



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

525 South Main Street~Ukiah~California~95482  
www.mendocinocog.org

NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Administration: Suite B  
(707) 463-1859  
Transportation Planning: Suite G  
(707) 234-3434

## AGENDA

**Monday, August 14, 2023 at 1:30 p.m.**

### Primary Location:

County Administration Center, Board of Supervisors Chambers  
Room 1070, 501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah

### Teleconference Locations:

Fort Bragg City Hall, 416 N. Franklin St., Fort Bragg  
Point Arena City Hall, 451 School St., Point Arena  
Caltrans District 1, 1656 Union St., Eureka

### General Public Teleconference:

*Zoom videoconference link is provided by request. Please submit access request to [info@mendocinocog.org](mailto:info@mendocinocog.org) or call MCOG Administration at (707) 463-1859.*

Audio Call-in Option: 1 (669) 900-6833 (in CA)  
Meeting ID: 814 3892 1792 Passcode: 970695

### Attachments Posted

[Board of Directors - Mendocino Council of Governments \(mendocinocog.org\)](https://www.mendocinocog.org)

### Additional Media

For live streaming and later viewing:

[Mendocino County Video](https://www.mendocinocog.org) or find  
[YouTube link at http://www.mendocinocog.org](http://www.mendocinocog.org) under Meetings

**The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) meets as the Board of Directors of:**  
Mendocino Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and  
Mendocino County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

**NOTICE:** As of March 2023, the Mendocino Council of Governments returns to in-person meetings, in a new format. Staff and a potential quorum will meet in the Board of Supervisors chambers in Ukiah. Also, board members will join remotely by teleconference (audio and video) from City Hall locations in Fort Bragg and Point Arena. Policy Advisory Committee member(s) will join from Caltrans District 1 office in Eureka. The general public may join from any of these posted locations or by calling in to the teleconference.

Several ways to make public comments to MCOG's Board of Directors are available:

- In advance of the meeting: comments may be sent by email to [info@mendocinocog.org](mailto:info@mendocinocog.org) or by using the form at <https://www.mendocinocog.org/contact-us>, to be read aloud into the public record. Please submit by 10:00 a.m. on the meeting date to ensure comments are received timely, and include the agenda item number(s) addressed.
- During the meeting: make oral comments in person, or on the conference call by phone or video, when public comment is invited by the Chair.

Thanks to all for your interest and cooperation.

**NOTE: All items are considered for action unless otherwise noted.**

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Assembly Bill 2449 Notifications and Considerations – *to receive and address requests from Board members to participate in the meeting from a non-posted location, subject to conditions set forth in AB 2449*
3. Convene as RTPA
4. Recess as RTPA – Reconvene as Policy Advisory Committee

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

The following items are considered for approval in accordance with Administrative Staff, Committee, and/or Directors' recommendations and will be enacted by a single motion. Items may be removed from the Consent Calendar for separate consideration, upon request by a Director or citizen.

5. Approval of June 5, 2023 Minutes
6. Approval of July 10, 2023 Executive Committee Minutes
7. Approval of First Amendment to Fiscal Year 2023/24 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP)
8. Fiscal Year 2023/24 RTPA Budget Amendment: Adoption of Resolution No. M2023-07 Revising Allocation of 2023/24 LTF, STA, and FY 2022/23 Carryover Capital Reserve Funds to Mendocino Transit Authority – *to move Capital Reserve funds from Long-Term to current year*

**PUBLIC EXPRESSION – Please refer to notice at top of this Agenda.**

9. Participation is welcome in Council meetings. Comments will be limited to three minutes per person and not more than ten minutes per subject, so that everyone can be heard. “Public Expression” time is limited to matters under the Council's jurisdiction that may not have been considered by the Council previously and are not on the agenda. No action will be taken. Members of the public may comment also during specific agenda items when recognized by the Chair.

**REGULAR CALENDAR**

10. Presentation and Acceptance of Draft (Proposed Final) Feasibility Study - Mobility Solutions for Rural Communities of Inland Mendocino County – *AMMA Transit Planning*
11. Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Committee Recommendations of May 24, 2023 and July 10, 2023:
  - a. Approval of 2024 Regional/State Transportation Improvement Program (R/STIP) Policies and Priorities
  - b. Adoption of Resolution No. M2023-\_\_\_\* Establishing General Policies for the Commitment of Regional Improvement Program Shares for the State Transportation Improvement Program
12. Discussion and Possible Direction: 2024 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
13. Amendment of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Reserve Policy Adopted April 2, 2001

**RATIFY ACTION**

14. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee

**REPORTS**

15. Reports – Information – *No Action*

- a. Caltrans District 1 – Projects Update and Information
- b. Mendocino Transit Authority
- c. Great Redwood Trail Agency
- d. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings
- e. MCOG Administration Staff
  - i. Covelo SR 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail Project – *verbal report*
  - ii. RuralREN (Regional Energy Network) – *verbal report*
  - iii. Miscellaneous
  - iv. Next Meeting Date – Monday, October 2, 2023
- f. MCOG Planning Staff
  - i. Feasibility Study - Mendocino Transit Authority's Ukiah Transit Center
  - ii. Miscellaneous
- g. MCOG Directors
- h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates

## ADJOURNMENT

16. Adjourn

## AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) and TRANSLATION REQUESTS

Persons who require special accommodations, accessible seating, or documentation in alternative formats under the Americans with Disabilities Act, or persons who require interpretation services (free of charge) are advised to contact the MCOG office at (707) 463-1859, **at least five days** before the meeting.

Las personas que requieren alojamiento especial, asientos accesibles, o documentación en formatos alternativos de acuerdo con la Ley de Estadounidenses con Discapacidades, o personas que requieren servicios de interpretación (sin cargo) deben comunicarse con MCOG (707) 463-1859, por lo menos cinco días antes de la reunión.

## ADDITIONS TO AGENDA

The Brown Act, Section 54954.2, states that the Board may take action on off-agenda items when:

- a) a majority vote determines that an “emergency situation” exists as defined in Section 54956.5, **or**
- b) a two-thirds vote of the body, or a unanimous vote of those present, determines that there is a need to take immediate action and the need for action arose after the agenda was legally posted, **or**
- c) the item was continued from a prior, legally posted meeting not more than five calendar days before this meeting.

## CLOSED SESSION

If agendized, MCOG may adjourn to a closed session to consider litigation or personnel matters (i.e. contractor agreements). Discussion of litigation or pending litigation may be held in closed session by authority of Govt. Code Section 54956.9; discussion of personnel matters by authority of Govt. Code Section 54957.

POSTED 8/8/2023

\* Next Resolution Number: M2023-08





August 8, 2023

**To:** MCOG Board of Directors  
**From:** Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO  
**Subject:** Consent Calendar of August 14, 2023

The following agenda items are recommended for approval/action.

5. Approval of June 5, 2023 Minutes – *attached*
6. Approval of July 10, 2023 Executive Committee Minutes – *attached*
7. Approval of First Amendment to Fiscal Year 2023/24 Transportation Planning Overall Work Program (OWP) – This routine amendment will reprogram funds unexpended in 2022/23 and carried over. Total OWP funding will increase from \$894,365 to \$1,086,672, an increase of \$192,307.  
– *Staff report and amended financial summaries attached*
8. Fiscal Year 2023/24 RTPA Budget Amendment: Adoption of Resolution No. M2023-07 Revising Allocation of 2023/24 LTF, STA, and FY 2022/23 Carryover Capital Reserve Funds to Mendocino Transit Authority – MTA has requested a revision to move Capital Reserve funds from Long-Term to the current year, to purchase a zero-emission, battery-electric bus with charging infrastructure at a total cost of approximately \$1.2 million. This requested allocation would provide a local match for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5339 program funding.  
– *Staff report and revised claim letter with summary attached*



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## MINUTES Monday, June 5, 2023

### Primary Location:

County Administration Center, Board of Supervisors Chambers  
Room 1070, 501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah

### Teleconference Locations:

Fort Bragg City Hall, 416 N. Franklin St., Fort Bragg  
Point Arena City Hall, 451 School St., Point Arena  
Caltrans District 1, 1656 Union St., Eureka

### General Public Teleconference by Zoom

### ADDITIONAL MEDIA:

[Mendocino County Video](#) or find  
[YouTube link at http://www.mendocinocog.org](http://www.mendocinocog.org) under *Meetings*

**The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) meets as the Board of Directors of:**  
Mendocino Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and  
Mendocino County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call.** The meeting was called to order at 1:34 p.m. with Directors present: Dan Gjerde, John Haschak, Mike Carter, Greta Kanne, Josephina Duenas and Bernie Norvell in Ukiah; Jeff Hansen in Point Arena; and Tatiana Ahlstrand (Caltrans/PAC) in Eureka. Chair Gjerde presiding.

Staff present in Ukiah: Nephele Barrett, Executive Director; Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO; Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner; Alexis Pedrotti, Program Manager; and Jody Lowblad, Administrative Assistant.

Staff present by Zoom: Lisa Davey-Bates, Transportation Planner; James Sookne, Program Manager; and Michael Villa, Project Coordinator.

**2. Assembly Bill 2449 Notifications and Considerations.** This item is to receive and address requests from Board members to participate in the meeting from a non-posted location, subject to conditions set forth in AB 2449. There were no such requests.

**3. Convene as SAFE – Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies.** Ms. Pedrotti presented the three agenda items, reporting background and details, noting that a turning point in the Mendocino County SAFE motorist aid call box program had been reached and staff would be addressing the Board with these issues more often in the coming year.

- a. Report of Motorist Aid Call Box Program Status. Currently 141 call boxes are operating in the system along state highways, 97 of which are traditional cellular models and 44 use satellite technology. As reported last year, 3G service was terminated by Verizon, the operator. Staff has been working with the contractor, CASE Systems, to upgrade equipment to 4G. They were able to develop a radio for the call boxes and have completed 70 percent of conversions to date; the remainder are bagged as inoperable. Satellite boxes are unaffected. The main issue constraining progress now is lack of funding, which is limited to a portion of Department of Motor Vehicles registration fees. Staff is evaluating the entire system to determine a sustainable level of deployment.

Ms. Pedrotti addressed a common question of need for call boxes in the age of cell phones. Usage reports indicate the average number of calls received by CHP as the Primary Answering Point is 1.93 per day. In her opinion the system is worthwhile. Mendocino SAFE has invested significantly in satellite boxes as an early adopter, expecting the high operating costs would go down over time, which has not been the case. Meanwhile cellular service has improved, so that some satellite boxes could be replaced with cellular to reduce costs; CASE has identified eleven as eligible. A few boxes on SR 20 no longer have enough solar exposure to charge batteries due to growth of tree canopy, so are candidates for removal. Staff proposes to move forward by way of an action plan to evaluate, then remove, shift or install equipment based on system needs. Regular maintenance deals with issues such as knock-downs, storm damage, and deterioration.

- b. Adoption of FY 2023/24 Mendocino SAFE Budget. Staff's proposed budget shows estimates and actuals over several years. Ms. Pedrotti described line items and reasons for funds carried over from prior years. Revenue through DMV is \$1 per vehicle registration in the county. \$10,000 is proposed for new radio upgrades (added in a revised draft budget), along with costs for cellular and satellite service, CHP contract, and staffing for a total of \$116,668 annual expenditures in 2023/24. Revenues are estimated at \$261,027 including new funds, existing fund balance and a small amount of interest earnings. Ms. Barrett commented that while cellular service could replace some satellite boxes to help with sustainability, certain satellite locations should be maintained as much as possible where most needed, such as along SR 162. She noted urban areas have pulled out call box systems, though they are still valuable here on certain corridors. Board questions and discussion included:
- Agrees the system is valuable. What kinds of calls are coming in? (Haschak) CHP does not report to that level of detail. The highest volume at 75 calls were reported from SR 162 milemarker 14.4; of these a few were likely extreme emergencies, while others were less dire and a small percentage may have been repeated calls for assistance. One of the first, this is a satellite box, as reception is inadequate there in the canyon. (Pedrotti)
  - What are locations of the two out-of-service boxes between Willits and Fort Bragg? (Norvell) Mile markers are known and can be confirmed after the meeting. (Pedrotti)
  - Brief discussion of cellular reception in segments of SR 20 west. Exact locations unknown, but has been improving. Tree canopy blocks solar power, not cellular service. (Gjerde, Pedrotti, Barrett)
  - The boxes should be maintained, as there are times when needed, particularly by low-income motorists; thanks for providing the service. (Duenas)

The Chair invited public comment; none was offered.

- c. Adoption of Resolution To Approve Agreement with the State of California Department of California Highway Patrol (CHP). The standard agreement was made available for review in the agenda packet materials, for a total not to exceed \$2,160 for SAFE call box program dispatch and related services during Fiscal Years 2023/24 through 2025/26.

**Upon motion** by Haschak, second by Carter, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (7 Ayes – Haschak, Carter, Kanne, Hansen, Norvell, Duenas and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent): IT IS ORDERED that 1) the FY 2023/24 SAFE Program Budget is approved as recommended by staff, and 2) the following resolution is adopted:

**Resolution No. S2023-01**

To Approve Agreement with the State of California Department of  
California Highway Patrol (CHP)  
(Reso. #S2023-01 is incorporated herein by reference)



**4. Recess as SAFE – Convene as RTPA****5. Recess as RTPA – Reconvene as Policy Advisory Committee**

**6 - 7. Consent Calendar.** The Chair invited any comments; none were heard. Upon motion by Norvell, second by Carter, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (*8 Ayes – Haschak, Carter, Kanne, Hansen, Norvell, Duenas, Ahlstrand/PAC and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent*): IT IS ORDERED that consent items are approved.

**6. Approval of May 1, 2023 Minutes – as written****7. Approval of May 12, 2023 Transit Productivity Committee Minutes – as written****8. Public Expression.** None.

**9. Presentation: Clean California Grant Program – Caltrans District 1.** This item was taken after #11, presented by Julia Peterson of Caltrans District 1: Transformative Initiative – Remove Litter, Create Jobs, and Beautify California. Highlights included:

- \$1.2 billion to Clean & Beautify, with about a third expended by Caltrans to remove and prevent litter, another third to Caltrans beautification projects (such as Boonville, Covelo), and roughly a third to local grants
- In Mendocino County, “Dump Days” covered about ten percent of population, collecting 1,608 mattresses, 1,004 appliances, and 12,315 tires in Covelo, Fort Bragg/Caspar, Gualala and Ukiah – events were successful with high demand
- Beautification in downtown Covelo—community wanted solar lighting and speed bumps; a pilot project will provide movable bumps, locals will install their own art and street furniture
- Special Peoples Program (SSP), “a Caltrans work mentoring program providing temporary litter collection jobs and life skills training to parolees and veterans” —a Mendocino County crew operates out of Ukiah providing litter pickup (performing above target), receiving social services, and gaining work experience for new job opportunities
- Other programs include Litter Standdowns (Caltrans crews) and Adopt-a-Highway
- Local Grant Program – Cycle 1 awarded funds to seven projects in District 1
- \$100 million available in Cycle 2, due May 31 (closed), awards to be made in next few months.

Ms. Peterson invited Board questions and comments, including:

- SR-162 day use in summer between Legal Bridge and Dos Rios needs litter cleanup. (Kanne)
- Thanks for all the work in Covelo and being flexible; safety is a high priority there. With dump days, people see what government can do. What are some educational components? (Haschak) Taking responsibility and pride, games for kids, coloring book, booth at events.
- It’s important not to continue picking up people’s garbage. (Haschak) A budget change is requested to continue four years; meanwhile ramping down. Agree with need to teach.
- Impressed with how quickly projects came together, so well received. Looking forward to the project being implemented in Covelo. Any more proposed? (Barrett) Yes, some funding remains and they plan to expend all. Caltrans is vetting projects now; if any more ideas are shovel ready, let her know promptly. Eligible projects include murals, art, landscaping, for quick construction on a state highway, to be completed by December 2023; examples given.
- County of Mendocino was approached by two other counties for a joint project; County does not have funds for its portion, so is pursuing grants. Will forward information. (Gjerde)
- Are more free dump days planned for Willits and Laytonville? (Haschak) Yes, July/August for Willits; Caltrans is looking for a large enough site in Laytonville.

**10. Technical Advisory Committee Recommendations of May 24, 2023: Adoption of Final Fiscal Year 2023/24 Planning Overall Work Program (OWP).** This item taken before #9 while waiting for the presenter to arrive. Ms. Pedrotti presented the final OWP as recommended by the TAC, highlighting changes since the draft version was reviewed at the Council’s budget workshop in May. She noted minor changes requested by Caltrans and several projects carried over from the previous fiscal year with estimated fund balances; actual carryover balances will be identified in the first amendment, anticipated in August. As proposed, the FY 2023/24 Final Overall Work Program includes 15 work elements and totals \$894,365. For comparison, the Final (Amended) FY 2022/23 Overall Work Program contains 14 work elements and totals \$1,203,314. Questions and public comment were invited; none were offered.

**Upon motion** by Carter, second by Haschak, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (8 Ayes – Haschak, Carter, Kanne, Hansen, Norvell, Duenas, Ahlstrand/PAC and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent): IT IS ORDERED that the final Transportation Planning Overall Work Program for Fiscal Year 2023/24 is adopted as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee and staff, and the Executive Director or designee is authorized to sign certifications and the OWP Agreement and to forward to Caltrans as required.

**11. Fiscal Year 2023/24 RTPA and COG Budget.** This item also was taken before #9 while waiting for the presenter to arrive. Ms. Orth referred to her written staff report, summarizing final notes and changes since the May draft budget workshop. Total revenues come to \$16,175,346, and total proposed allocations \$15,753,101. The Planning OWP increased the budget by \$235,001, mainly as estimated funds carried forward. She reviewed relevant details of the final budget proposal, as recommended by the Executive Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, Transit Productivity Committee, Social Services Transportation Advisory Council and staff. Two Unmet Transit Needs were recommended by both transit committees as “reasonable to meet.” Questions were invited. Director Kanne gave compliments on preparation of the budget package.

**Upon motion** by Haschak, second by Carter, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (8 Ayes – Haschak, Carter, Kanne, Hansen, Norvell, Duenas, Ahlstrand/PAC and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent): IT IS ORDERED that the following five resolutions are adopted as recommended by staff and committees:

- a. Adoption of Resolution Allocating Fiscal Year 2023/24 Funds and 2022/23 Carryover Funds for Administration, Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities, Planning, and Reserves

**Resolution No. M2023-02**

Allocating Fiscal Year 2023/24 Funds and 2022/23 Carryover Funds for Administration, Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities, Planning and Reserves  
(Reso. #M2023-02 is incorporated herein by reference)

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)		
MCOG Administration & Other Direct Costs	559,626	
2% Bicycle & Pedestrian	86,846	
Planning Program – new funds	141,479	
Planning Program – carryover	122,868	
Planning program – prior year funds	29,135	
Total LTF		939,953
Surface Trans. Block Grant Program – Admin.		101,116
Rural Counties Task Force – Admin.		38,500
ATP Infrastructure Grants – Admin.		6,500,000
PPM Funds - Planning		259,750
RPA Funds - Planning		319,000

State Highway Account - Planning		22,133
<b>Total Allocations</b>		<b>8,180,453</b>

b. Adoption of Resolution Finding That There Are Unmet Transit Needs That Are Reasonable To Meet for Fiscal Year 2023/24

**Resolution No. M2023-03**

Finding That There Are Unmet Transit Needs That Are Reasonable To Meet for Fiscal Year 2023/24

(Reso. #M2023-03 is incorporated herein by reference)

#S-3	Affordable public transit link to Humboldt County, stopping in Piercy, Leggett, Laytonville – <i>contingent on grant award to Humboldt Transit Authority</i>
#P-2	Fixed route timing that coincides with retail workforce shifts in the Fort Bragg/ Mendocino coast area

c. Adoption of Resolution Allocating Fiscal Year 2023/24 Local Transportation Funds, State Transit Assistance, and FY 2022/23 Carryover Capital Reserve Funds to Mendocino Transit Authority

**Resolution No. M2023-04**

Allocating Fiscal Year 2023/24 LTF, STA, and 2022/23 Carryover Capital Reserve Funds to Mendocino Transit Authority

(Reso. #M2023-04 is incorporated herein by reference)

Local Transportation Fund (LTF)		
MTA Operations	3,621,782	
Unmet Transit Needs	50,000	
Senior Center Operations	681,249	
Transit Planning	0	
Total LTF		4,353,031
State Transit Assistance (STA)		
MTA Operations	1,293,571	
MTA & Senior Center Capital	150,000	
Capital Reserve Fund	0	
Total STA		1,443,571
Capital Reserve Program		
Current Year - MTA	0	
Current Year – Senior Centers	0	
Long Term – MTA and Seniors	705,462	
Total Capital Reserve		705,462
<b>Total Transit Allocations</b>		<b>6,502,064</b>

d. Adoption of Resolution Allocating Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Funds for Fiscal Year 2023/24 MCOG Partnership Funding Program, Local Assistance, and Distribution By Formula To Member Agencies

**Resolution No. M2023-05**

Allocating STBG Funds for Fiscal Year 2023/24 MCOG Partnership Funding Program, Local Assistance, and Distribution by Formula To Member Agencies

(Reso. #M2023-05 is incorporated herein by reference)

MCOG Partnership Funding Program		100,000
Local Assistance – Project Delivery		90,000
Formula Distribution to Members		
Mendocino County DOT	133,871	
City of Ukiah	180,162	
City of Fort Bragg	120,290	
City of Willits	112,903	
City of Point Arena	74,622	
Total Formula Distributions		621,848
<b>Total RSTP Allocations</b>		<b>811,848</b>

- e. Adoption of Resolution Allocating Fiscal Year 2022/23 Carryover Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Program Grant Funds for FY 2023/24

**Resolution No. M2023-06**

Allocating Fiscal Year 2022/23 Carryover Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) Program Grant Funds for FY 2023/24

(Reso. # M2023-06 is incorporated herein by reference)

MCOG Grant Administration & Management		20,197
Formula Distribution to Members		
County of Mendocino	177,228	
City of Ukiah	69,536	
City of Fort Bragg	46,410	
City of Willits	35,365	
City of Point Arena	0	
Total Formula Distributions		328,539
<b>Total REAP Allocations</b>		<b>348,736</b>

**12. Acceptance of Transit Productivity Committee Report of May 12, 2023 – Annual Transit Performance Review.** Ms. Orth reported the recommendation, summarizing her written report. No changes were recommended to MCOG’s adopted Transit Performance Standards, as all essential adjustments were completed last year. In performance review, two main observations rose to the top: 1) operating costs had dropped significantly from 2021 to 2022, and 2) none of the service types were able to meet the Passengers per Hour benchmark in 2022, indicating the need to rebuild ridership, an industry-wide problem. It was considered premature to revise the standard again during ongoing pandemic recovery. All service types met two of three standards or better over the three-year period.

In Board commentary, Director Haschak noted recent discussions at CALCOG meetings about the looming transit fiscal cliff, so this report could have been worse. Ms. Orth elaborated on status of federal transit relief funds. The Chair invited public comments; none were heard.

**Upon motion** by Carter, second by Duenas, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (8 Ayes – Haschak, Carter, Kanne, Hansen, Norvell, Duenas, Ahlstrand/PAC and Gjerde; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent): IT IS ORDERED that the committee’s report of the Annual Transit Performance Review through December 31, 2022, remarking good performance while emerging from two years of the COVID pandemic. is accepted as provided in the board agenda packet materials and summarized as follows.

Service Type	2022 *	3-Year Average
Dial-A-Ride (DAR) met one more standard in 2022 (Cost/Hour), maintained same 3-year average	2 of 3	2 of 3
Short Distance Bus Routes maintained the same 1-year and 3-year average	1 of 4	2 of 3
Long Distance Routes met one in 2022 (Cost/Hour), compared to one in 2021 (Farebox), maintained same 3-year average	1 of 4	3 of 3
Senior Centers maintained the same 1-year and 3-year average (Farebox, Cost/Hr)	1 of 4	2 of 3

\* Note fourth standard applied where 2 of 3 not met; however, none met the fourth (Cost per Passenger.)

**13. Recess as Policy Advisory Committee – Reconvene as RTPA – Ratify Action of Policy Advisory Committee.** Upon motion by Norvell, second by Carter, and carried unanimously on roll call vote (7 Ayes – *Haschak, Carter, Kanne, Hansen, Norvell, Duenas and Gjerde*; 0 Noes; 0 Abstaining; 0 Absent): IT IS ORDERED that the actions taken by the Policy Advisory Committee are ratified by the MCOG Board of Directors.

#### 14. Reports - Information

- a. Caltrans District 1 – Projects Update and Information. Director Ahlstrand reported the project nomination survey closed last week; thanks to those who provided feedback. The Asset Management team was reviewing comments to be incorporated as feasible; additional outreach will proceed as soon as more project specific information is ready. The System Management team is developing a route concept for the SR 222 Talmage Road Corridor Plan including input from the April community workshop; a draft is anticipated for review and comment this summer. The Willits “road diet” project will be reported when Safety staff is present; reach out with questions in the meantime.
- b. Mendocino Transit Authority. There was no report from MTA.
- c. Great Redwood Trail Agency. Director Haschak stated no news to report.
- d. MCOG Staff - Summary of Meetings. Ms. Barrett referred to the written report.
- e. MCOG Administration Staff
  - i. *Covelo SR 162 Corridor Multi-Purpose Trail Project.* Ms. Barrett reported above-ground vegetation removal is ongoing, except for two locations that are still too wet. The team is waiting for conditions to dry out more before breaking ground. Project is moving forward.
  - ii. *Staff Events in June: 24<sup>th</sup> Annual California Transportation Foundation (CTF) Forum; 14<sup>th</sup> Annual California Climate & Energy Forum.* Ms. Barrett reported staff would be attending these conferences, June 7 in Sacramento and June 13-14 in Santa Rosa respectively. The CCEC Forum is of interest due to MCOG’s intent to join the multi-county RuralREN (Regional Energy Network). Director Haschak indicated he would attend the climate forum.
  - iii. *Miscellaneous.* None.
  - iv. *Next Meeting Date.* Monday, August 14, 2023 – second Monday of the month.
- f. MCOG Planning Staff
  - i. *Feasibility Study - Mendocino Transit Authority's Ukiah Transit Center.* Ms. Ellard reported continuing work with the consultant and MTA. The project team has been reviewing six potential sites that meet screening criteria. The J.C. Penney location was eliminated as the owner unwilling to make space available. Other sites are on Mason Street, Perkins Street, corner of Brush & Orchard, and corner of Orchard & Gobbi. Property owners being contacted to determine availability.

