



San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments

3452 East Foothill Blvd., Suite 810, Pasadena, California 91107-3142 Phone: (626) 564-9702 FAX: (626) 564-1116 E-Mail SGV@sgvcog.org

PLANNERS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

DATE: Thursday, March 20, 2008
TIME: 12 noon
LOCATION: Monrovia Community Center

1.0 Preliminary Business

1.1 Call to Order at 12:15 pm

******* Please note that there was not a quorum present at this meeting, therefore no action was taken and all meeting notes are unofficial.*******

1.2 Pledge of Allegiance

There was no Pledge of Allegiance due to a lack of a flag.

1.3 Roll Call/Introductions

	Present	Absent
Baldwin Park	Amy Harbin	Alhambra
Covina	Shelby Williams	Arcadia
El Monte	Minh Thai	Azusa
Glendora	David Chantarangsu	Claremont
Irwindale	Paula Kelly	Diamond Bar
La Canada Flintridge	Patrick Clarke	Duarte
Monrovia	Craig Jimenez	Industry
Pasadena	Bill Trimble	La Puente
San Dimas	Larry Stevens	La Verne
San Gabriel	Mark Gallatin	Montebello
Walnut	Dan Fox	Monterey Park
West Covina	Jeff Anderson	Pomona
LA County	Paul Novak	Rosemead
	Mark Herwick	San Marino
Metro	Ben Wong	Sierra Madre
		South El Monte
		South Pasadena

SGVCOG Staff

N. Conway, Executive Director

M. Creter, Staff

D. Kalovsky, Staff

2.0 Public Communications

There were no public communications.

3.0 Changes to Agenda Order; Identify Subsequent Need or Emergency Items

4.0 Consent Items

4.1 Minutes from February 28th, 2008 meeting

Spelling mistake on Minh Thai's name under "Roll Call/Introductions"

5.0 Discussion Items

5.1 Request for Comments: Metro's Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Study

Representatives from Metro conducted a presentation on the topic. They introduced the subject by providing background. Metro began looking at the congestion mitigation fee in 2003. It is currently a feasibility study. They are asking for comments back from all the agencies by April 25th, 2008, and plan to be ready for action in June, where the next steps would be a nexus study. It was mentioned that the fee would be a one-time fee, with a county-wide minimum. The cities would collect and control all fees.

The following issues were discussed:

- **Status of existing Credits & Debits:** As the Congestion Management Agency for Los Angeles County, the MTA is required by state law to monitor local implementation of all CMP elements. Currently, a key CMP component is the deficiency plan through which jurisdictions track and report their local development activity as "debits" and transportation improvements as "credits." Jurisdictions must maintain an annual positive balance of credits over debits to be in conformance with the CMP. If cities are found out of compliance they risk loss of their State gas tax monies as well as their eligibility for State and federal transportation monies. One issue that has been raised by a number of jurisdictions is whether these "credits" or "debits" would be translated into a proposed mitigation fee program. Additionally, whether there would be distinction between those cities with a high "credit" balance and those with a lower balance. Currently, Metro legal staff has indicated that any "credit" *could not* be converted into a monetary value under this new system as this would be providing a future benefit for a prior mitigation. However, failing to account for cities' different "credit" levels could bring up equity issues.
- **Coordination with CEQA Conformity and Local Mitigation Requirements:** Several jurisdictions have expressed concern that a new fee program may be problematic in relation to CEQA requirements for local mitigation. While many developers are familiar with the concept of either paying for or completing work needed for local mitigation, they may strongly oppose paying an additional fee on top that which is required for CEQA conformity in order to address regional mitigation efforts.
- **Fit with Local Fee Programs:** Several cities within the San Gabriel Valley already have existing mitigation fee programs. According to Metro's feasibility study, "local jurisdictions with existing fee programs receive dollar-for-dollar credit for local projects with a regional benefit consistent with an agreed upon guidelines." This study would include a survey of all member agencies to determine which cities have fee programs and whether part or all of the fees collected would be eligible under this program. For example, in the case of Pasadena, 50% of the mitigation is used for transit services and it still needs to be determined if this is would eligible for credit under the program.

The Executive Director discussed the desire of Director Fasana to create a pilot program that works for all the Valley's member agencies. A committee consisting of 3 planning directors, 3 public works members, and 3 city managers is being established. This committee will create a scope based on the needs of the cities and the needs of Metro that will then be presented to Metro. Volunteers for this committee were: Larry Stevens, Michael Cano, and Minh Thai. After meeting with the other members of the committee, they will present information to each TAC.

The SGVCOG will submit a consensus list of broad-range comments regarding the Draft Congestion Mitigation Fee Feasibility Report to Metro by April 25th. Staff asked that all member agencies submit their concerns to COG by April 15th.

5.2 SGVCOG Strategic Planning Session

The Executive Director announced the upcoming Strategic Planning Session, occurring on May 13th. All are encouraged to attend.

5.3 San Gabriel Valley Night at the Pasadena Pops

In an effort to create more social events outside of work for COG members to get to know each other, an event was organized at the Descanso Gardens. This will be on June 20th and tickets are discounted for member of the COG. All are encouraged to attend.

6.0 New Business items for Next Regular Meeting

Updates on the Arrow Highway Study will be addressed, as well as CRTP.

7.0 Announcements

There were no announcements.

8.0 Next Meeting

The next meeting will take place at the regular time, in the same place, same room.

9.0 Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm.