8,283
G. Graham 8/20	-5,000
COG Liability Insurance	-3,607
Terry Dipple – 9/20 Ex. Dir.	-12,250
M. Micheline 9/20 Metro	-8,283
G. Graham 9/20	<u>-5,000</u>

Total to Date **-80,206**

Governing Board Agenda Report

DATE: October 20, 2020
TO: Governing Board Delegates and Alternates
FROM: Terry Dipple, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Executive Director's Report

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this memorandum is to update the Governing Board on the status of COG projects and other items of interest.

Evacuation Plan – According to Kevin McGowan, Director, LA County Office of Emergency Management (OEM), the COG cities are going to be invited to a meeting in mid-November to participate in the development of the Emergency Management Zones (EMZ) and notification messaging. The County partners are building baseline products for a starting point for that meeting so it can be action oriented. The meeting goal is to build consensus on EMZs and terminology. Currently, LASD Lost Hills, LA County Fire Division VII and LA County OEM are completing foundational concepts and baseline planning products and standardized evacuation terminology and zone naming. OEM stressed the importance of adopting the use of statewide evacuation terminology and is working to incorporate into existing preparedness products. This process will include naming of EMZs with a numeric designation for the entire COG region, including the Santa Monica Mountains. Baseline Emergency Management Zones will build off of pre-existing Topanga and Malibu zones that used the Thomas Guide grid system. The final products will result in mapped EMZs that can be used for evacuations and other types of emergency protective actions, and pre-programmed emergency notifications, which is evacuation planning. OEM expects to have the final product completed six months after the November meeting.

Los Angeles County City Summit on Climate Vulnerability – LA County is hosting a City Summit on Climate Vulnerability on October 21st at 9:30 AM. For the 3rd annual event, the County is convening cities to hear about their climate vulnerabilities and to share about its effort to conduct the first countywide climate vulnerability assessment. The 2020 City Summit will be an integral part of the stakeholder engagement for the assessment. Additionally, wants to hear from cities about what needs they have and how the County can structure their project to help meet those needs. Cities can register at [EventBrite.com](https://www.eventbrite.com).

Metro Traffic Reduction (AKA Congestion Pricing) – The Traffic Reduction Study seeks to explore the feasibility of various congestion pricing concepts to reduce traffic in Los Angeles County. Metro staff are examining corridor pricing, cordon pricing, and Vehicle Miles Traveled pricing as potential strategies for managing transportation

demand. Staff has launched their stakeholder and public engagement process with a focus on potential geographic locations for a pilot program, potential support and opposition to a pilot program, and potential tradeoffs they should consider. Metro has held four virtual public meetings in late September and early October to inform LA County residents and answer any questions regarding the Traffic Reduction Study. It is very important that Metro ensure this will be an unbiased analysis and justification to implement toll lanes. The highest value of tolling and convincing people to pay is to keep the users' trips at high speeds. That requires a connected network including connectors at all interchanges to allow the users to keep going without having to merge into congested lanes to get to the next freeway/express lane. The regional infrastructure is not set up for that. I will continue to provide updates to the COG as this study moves forward.

SoCal Regional Climate Adaptation Framework: SCAG has requested to make a presentation at the November COG meeting to share tools and strategies aimed at helping COGs and cities with Climate Adaptation planning. The presentation includes a collection of resources to support climate adaptation planning efforts across the region. The Framework consists of tools supporting both local and subregional planning, such as workshop materials and strategies for communicating climate change, planning guidance and model policy language, vulnerability mapping and assessment tools, and a collection of case studies. I understand from SCAG that the presentation would be no more than 15 minutes (10-minute PowerPoint and 5-minute Q&A). I would like some direction from the Governing Board as to whether the presentation should be at the COG or just with city planners.