- ii. *Feasibility Study - Mobility Solutions for Rural Communities of Inland Mendocino County.* Ms. Ellard reported the team continued to vet recommendations reported to the Council at the May meeting. In the next week or so they will advertise a community-wide virtual meeting to review sites. Presentation of the final plan and recommendation will be on the August agenda.
- iii. *Miscellaneous.* Ms. Ellard reported MCOG staff's participation with MTA's project team on the Short Range Transit Development Plan. The same consultant was engaged as for the Transit Center project, so there is good coordination.

At the most recent Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting, staff introduced a program under the federal Investment in Infrastructure & Jobs Act (IIJA) called Safe Streets For All to fund both planning and capital for safety projects. A call for projects has been released with proposals due July 10. Ms. Ellard described how MCOG had sponsored Local Road Safety Plans to qualify for Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) grants, and all of the MCOG member agencies that applied were recently awarded funds as a result of the plans. The TAC requested that MCOG apply for a planning grant to update and enhance existing plans in order to qualify under future cycles of this new program. \$5 billion is available over five years, so more funds will be coming annually.

In Board discussion, Chair Gjerde asked for examples of safety improvements. Ms. Ellard and Ms. Barrett discussed technical differences between the programs. Likely project candidates include North State Street, Sherwood Road, and Branscomb Road, and are not required to be connected to a state highway.

- g. MCOG Directors. None.
- h. California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG) Delegates. Director Haschak announced CALCOG's Legislative Day in Sacramento, but was unable to attend; Director Norvell agreed to attend as Alternate Delegate.

**15. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Submitted: NEPHELE BARRETT, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

By Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO

# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## Executive Committee

### MINUTES

July 10, 2023

#### Primary Location

MCOG / Dow & Associates Offices  
525 S. Main St., Suite B, Ukiah

#### Teleconference Locations

County Administration Center, Conference Room A, 501 Low Gap Rd., Ukiah  
City Hall Conference Room, 416 N. Franklin St., Fort Bragg

#### General Public Teleconference by Zoom

**PRESENT:** Committee Members: Chair Dan Gjerde, Vice Chair John Haschak, Director Bernie Norvell  
MCOG Staff: Nephele Barrett, Lisa Davey-Bates, Janet Orth

**ABSENT:** None

1. **Call to Order** at 10:04 a.m. with all present, Chair Gjerde presiding.

2. **Public Expression** – There was no public input on off-agenda items.

3. **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Recommendations of June 21, 2023: 2024 Regional/State Transportation Improvement Program (R/STIP) Policies & Priorities.** Executive Director Barrett summarized her written staff report and reviewed the TAC's revised project rating criteria, as directed by the Council at the April meeting. Every two years, as lawfully authorized, Regional Transportation Planning Agencies develop and adopt Regional Transportation Improvement Programs (RTIPs) for programming to be included by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in its five-year State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Staff and the TAC will be working on this in the coming fall season, for adoption at the December board meeting. The CTC's 2024 STIP funding target for Mendocino County is estimated at \$8 million. MCOG's policy was last updated in 2011 for the 2012 STIP, and a new resolution is needed to reflect changes since then. The State's priorities have shifted away from capacity increasing projects and toward a multi-modal approach.

The proposed project rating criteria are (in no priority or weighted order): 1) Urgency, 2) Leverage of funds, 3) Air quality/environmental benefit, 4) Traffic volume/usage, 5) Regional benefit, 6) Safety benefit, and 7) System condition/preservation/completion. Each criterion was assigned a point value and queries for reviewers' consideration in scoring. – *refer to agenda packet materials*

Questions and discussion included:

- How does public transit score points under system preservation? By investing in the transit system, e.g. a new route could be considered "completion" of system. How could this be compared to road Pavement Condition Index (PCI)? This may be somewhat subjective, for the applicant to describe (besides objective PCI data) how the project would preserve condition or complete a system. For transit, look at standards such as useful life depending on size and type of vehicle. (Dan, Nephele)
- For bicycle and pedestrian (non-motorized) mode, the case to be made might be more subjective; as with most of the categories, in how the applicant explains their proposal. Scoring is done by all TAC members, resulting in a balanced review. (Dan, Nephele)
- Return to discussion comparing busses to road condition. Suggestion to add language that would instruct reviewers to consider condition of specific roads/facilities or vehicle as well as entire network? Agreed. Additional ideas for ways to score under transit versus system discussed. (Dan, Nephele)
- Vehicles are the primary type of transit projects that qualify for STIP funds; there are other sources of funding for transit. CTC has not yet provided a target for Public Transportation Account (PTA) funds in STIP, and there is not much capacity in STIP for transit in general, so not an ideal funding source for transit projects. More language could be added to rating criteria. (Nephele)

- Set text revisions today or bring to the next board meeting? Staff to work on and present to full Board. (Nephele, Dan)

Chair Gjerde invited public input. Dave Shpak stated his appreciation for the text added to support bicycle and pedestrian and transit modes, and revisions made to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and state of good repair. These align well with the State's shift in funding policy and practice to more rehabilitation, multimodal transportation, and environmental performance. However, the adjustments to rating points suggested today do not complement those changes in state policy, with its increasing emphasis away from capacity increasing and toward repair and maintenance, VMT reduction, Complete Streets and behavioral changes. His comments also were made in the TAC meeting. To make Mendocino County more competitive in funding allocations, he listed suggested project rating criteria points. He appreciated the opportunity and care invested in this process.

Further committee discussion included:

- General agreement with Dave's comments. Regional Benefit would not necessarily focus on traffic issues or capacity increases; what is staff's interpretation? (Dan)
- Analysis of TAC's recommended scoring: take in context of all criteria; prioritize facilities with the most use; apply traffic volume metric where available, noting bike & ped mode data is not always available though some projects could score well that relieve traffic. This funding source is flexible and other grant sources heavily emphasize factors such as non-motorized benefit and VMT reduction, though those projects can still do well since points are added here to Regional Benefit for new issues such as access to housing. (Nephele)
- The most recent R/STIP policy Resolution M2011-10 was shared on screen and reviewed. Discussion of suggested revisions to policy resolution: some whereas/resolved text is no longer relevant, so several changes are called for in new policy and revised criteria. (Nephele, group)
- Discussion: Agreement with TAC's revisions. (Dan). Wants to understand Dave's suggestions. (John) TAC believes there are various ways to score points under several criteria; explained TAC's rationale. (Nephele)

#### **Recommendation:**

Upon motion by Haschak, seconded by Norvell, and carried on roll call vote (*3 Ayes; 0 Noes; 0 Absent*), the Executive Committee recommended that the Council approve 1) the resolution "Establishing General Policies for the Commitment of Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Shares for the 2024 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)" as amended and proposed by staff, and 2) the revised Regional Improvement Program Project Rating Criteria as recommended by the Technical Advisory Committee.

**4. Discussion and Possible Action: Development of Request for Proposals for Comprehensive Staffing Services Commencing Fiscal Year 2024/25.** Nephele introduced the issue (refer to written staff report), emphasizing that staff may present options but not recommendations, due to conflict of interest. The Request for Proposals (RFP) process may be conducted by any of the MCOG member agencies. Also, an informal offer was received from Regional Analysis and Planning Services (RAPS), a non-profit arm of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) to conduct an independent procurement for a fee. Another alternative is to directly hire staff rather than contract out. Those are the major options available.