COG's Homeless Outreach Coordinator – Gabriel continues to provide weekly updates on his assistance to people experiencing homelessness in the region. We completed our rounds with the COG cities to introduce Gabriel at City Council meetings. By all accounts, this effort was very well received. From a regional perspective, I wanted to provide an update on Project Roomkey (PRK), which is a collaborative effort between the County, State, and LAHSA to enter into agreements with hotels to provide temporary shelter to people experiencing homelessness (PEH) who are at high risk of complications should they become infected with COVID-19. While there are no participating hotels in the COG cities, LAHSA reports that nearly 7,500 individuals have been served county-wide in the PRK program. The County and LAHSA have started the demobilization process for the PRK sites. As a part of LAHSA's Recovery Plan for PEH, PRK participants are being prioritized for permanent housing. LAHSA and service providers are working to match participants to the appropriate programs and secure housing for them as they exit the PRK program. As of October 6th, six PRK sites have closed and an additional three sites are expected to close in the next 30 days. Sites will continue to ramp down over the coming months. Currently, there are more than 3,800 participants at PRK sites that remain open.

Broadband – This issue was raised by the Governing Board during the goals and priorities discussion, in July. As I reported, South Bay Cities COG is using Measure M funds for their broadband project. I subsequently learned that Supervisor Kuehl did not

support the broadband project when it came before the Metro Board. Although it was approved, I understand Supervisor Kuehl remains opposed to the use of Measure M funds for broadband projects. As I reported at the COG meeting, I recommend rethinking the funding source or scope of such a project.

SCAG Regional Early Action Planning Grant Program (REAP) – As I previously reported, SCAG approved a \$100,000 minimum that our COG is eligible to receive. Unfortunately, we cannot divide the funds up between the cities like we do with our Measure M allocation. The COG held two meetings with SCAG to discuss options. Most of the cities have applied for a Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) grant from the state, which has significant funds available for cities to update their housing element. COG city planners and I held a subsequent meeting with SCAG to explore other housing-specific topics that may help the cities such as how the RHNA process works, new state housing legislation and what it means for the cities, growth constraints such as fire and flood zones and how to plan and fund workforce housing. This is on the October COG agenda.

Metro NextGen Bus Study – The NextGen Bus Study is coming to a close. The Study took into consideration both technical data and the priorities and personal experiences Metro heard during the outreach meetings and responses to questionnaires. The proposed changes in bus and transit will be implemented in three phases over the next 18 months. The only change Metro is proposing in the COG region is to remove the Point Dume deviation, in Malibu from Bus Line 534. According to Metro, that area has very low ridership and they plan to remove this deviation in December 2020, if the NextGen Bus Study is approved by the Metro Board, next month. Metro has informed Malibu of this change. No changes planned in the other parts of the COG. Bus Line 161 will not be changing alignment in the Calabasas/Agoura Hills/Westlake Village area.

Governing Board Agenda Report

DATE: October 20, 2020
TO: Governing Board Delegates and Alternates
FROM: Terry Dipple, Executive Director
SUBJECT: 7th Year Measure M Project Funding

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this report is to provide the Governing Board with information on the COG’s Measure M 5-Year Project List, specifically the 7th year funding allocations. Some projects are continuing and others are new. Metro has given the new projects an informal eligibility review. Some of the cities have elected to not program some or all of their funds in this cycle.

RECOMMENDATION

The Technical Advisory Committee reviewed the 7th Year Measure M Project List and funding and is recommending approval by the Governing Board.

BACKGROUND

The COG’s 7th Year Measure M allocation from Metro is \$12,870,156 which included \$2.4 million for Active Transportation and \$10.4 million for Highway projects. Pursuant to the COG’s policy, the funds are allocated using the same per capita formula that has been used since the beginning. Below, is a summary of Measure M 7th year funding allocation for the cities. It should be noted that not all cities are requesting Measure M funds for the 7th year.

	<u>Allocated</u>	<u>7th Year</u>
Agoura Hills	13,508,929	3,114,577
Calabasas	13,856,749	3,526,422
Hidden Hills	1,215,652	270,274
Malibu	9,283,219	1,930,524
Westlake Village	2,378,247	1,274,146
LA County	<u>1,275,000</u>	<u>2,754,213</u>
Total	49,204,915	12,870,156

Agoura Hills

Kanan Corridor Safety, Operations, and Capacity Enhancement Project

Requested Amount: \$4,638,860 (includes \$1,524,288 unallocated carryover)

The Kanan Corridor Project is multi-phased with both Caltrans and City governance, spanning a 7-8 year process (PSR, PAED, ROW and PS&E phases) to feasible start of construction. Currently, the Project is in the beginning stages with the PSR phase (Phase 1), which will provide the City with feasible alternatives that meet the purpose and need of the project. Moreover, there is a 1000 feet portion of the project area, crossing over drainage facilities for Medea Creek, which spans the full width of public right of way and adjacent private properties, that requires reconstruction of the structural section of the roadway, adjacent slopes, retaining walls, sidewalks and utilities, due to earth movement. The vertical displacement in this area is increasingly noticeable with an estimate of 1-2 feet from centerline to sidewalk. Due to the length of the process to produce a construction ready package, an additional phase of work is needed to ensure the structural stability of the existing roadway now rather than later. This work will be Phase 2 and will precede the PAED, ROW and PS&E phases.

Calabasas

Mulholland Hwy Gap Closure

Requested Amount: \$550,000

This is an existing project that requires \$550,000 to cover related costs (Construction Management, Project Administration, Inspection, Material Testing and Contingency). In May 2020, the City rejected all bids. The City will advertise the project again for construction as soon as school is in recess in June, 2021. Although the responsive and responsible bidder submitted a Bid in the amount of \$2,649,451 and is lower than the amount allocated for this project (\$2,744,637), the related costs (Construction Management, Project Administration, Inspection, Material Testing and Contingency), if added to the Bid amount, would be more than the allocated total. Since this project includes double-tiered retaining wall, there is highly likely that there would be extra work involved.

Hidden Hills

Long Valley Road/US 101 Project

Requested Amount: \$270,274

This is an existing project that will improve traffic congestion and pedestrian access on the Long Valley Road on-ramp. The City of Hidden Hills proposes to install sidewalk and construct a right turnout lane on the Long Valley Road on-ramp at the stop-controlled NB U.S. 101 on-ramp (also the intersection with Long Valley Road in Hidden Hills). The City of Hidden Hills has already purchased the land for the proposed staging area for vehicles waiting to enter Hidden Hills.

LA County

Agoura Hills and Westlake Village Intelligent Transportation System Project

Requested Amount: \$7,300,000 (includes \$4,545,787 unallocated carryover)

- Thousand Oaks Boulevard Corridor Improvement Project
Limits: Via Colinas to Argos Street (3.2 mi segment with 9 traffic signals)

Jurisdictions: Cities of Westlake Village and Agoura Hills (both County-maintained)

This project will install fiber communication and traffic signal equipment on Thousand Oaks Boulevard and implement signal synchronization. It closes an existing fiber communication gap and installs advanced traffic signal controllers on the entire route. The project will also install traffic signal equipment improvements at the intersection of Agoura Road at Liberty Canyon Road, which is shared jurisdiction with County and Agoura Hills.

- Communication Gap Closure and Central Traffic Systems Upgrade
Communication gap closures (fiber) and implementation of adaptive (Agoura Hills) and upgraded central systems for both Westlake Village and Agoura Hills.

Governing Board Agenda Report

DATE: October 20, 2020
TO: Governing Board Delegates and Alternates
FROM: Terry Dipple, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Lobbyist Retention

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATION

That the Governing Board determine if the COG wants to retain a lobbyist.

BACKGROUND

During the Goals and Priorities discussion at the July COG meeting, the Governing Board “kicked the tires” on retaining a lobbyist. It was decided that the COG President and Vice President would interview the lobbyist from Best Best and Krieger. Subsequently, President Buckley Weber and Vice President Honig, along with city managers Nate Hamburger and Rob de Geus and I held a Zoom meeting with the lobbyist, Syrus Devers. Following the meeting, both the President and Vice President felt the COG should talk with other lobbyists.