Another consideration is staffing procurement for the RuralREN, approved by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) at end of June. Initially proposed to start with five years, the program is now down to four (minus 2023), resulting in less time for ramp-up with new staff in 2024. Options include: 1) standalone procurement or 2) amendment of existing staffing contracts, then add to next MCOG staffing procurement as part of overall work scope. These are factors to consider and direction is welcome. No action is required today. Discussion included:

- Last time County staff conducted procurement, but does not have capacity now. AMBAG might be a better fit. (Dan)
- Agrees with approach to secure outside help with an RFP, seems most efficient using RAPS. (John)
- Lake Area Planning Council (APC) also is discussing renewal of contracts with an RFP next year. They are in discussions with Maura Twomey and Dianne Eidam, the principals of RAPS/AMBAG. She has worked with them both over 25 years. Maura was a Caltrans auditor, so is very familiar with relevant issues. Lake APC is interested in working with these consultants on an RFP; she



spoke with them in March. General estimates from RAPS are to write a proposal for about \$2,200 and possibly conduct procurement for about \$6,600. (Lisa)

- Floated idea of Sonoma Clean Power providing one or more staff for RuralREN, or perhaps BayREN. (Dan)
- CPUC approved RuralREN including MCOG; BayREN previously turned down MCOG. Sonoma Clean Power is a Community Choice Aggregator (CCA), so there will be some coordination or overlap with them regardless. (Nephele)
- SCP provides rebates, basically matching funds. Described process of rebates through BayREN. There can be a strong relationship with marketing at Sonoma Clean Power. Lake County is likely to eventually join SCP. (Dan)
- In question is first eight months of a 2024 launch, during final year of staff contracts. With care as staff not to make a recommendation, MCOG could justify adding to existing work scope for a short period. (Nephele)
- Agrees with that approach. (Bernie)
- Next step would be to contact RAPS, gather more information, and receive direction on best way with minimum of existing staff working on this. Does the Executive Committee prefer to have another meeting or bring this to the full board, or perhaps appoint an ad hoc committee? (Nephele)
- Bring back to full board. (Bernie, Dan) We have the direction we need. (Nephele)

**Recommendation:**

No recommendation was made, pending more information to be reported to the full Council.

**5. RuralREN (Regional Energy Network) Status Report.** Nephele reported outcome of the CPUC meeting. The RuralREN Leadership Team is working on a press release to share with general public; she has seen drafts to be customized by each jurisdiction and can share with the Board for approval. Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA) is administrator of the RuralREN. They will provide some services to Lake & Mendocino Counties initially, since MCOG and APC joined late and are starting as contractors to RCEA until a scheduled opportunity for full membership. Ramp-up starts in September for launch in January 2024, contingent on CPUC allowing some expenditures in 2023. If not allowed, work will be pushed out until January. MCOG signed a Memorandum of Understanding with RCEA indicating a new MOU will be developed, which will be brought to the MCOG Board for approval.

- At the recent California Climate & Energy Forum, there was excitement about the RuralREN from higher-ups such as federal representatives. (John, Janet)
- It is unique in that not all members are government agencies; some are Community Based Organizations. (Nephele)
- Discussion of what a REN can do or not in within a municipal utility such as Ukiah. (Group)
- Report from attendance at RuralREN working group meetings to date, noting the “Public Equity” public sector program. RCEA advised this would be a good place for MCOG and APC to start, since membership comprises local agencies and there are existing partnerships to build upon. Listed the other major program groups, which MCOG intends to offer eventually. (Janet, Lisa)
- Suggestion to enlist help from Sonoma Clean Power when working on education, marketing, outreach and events, since they have significant resources available, such as staff capacity and funding reserves. (Dan)

**6. Reports / Information / Members’ Concerns.** None.

**7. Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Submitted by Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO





## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

### STAFF REPORT

---

**TITLE:** First Amendment to FY 2023/24 Overall Work Program

**DATE PREPARED:** 8/8/23

**SUBMITTED BY:** Alexis Pedrotti, Project Manager

**MEETING DATE:** 8/14/23

---

#### **BACKGROUND:**

The Final FY 2023/24 Overall Work Program (*totaling \$894,365*) was adopted by MCOG on June 5, 2023. Now that the FY 2022/23 books have closed, we need to carry over and reprogram some unexpended planning funds, some of which expire 6/30/24. Included in this amendment are Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) Funds; Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) Funds; Local Transportation Funds (LTF); and State Planning Grant Funding. Unexpended RPA funds have been included in this proposed amendment but will not become official until RPA fund balances are certified by Caltrans.

The purpose of this proposed First Amendment is to carry over and reprogram planning funds as follows:

W.E.1 (MCOG) Regional Government & Intergovernmental Coordination – A total of \$4,646 in RPA carryover funds is being carried over and added to this work element for MCOG Staff.

W.E.2 (MCOG) Planning Management & General Coordination (Non-RPA) – MCOG Staff had a remaining balance of \$31,205 of LTF funding at the close of FY 2022/23. These carryover funds have been carried over and added to this work element, along with \$9,567 of LTF carryover for direct costs that weren't fully expended in FY 2022/23.

W.E.3 (MCOG) MTA Feasibility Study for Ukiah Transit Center – Remaining LTF funds in this work element are being carried over for the consultant to finalize the project. Funds carried over total \$88,975.

W.E.4 (MCOG) Sustainable Transportation Planning –\$10,000 of LTF Direct Expense funding is being carried over to cover the VMT Hosting Fee from previous fiscal years. MCOG is waiting for the invoice from the consultant to finalize this payment.

W.E.5 (MCOG) Mobility Solutions-Feasibility Study for Rural Areas (Inland) – MCOG was successful in receiving this Sustainable Communities -State Highway Account Grant award at the end of June 2021. MCOG received \$177,060 of grant funding. This project is a multi-year project and is being carried over to be completed in the FY 2023/24 OWP. Carryover funds total \$20,191 for the Consultant.

W.E. 7 (MCOG) Planning, Programming & Monitoring – A total of \$86,751 in carryover funding (\$55,251 – PPM; \$31,500 - LTF) has been carried over and added to this work element, increasing the total to \$181,251. (An estimated amount of \$20,000 PPM was already included in the Final)

W.E. 8 (MCOG) Regional Leadership Training – A total of \$13,668 in RPA Grant funding has been carried over and added to this work element for processing of the two remaining RCTF Scholarship recipients' direct expense invoices for their California Academy for Regional Leadership (CARL) training participation in FY 2022/23.

W.E. 12 (UKIAH) Truck Route Study – A total of \$45,000 in PPM carryover funding has been carried over and added to this work element for the City of Ukiah to continue working on this project. No new funding was added to this element, only carryover funds will be identified.

W.E. 13 (FORT BRAGG) Central Business District Parking Evaluation – A total of \$57,062 in LTF carryover funding has been carried over and added to this work element for the City of Fort Bragg to continue working on this project. No new funding was added to this element, only carryover funds will be identified.

W.E. 14 (MCOG) Training – A total of \$35,243 in LTF carryover funding has been carried over and added to this work element. No new funding was added to this element, only carryover funds will be identified.

W.E. PROJECT RESERVE – A total of \$53,750 in PPM carryover funding was carried over and added to various work elements in the Final 2023/24 OWP. This funding was added to the draft and final Overall Work Program for the new fiscal year to help with any shortfall of funds when programming new projects.

This proposed amendment would increase the FY 2023/24 Overall Work Program total from \$894,365 to \$1,086,672, an increase of \$192,307. Details are shown in **bold** and ~~strike out~~ on the attached Amended Overall Work Program Financial Sheets. The full Amended Overall Work Program will be sent under separate cover. *Hard copies of the full amendment will be available upon request.*

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Consider approval of First Amendment to FY 2023/24 Overall Work Program.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** (1) Approve Amendment (*Recommended*); (2) Do not approve Amendment; or (3) Refer Amendment to TAC for review and recommendation.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Accept staff's recommendation to approve the First Amendment to FY 2023/24 Overall Work Program (OWP) and authorize Executive Director to sign appropriate certifications and revised OWP Agreement (as needed), and forward to Caltrans as required.

/ajp

Attachments: FY 2022/23 OWP - Financial Summary of Funding Sources

FY 2022/23 OWP – Financial Funding Allocations & Expenditure Summary

**MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
FY 2023/24 (FINAL-AMENDED) OVERALL WORK PROGRAM  
SUMMARY OF FUNDING SOURCES**

NO.	WORK ELEMENT	LOCAL LTF	STATE PPM	STATE RPA	OTHER / GRANT	TOTAL
1	MCOG - Regional Government & Intergovernmental Coordination	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 142,000	\$ -	\$ 142,000
2	MCOG - Planning Management & General Coordination (Non-RPA)	\$ 149,317	\$ 26,108	\$ 146,646	\$ -	\$ 322,071
3	MCOG - MTA Feasibility Study for Ukiah Transit Center - (Carryover)	\$ 88,975	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 88,975
4	MCOG - Sustainable Transportation Planning	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 30,000
5	MCOG - Mobility Solutions-Feasibility Study for Rural Areas (Carryover)	\$ 2,868	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 22,133	\$ 25,001
6	Co. DOT - Combined Special Studies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 54,000	\$ -	\$ 54,000
7	MCOG - Planning, Programming & Monitoring	\$ 31,500	\$ 135,446	\$ 14,305	\$ -	\$ 181,251
8	MCOG - Regional Leadership Training	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25,000	\$ -	\$ 25,000
12	Ukiah - Truck Route Study - (Carryover)	\$ -	\$ 45,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,000
13	Fort Bragg - Central Business District Parking Evaluation - (Carryover)	\$ 57,062	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 57,062
14	MCOG - Training	\$ 35,243	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,243
15	Point Arena - Downtown Parking Master Plan (NEW)	\$ -	\$ 48,375	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 48,375
16	MCOG - Multi-Modal Transportation Planning	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 45,000	\$ -	\$ 45,000
18	MCOG - Geographic Information System (GIS) Activities	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,798	\$ -	\$ 5,798
20	MCOG - Grant Development & Assistance	\$ 18,103	\$ -	\$ 32,897	\$ -	\$ 51,000
	PROJECT RESERVE	\$ 23,966	\$ 40,072	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 64,038
	<b>TOTAL</b>	\$ 436,482	\$ 259,750	\$ 337,314	\$ 22,133	\$ 1,086,672
<b>TOTAL WORK PROGRAM SUMMARY/PROGRAM MATCH</b>						
Local		\$436,482	40%	Local LTF 2023/24 - 3% Alloc.		\$141,479
State		\$650,190	60%	Local LTF Unallocated		\$29,135
Federal		\$0	0%	Local LTF Carryover		\$265,868
Other		\$0	0%	State PPM 2023/24 Alloc.		\$141,000
		\$0	0%	State PPM Carryover		\$154,001
		\$1,086,672	100%	State RPA 2023/24 Alloc.		\$294,000
				State RPA Grant Funds		\$25,000
				State RPA Carryover		\$18,314
				State Grant (SHA) Carryover		\$17,875
				Federal		\$0
				<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$1,086,672</b>

**MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
FY 2023/24 (FINAL AMENDED) OVERALL WORK PROGRAM  
FUNDING ALLOCATION & EXPENDITURE SUMMARY**

NO.	WORK ELEMENT TITLE	COUNTY DOT	CITIES	MCOG STAFF	CONSULT/ OTHERS/ DIRECT COSTS	TOTAL
1	MCOG - Regional Government & Intergovernmental Coordination			\$ 140,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 142,000
				\$ 142,646	\$ 4,000	\$ 146,646
2	MCOG - Planning Management & General Coordination (Non-RPA)			\$ 134,653		\$ 134,653
				\$ 165,858	\$ 9,567	\$ 175,425
3	MCOG - MTA Feasibility Study for Ukiah Transit Center - Carryover				\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
					\$ 88,975	\$ 88,975
4	MCOG - Sustainable Transportation Planning			\$ 15,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 20,000
					\$ 15,000	\$ 30,000
5	MCOG-Mobility Solutions-Feasibility Study for Rural Areas - Carryover				\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
					\$ 20,191	\$ 20,191
6	Co. DOT - Combined Special Studies	\$ 54,000				\$ 54,000
7	MCOG - Planning, Programming & Monitoring			\$ 105,000	\$ 9,500	\$ 114,500
				\$ 171,751		\$ 181,251
8	MCOG - Regional Leadership Training				\$ 25,000	\$ 25,000
					\$ 38,668	\$ 38,668
12	Ukiah - Truck Route Study - Carryover		\$ 45,000			\$ 45,000
13	Fort Bragg - Central Business District Parking Evaluation - Carryover		\$ 50,000			\$ 50,000
			\$ 57,062			\$ 57,062
14	MCOG - Training			\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 20,000
				\$ 17,041	\$ 18,202	\$ 35,243
15	Point Arena - Downtown Parking Master Plan (NEW)		\$ 48,375			\$ 48,375
16	MCOG - Multi-Modal Transportation Planning			\$ 45,000		\$ 45,000
18	MCOG - Geographic Information System (GIS) Activities			\$ 5,798		\$ 5,798
20	MCOG - Grant Development & Assistance			\$ 51,000		\$ 51,000
	PROJECT RESERVE				\$ 64,038	\$ 64,038
	<b>TOTAL</b>	\$ 54,000	\$ 143,375	\$ 506,451	\$ 190,539	\$ 894,365
			\$ 150,437	\$ 614,094	\$ 268,141	\$ 1,086,672

**Note:** Reimbursement Rates Used for Calculating Days Programmed (estimate only). County/Cities/Local Agencies (\$75/hr.); Consultants (\$125/hr.); MCOG Planning Staff (est. @ approx. \$38-\$130/hr. - various positions).

\* MCOG planning staff funding level is based on contracted obligation with DBC Consulting (\$476,451). DBC's contract extension (approved 4/3/2023) goes through 9-30-24. In addition, \$30,000 \$94,614 in ESTIMATED carryover funding is available from under-expending prior years' funding, for a total available of \$506,451 \$571,065.



## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

### STAFF REPORT

**Agenda # 8**  
Consent  
MCOG Meeting  
8/14/2023

**TITLE:** FY 2023/24 Budget Amendment - MTA's Revised Claim for Capital Reserve Funds

**SUBMITTED BY:** Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO

**DATE:** 8/7/2023

---

**BACKGROUND:**

Mendocino Transit Authority has requested a revised allocation from the Capital Reserve Fund (CRF) for Fiscal Year 2023/24. The adopted budget allocates the entire estimated balance of \$705,462 for Long-Term projects in MTA's Five Year Capital Program, as allowed by the Transportation Development Act (TDA). MTA is the only eligible applicant for CRF funds under MCOG's jurisdiction, and funds are available.

MTA now requests moving the Long-Term allocation to current-year MTA Capital. They are purchasing a zero-emission, battery-electric bus with charging infrastructure at a total cost of approximately \$1.2 million. This requested CRF allocation would provide a local match for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5339 program funding. MTA has also contributed some of its own capital reserves to the project. It is anticipated that other state and/or federal resources will free up Local Transportation Funds for MTA to replenish MCOG's Capital Reserve Fund at some point going forward.

The proposed project expenditures are in conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan. The other required findings remain in effect, as documented in the budget allocating resolution.

I have prepared a draft resolution #M2023-07 indicating the requested changes in ~~strikeout~~ and ~~bold-italic~~ typeface to the adopted allocating resolution M2023-04, which would be superseded by this new resolution.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Approval of this change to the Capital Reserve Fund allocation for 2023/24. If approved, staff will prepare an amendment of the adopted Budget package.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:**

This item could be pulled from the Consent Calendar for questions of MTA and/or further discussion.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve MTA's revised FY 2023/24 claim for Capital Reserve funds as a Budget Amendment, and authorize the Executive Director to issue revised allocation instructions to the County Auditor-Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector.

Enclosures:

Resolution M2023-07 superseding MCOG's FY 2023/24 allocating resolution M2023-04  
Exhibit B - MTA's letter dated 8/7/2023 with summary of Revised 2023/24 Claim for Funds





# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

BOARD of DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION No. M2023-07

REVISING ALLOCATION OF FISCAL YEAR 2023/24 LTF, STA, and  
FY 2022/23 CARRYOVER CAPITAL RESERVE FUNDS to  
MENDOCINO TRANSIT AUTHORITY,  
SUPERSEDING RESOLUTION #M2023-04

WHEREAS,

- The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Mendocino County;
- The Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) is designated as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) for Mendocino County by MCOG and has submitted a claim for funding for public transportation purposes in accordance with the Transportation Development Act (TDA), which provides for the needs of MTA and Senior Centers in Mendocino County with Local Transportation Funds (LTF) funds, State Transit Assistance (STA) funds, and Capital Reserve Funds;
- This claim, attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, was reviewed by MCOG staff and the Transit Productivity Committee (TPC), and the MTA Board of Directors may make revisions according to budget development and TPC recommendations, as allowed by adopted MCOG policy; staff and the TPC recommended that MCOG identify Local Transportation Funds for reasonable-to-meet Unmet Transit Needs in MTA's FY 2023/24 allocation, and MTA revised the claim accordingly;
- According to MCOG's adopted Capital Reserve Fund policies, eligible applicants under contract with MTA may request capital funds, providing that a five-year capital program and contract between the claimant and MTA is on file with the RTPA;
- *A revised claim for Capital Reserve Funds was received from MTA on August 7, 2023, requesting the entire fund balance of \$705,462 to be reallocated from Long-Term Capital to a current year MTA Capital project in FY 2023/24, attached hereto as Exhibit B;*
- Capital claims must be identified in accordance with TDA: 1) to reflect capital needs that will be expended during the fiscal year so claimed under Public Utilities Code 6648 and 2) filed to reflect specific capital improvements of a long-term nature up to five years, or for matching purposes in applying for federal transportation grants under P.U.C. 6631;
- MTA is the only eligible claimant of State Transit Assistance, for which eligibility for Operations funding is to be determined by performance reviews, fiscal audits, and state legislation;
- State of Good Repair program funding is available through the RTPA from Senate Bill 1, the Road Repair & Accountability Act of 2017; and

- Based on allocations in accordance with TDA for Administration, Planning, and Reserves, the 2023/24 LTF funds available for transportation services are \$4,353,031; STA funds available for 2023/24 are estimated at \$1,443,571 (\$1,073,881 of new State funds and \$369,690 of audited and anticipated fund balance); State of Good Repair funds are estimated at \$154,817 (preliminary estimate of new funds); and the Capital Reserve Fund balance is estimated at \$705,462; The total amount available for transportation services from these four funding sources is estimated at **\$6,656,881**; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, THAT:

MCOG hereby allocates LTF, STA, and Capital Reserve Funds to MTA and its contract claimants as follows:

1.