At the direction of the Governing Board, I spoke with three additional firms: Rusty Areias and Ted Harris from California Strategies (the firm that Malibu has used for over 15 years), David Quintana from Resolute, and Dane Hutchings and Dan Carrigg from RPPG. After the interviews, I briefed President Buckley Weber and it was determined that California Strategies was too expensive as they verbally proposed \$40,000 for the last month of the legislative session or \$50,000 for a limited engagement through the Governor’s sign/veto deadline. Their annual retainer is \$12,500/month. David Quintana with Resolute indicated his minimum was \$8,000-10,000/month but he would consider a \$5,000/month retainer through the end of the year. Dane Hutchings with RPPG proposed \$30,000 for a limited engagement through the Governor’s sign/veto deadline or \$7,000.00/month retainer through September of 2021.

President Buckley Weber asked me to schedule an interview with Dane Hutchings and Dan Carrigg from RPPG. On August 12th President Buckley Weber, Vice President Honig, Nate Hamburger and I held a Zoom meeting with Dane and Dan. Their initial proposal was \$7,000 per month for an annual contract. President Buckley Weber and Vice President Honig both felt it should be presented to the Governing Board for consideration. I subsequently spoke with Dane Hutchings to see if he would consider a smaller monthly

retainer as it was likely that only four cities would be involved if the COG moved forward. Dane agreed to talk with his partners and came back with two options:

Option 1: RPPG is willing to reduce their initial proposal amount from \$7,000.00 per month (\$84,000.00 annual) to \$5,000.00 per month (\$60,000.00 annual) for all services, including assisting the COG in developing a legislative platform and grant assessment.

Option 2: RPPG is willing to provide strictly legislative advocacy and public affairs strategy services (elimination of grant assessment, review and advocacy) for \$4,100.00 per month (\$49,200.00 annually).

DISCUSSION

Although there has been a lot of work and discussion on whether the COG should hire a lobbyist and, if so, should the COG go with RPPG Option 1 or 2? Or, should the Governing Board step back for a moment and have a more fundamental discussion: Does the Governing Board support hiring a lobbyist? If the answer is yes, additional work can be done to determine which firm and how the fee would be allocated. If the answer is no, the matter will be tabled and no action will be taken to hire a lobbyist.

FISCAL IMPACT/SOURCE OF FUNDING

The COG does not have reserves to cover \$49,200-60,000. The Governing Board would have to determine the split among the cities agreeing to participate.

REQUESTED ACTION

That the Governing Board determine if the COG wants to retain a lobbyist. If so, review the initial proposal from Renne Public Policy Group (RPPG) and provide direction to staff.

Governing Board Agenda Report

DATE: October 20, 2020
TO: Governing Board Delegates and Alternates
FROM: Terry Dipple, Executive Director
SUBJECT: SCAG Regional Early Action Planning Grant Program

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this report is to provide the Governing Board with information on SCAG's Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) grant program. SCAG has allocated funding to all of the COG's and \$100,000 is available to our COG for eligible projects.

RECOMMENDATION

The TAC did not discuss the proposed project. City planners participated in two meetings with COG staff and support the project. It is recommended that the Governing Board review and discuss the proposed project that would be paid for with the REAP funds from SCAG.

BACKGROUND

The Regional Early Action Program (REAP) Subregional Partnership Program is intended to help accelerate housing production throughout the SCAG region and have a net-positive effect on housing supply by increasing housing planning, meeting the sixth cycle regional housing needs assessment (RHNA). The Subregional Partnership program has been designed to augment and complement funds that are awarded to jurisdictions by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) pursuant to SB (Senate Bill) 2 Planning Grants and the Local Early Action Program (LEAP).

Approximately \$23 million is available to fund subregional partnership projects. The REAP funds are available on a reimbursement basis, requiring completed contractual deliverables.

Early on in this process, COG staff and city planners were hoping that the \$100,000 could be divided between the cities to offset some of the costs associated with updating their respective housing elements. COG cities have applied for Local Early Action Planning (LEAP) grant from HCD, which has significant funds available for cities to update their housing element. We were optimistic the REAP grant funds could supplement funds the cities were spending on this effort. COG staff and city planning representatives held a virtual meeting with SCAG staff to discuss this option and SCAG stated HCD requirements will not allow the COG to divide the funds between the cities as is the Governing Board policy with Measure R and M and other funding. Also discussed was

the possibility of holding workshops that would inform the COG community of the RHNA process, how SCAG allocates the housing numbers to each city and other state housing legislation and what that means for the cities.

COG staff and city planners held a subsequent meeting to explore other housing-specific topics that may help the cities such as how the RHNA process works, new state housing legislation and what it means for the cities, growth constraints such as fire and flood zones and how to plan and fund workforce housing.

DISCUSSION

After discussing the strict limitations of the REAP grant funds with city planners, COG staff developed a potential project that may meet SCAG/HCD eligibility requirement, while at the same time educating residents on the state-mandated RHNA process and recent legislation that adds density and/or overrides local zoning.

To accomplish this, the COG would use the \$100,000 REAP grant to hire a consultant. The solicitation and RFP process would be coordinated with SCAG.

COG staff discussed the project with President Buckley Weber and Vice President Honig to get their thoughts and input. They like the idea but also wanted the project to include a final report/work product that would summarize the RHNA process, analyze new housing legislation that cities must comply with and address geographical constraints such as fire and flood zones. Subsequent discussions with city planners concurred with the input from COG leadership and also recommended including how the cities can address workforce housing.

It is proposed that the Workshops and Final Report discuss and analyze these topics:

1. Understanding the RHNA Process

- A. How does RHNA work? What's changed since the last cycle?
- B. A brief history of RHNA Cycles 1-5 performance statewide
- C. How did COG cities perform against the RHNA Cycle 5 targets?
- D. What are the RHNA Cycle 6 targets for COG cities?

2. Parsing State Housing Legislation

- A. Changes in how RHNA is calculated (SB 828)
- B. New Laws that add density and/or override local zoning
- C. Pending bills that add density and/or override local zoning
- D. How will legislation shape housing at the community level?
- E. How will legislation impact housing production in the 3 RHNA categories?

F. Why does below-market housing production lag the RHNA targets?

3. Growth Constraints and Opportunities in the COG

- A. Constraints: High-risk areas (fire zones, flood zones, hillside sites)
- B. Potential constraint: Displacement of low-income households
- C. Opportunities: Underutilized mixed-use and industrial areas
- D. Opportunities: Underutilized sites suitable for redevelopment

4. Understanding "Scale" (optional or briefer)

- A. How project size impacts unit cost
- B. The underlying impact of land costs
- C. Housing types: S/M/L: what the market produces
- D. "Workforce housing" and zoning

5. Housing and Mobility (optional)

- A. Why housing and transit are "joined at the hip"
- B. What does this look like in the COG?
- C. Planning for mobility as you plan future housing

6. Closing the Gap on RHNA's Below-market Targets

- A. Production associated with market-rate housing
- B. Likely production associated with non-profits
- C. Alternative sources of funding: bond measures
- D. Alternative sources of funding: guaranteed leases
- E. Alternatives to production: housing vouchers

FISCAL IMPACT

There would be no fiscal impact as the project consultant would be funded with the SCAG REAP grant. The process would involve city planners from all of the COG cities but would not require any significant time commitment. COG staff would have time to manage the consultant's efforts and coordinate with SCAG.

RECOMMENDATION

If the Governing Board concurs with the project, the COG Executive Director would work with SCAG to hire the REAP consultant that would do background research, prepare workshop materials, conduct the workshops, and prepare the final report.