AUTHORITY		SOURCE	USE	AMOUNT
A.	PUC Sec. 99260(a)	Local Transportation Fund (LTF)	MTA Operations	3,621,782
	PUC Sec. 99260(a)		Unmet Transit Needs	50,000
	PUC Sec. 99400(c)		Senior Center Operations	681,249
	PUC Sec. 99262		Transit Planning	0
	CCR Sec. 6648		Capital Reserve Fund	0
	<b>Total LTF</b>			<b>4,353,031</b>
B.	CCR Sec. 6730(a)	State Transit Assistance (STA)	MTA Operations	1,293,571
	CCR Sec. 6731(b)		Senior Center Operations	0
	CCR Sec. 6730(b)		MTA and Seniors Capital	150,000
	CCR Sec. 6648		Capital Reserve Fund	0
	<b>Total STA</b>			<b>1,443,571</b>
C.	CCR Sec. 6648	Capital Reserve Fund (CRF)	Current Year - MTA	<b>705,462</b>
	CCR Sec. 6648		Current Year – Senior Centers	0
	CCR Sec. 6631		Long Term – MTA and Seniors	<b>705,462</b>
	CCR Sec. 6648		LTF/STA allocated to CRF above	0
	<b>Total CRF</b>			<b>705,462</b>
D.	Senate Bill 1	State of Good Repair (SGR)	To Be Determined	0
			<b>Total SGR</b>	
<b>Total LTF, STA, and Capital Reserve Allocations</b>				<b>6,502,064</b>
Balance Remaining for Later Allocation (SGR)				154,817
<b>Total Estimated 2023/24 Funds Available for Transit</b>				<b>6,656,881</b>

2. Additionally, MCOG makes the following required findings from Article 5, Section 6754 of the California Code of Regulations, regarding STA and LTF eligibility and fund allocation (refer to documentation on file):

- A. MCOG as the regional entity may allocate funds to an operator or a transit service claimant on the basis of all these findings:
  - a. The claimant’s proposed expenditures are in conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan.
  - b. The level of passenger fares and charges is sufficient to enable the operator or transit service claimant to meet the fare revenue requirements of Public Utilities Code (PUC) Section 99268.2, 99268.3, 99268.4, 99268.5, and

99268.9, as they may be applicable to the claimant. The most recent fiscal audit dated June 30, 2022 confirmed that MTA's farebox ratio of 3.7% had not met the 10% ratio required by Senate Bill 508, (effective July 1, 2016); however, the State had waived this regulation under COVID-19 as pandemic crisis relief.

- c. The claimant is making full use of federal funds available under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 as amended, now referred to as the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).
  - d. Of five measures for analysis on eligibility for Capital and Operations for use by both LTF and STA funds that were applied by the independent auditor in the most recent fiscal audit, most were met according to the auditor's report, and the remaining measure was waived by legislation.
    1. The sum of the claimant's allocations from STA did exceed the amount the claimant is eligible to receive during the fiscal year for operations purposes. For the fiscal year audited (ending June 30, 2022), the funds were claimed by MTA for operating and capital purposes. State Assembly Bill 90 provided statutory relief due to COVID-19.
    2. The sum of the claimant's allocations from LTF did not exceed the amount the claimant is eligible to receive during the fiscal year for operating.
    3. The sum of the claimant's allocations from LTF did not exceed the amount the claimant is eligible to receive during the fiscal year for capital.
    4. The claimant's subcontractors (senior centers) did not exceed the eligibility criteria for LTF and STA funds during the fiscal year.
    5. The fifth measure pertains to passenger rail eligibility and was not applicable for the fiscal year audited.
- B. MCOG as the regional entity may allocate funds to an operator for any transit-related purpose (as specified in Section 6730) on the basis of all these findings:
- a. The operator has made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvements recommended pursuant to PUC Section 99244. This finding shall make specific reference to the improvements recommended and to the efforts made by the operator to implement them. On May 12, 2023, the Transit Productivity Committee (TPC) reviewed performance data through December 31, 2022 with a report of good performance while emerging from two years of the COVID pandemic; no recommendations were made.
  - b. The California Highway Patrol has certified, within the last 13 months and prior to filing claims, that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code, as required by PUC Section 99251.
  - c. The operator is not in compliance with the eligibility requirements of PUC Section 99314 as applicable (relative to STA funds); however, State Assembly Bill 90 provided statutory relief due to COVID-19.

3. In accordance with Section 99405(c) of the Public Utilities Code, MCOG adopts and sets forth the local match requirements for senior centers claimed under Article 8 at a minimum of 10 percent, consistent with Senate Bill 508, signed into law October 9, 2015, amending the Transportation Development Act.
4. The Capital Reserve Fund (Account No. 2110-760271) audited balance of \$705,462 as of June 30, 2022, less 2022/23 allocations of \$0, and the addition of \$0 earned interest recorded as of the first budget draft in February 2023, provides a total estimated balance of \$705,462. MTA has requested ~~no~~ **all** funds for FY 2023/24 current-year capital projects and the TPC and MCOG staff have recommended full funding of MTA's claim after revising for Unmet Transit Needs, therefore the entire available balance of \$705,462 is hereby allocated to capital needs for MTA as identified in #1(C) above and to be referenced in MTA's Capital Plan.
5. The above allocations are to be paid to MTA in conformance with allocation instructions as submitted by MCOG's Executive Director to the County Auditor-Controller.
6. MTA will be required to incorporate all TDA requirements for these allocations in their upcoming 2023/24 contracts, including senior centers as applicable, and provide executed contracts to MCOG no later than September 30, 2023.

ADOPTION OF THIS RESOLUTION was moved by Director \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Director \_\_\_\_\_, and approved on this 14th day of August, 2023, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINING:

ABSENT:

WHEREUPON, the Chairman declared the resolution adopted, AND SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_\_  
ATTEST: Nephele Barrett, Executive Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dan Gjerde, Chair



SERVING MENDOCINO COUNTY SINCE 1976

August 7<sup>th</sup>, 2023  
Revised Claim for Funds FY 2023/24

Ms. Nephela Barrett, Executive Director  
Mendocino Council of Governments  
525 South State Street, Suite B  
Ukiah, CA 95482

Dear Nephela,

Attached is MTA's claim for funds for fiscal year 2023/2024. In summary, MTA is requesting:

\$ 4,353,031	from the Local Transportation Fund (LTF), and
\$ 1,443,571	in State Transit Assistance funds

### **Local Transportation Fund**

The Claim includes the amount recommended by MCOG's Executive Committee as available for Transit. Of that amount, \$ 3,671,782 would be used to support MTA's General Public Operations and \$681,249 for Senior Center operations.

### **State Transit Assistance Fund**

The Claim includes a total of \$1,443,571 of MTA's share of the Governor's State budget for STA funds, all to be used for Operating.

### **Capital Reserve**

The Capital Program for FY2023/24 balance will be transferred from Long-Term Capital to the MTA Capital section for use in FY 2023-2024, consistent with a revised Five Year Capital Program.

### **MTA Operations**

*241 Plant Road \* Ukiah, CA 95482 \* (707) 462-5765 \* Fax (707) 462-1760 \* 1-800-696 4MTA \*  
[www.4MTA.org](http://www.4MTA.org)*

The Auditor's Estimate of LTF Revenues FY23/24 will be utilized to augment MTA operating costs. We understand this estimate is subject to revision.

### **Senior Center Subsidy Program**

Senior Center operating budgets are not developed until later in the process. However, since 1996, MTA and Senior Centers have agreed to share equally in the percentage change in LTF funding available for transit operations.

### **MTA and Senior Center Capital Program**

The Capital Program for the budget year FY23/24 will reflect only projects which MTA will pay for from its Capital funds on deposit with Mendocino County, grant funding, and MTA Capital funds held by MCOG (CCR, Sec. 6648).

### **Uncertainty**

We are submitting the best information we have currently, but respectfully request your understanding and support if a revised claim is necessary.

Regards,



Jacob King  
Executive Director

Cc: Budget File

## Mendocino Transit Authority Summary of 2023/2024 Claim for Funds

8/7/23

Source	Authority	Purpose	FY 2022/23 Amount	FY 2023/24 Amount
<b>Local Transportation Fund:</b>				
	PUC, Sec. 99260(a)	MTA Operations	\$3,428,087	\$3,621,782
	PUC, Sec. 99260(a)	Unmet Transit Needs	\$300,000	\$50,000
	PUC, Sec. 99400(c)	Senior Center Operations	\$729,019	\$681,249
	PUC, Sec. 99260(a)	MTA & Senior Capital	\$0	\$0
	CCR, Sec. 6648	Transit Capital Reserve	\$0	\$0
	PUC, Sec. 99262	Transit Planning	\$200,000	\$0
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$4,657,106</b>	<b>\$4,353,031</b>
<b>State Transit Assistance Fund:</b>				
	CCR, Sec. 6730(a)	MTA Operations	\$967,375	\$1,293,571
	CCR, Sec. 6731(b)	Senior Center Operations	\$0	\$0
	CCR, Sec. 6730(b)	MTA & Senior Capital	\$200,000	\$150,000
	CCR, Sec. 6648	Transit Capital Reserve	\$0	\$0
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$1,167,375</b>	<b>\$1,443,571</b>
<b>Capital Reserve</b>				
	CCR, Sec. 6648	MTA Capital	\$0	\$705,462
	CCR, Sec. 6648	Senior Capital	\$0	\$0
	CCR, Sec. 6631	Long-Term Capital	\$701,179	\$0
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$701,179</b>	<b>\$705,462</b>
<b>Total Claim</b>			<b>\$6,525,660</b>	<b>\$6,502,064</b>







## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Agenda #10**  
Regular Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/14/2023

### STAFF REPORT

---

**TITLE:** Presentation & Acceptance of Feasibility Study – Mobility Solutions for Rural Communities of Inland Mendocino County      **DATE PREPARED:** 8/4/23

**SUBMITTED BY:** Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner

**MEETING DATE:** 8/14/23

---

#### **BACKGROUND:**

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency, MCOG is responsible for oversight and administration of Transit Development Act funding received for our region. As part of those responsibilities, MCOG conducts the annual unmet transit needs process each year to gather public input on needs throughout the region. Through that process we have repeatedly been informed of the need for some type of transit or mobility service in several of our remote communities. That prompted MCOG to secure a planning grant to explore potential, feasible solutions that could meet these needs. We are now nearing the end of this Caltrans grant-funded study that was competitively awarded to the AMMA Transit Planning, Inc. consultant team last spring (May, 2022).

As we've reported over the last year or so, the purpose of this project was to study the remote rural communities of Covelo, Laytonville, Brooktrails, Hopland, and Potter Valley, to research potential mobility solutions and alternatives to traditional transit service in these hard-to-serve rural areas with little or no transit service. (Although Hopland is not as remote, it's included in this study due to its limited transit service.)

During the course of the study, the AMMA team conducted substantial community outreach, including a successful online survey (*with 339 responses*), and held both in-person and virtual community workshops in all five of the above-listed communities. A Project Team (*composed of Consultant, MCOG, MTA, and Caltrans staff*) met monthly, and a Technical Advisory Group (*composed of various stakeholders*) met periodically throughout the study period.

Based on analysis of initial findings and community input, draft documents (Needs Assessment Executive Summary, Needs Assessment Full Report, and Solutions Research and Analysis Report) were developed and posted on the Mobility Solutions project page on MCOG's website at: <https://www.mendocinocog.org/mobility-solutions-study-reports-for-review-comment-update> for public review in December 2022, and finalized in January 2023.

You will recall that AMMA representatives gave an interim presentation at the April 2023 MCOG meeting to provide a preview of draft mobility solutions under consideration at that time. MTA Board members were also invited to hear the information presented. Since that meeting, potential mobility solutions and recommendations have continued to be evaluated, refined, and adjusted. A presentation on draft mobility solutions was provided in a final (virtual) community workshop on June 27, 2023.

At this meeting, Heather Menninger and other AMMA team members will give a presentation (*via Zoom*) on the draft study/plan components and recommendations, included in three volumes:

- Volume 1 – Five Communities' Transportation Needs Assessment (*January 2023*)
- Volume 2 – Mobility Solutions Research and Analysis Report (*January 2023*)
- Volume 3 – Rural Mobility Action Plan (*August 2023*)

These documents may be viewed at either of the following links:

<https://www.mendocinocog.org/mobility-solutions-study-reports-for-review-comment-update>

<https://www.mendocinocog.org/board-of-directors>

Volumes 1 and 2 provided the necessary assessment, research, and analysis, to inform Volume 3 – the Rural Mobility Action Plan. The AMMA team will describe all three volumes, however, the recommendations in the Action Plan will be the main focus of discussion at this meeting.

Understanding that transit decisions (funding, policy, etc.) are the responsibility of both the MTA and MCOG Boards, staff is not requesting “approval” of these documents/recommendations, but rather “acceptance” of the proposed final documents, as consistent with the wording in the grant application, Scope of Work, Task 7 below. Implementation of any of the recommendations in the plan will require future discussions and actions regarding funding, administration and operation.

#### Task 7: Board Review/Acceptance

Consultant shall present Final “Feasibility Study - Mobility Solutions for Rural Communities of Inland Mendocino County” Study/Plan at a public meeting of the Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) **for acceptance**.

This public meeting does not require legal notice; however, it’s been advertised with a press release to local media and in emails sent to stakeholder contact lists. Public comment is welcome at the appropriate time, as invited by the Chair.

This grant-funded planning study is included in MCOG’s FY 2023/24 Overall Work Program (Work Element 5), as a carryover project. The total project budget was \$200,000 (*\$185,000 consultant + \$15,000 MCOG staff*). The awarded consultant contract totaled \$184,995.28. *Per the contract, we have asked the consultant to edit the required funding note on the inside cover of Volume 3 to list the numbers and dollar amounts of all contracts and subcontracts relating to the preparation of these documents.*

---

#### **ACTION REQUIRED:**

- Receive staff report
- Receive consultant presentation
- Invite Board discussion
- Invite public comment
- Take Board Action

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** None provided.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Accept the draft final “Feasibility Study – Mobility Solutions for Rural Communities of Inland Mendocino County: Volume 1 – Five Communities’ Transportation Needs Assessment; Volume 2 – Mobility Solutions Research and Analysis Report; and Volume 3 – Rural Mobility Action Plan”; with the funding note in Volume 3 to be edited to list all contracts and subcontracts as required, and with the title of Volume 3 to be changed to “Final”.



# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

## STAFF REPORT

**Agenda #11**  
Regular Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/14/2023

---

**TITLE:** STIP Policy Update and Fund Estimate

**DATE PREPARED:** 08/04/23

**MEETING DATE:** 08/14/23

---

**SUBMITTED BY:** Nephele Barrett, Executive Director

---

**BACKGROUND:** Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) are given the authority to decide how to program the county share of funds from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), subject to STIP eligibility guidelines. To be eligible, projects must be nominated by the regional agency in their Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

RTIPs are developed and adopted every two years and due to the State on December 15 of odd years. In August of odd years (typically), the California Transportation Commission adopts the Fund Estimate for the STIP cycle. Regional agencies then adopt their RTIPs based on the adopted Fund Estimate. MCOG requires that all projects funded with RIP funds are identified in or consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan.

At the April MCOG meeting, the changes in the STIP funding and state policies over the years were discussed. Historically, the STIP has been a major source of funding for large scale projects within the Mendocino County region. Revenues that flow into the STIP have declined in recent cycles, reducing the ability to fund very large projects. The passage of SB 1 stabilized the State revenues that flow into the STIP, but we are still unlikely to see the large programming targets of the early 2000s. The STIP is largely dependent on fuel excise tax revenues, which continue to decline as fuel efficiency and use of electric vehicles increase. In addition, the State has shifted away from policies that prioritize capacity increasing projects.

With this in mind, the MCOG Board directed staff to work with the TAC to revise MCOG's policies for project selection to utilize the regional STIP funds. At their May and June meetings, the TAC discussed the criteria and scoring used for project selection and recommended changes. The recommended revised criteria and score values (attached) were presented to the Executive Committee in July, and recommended for approval by the MCOG Board. New language is shown with underline. The most significant changes are the addition of a new category, System Condition/Preservation/Completion and a change in category 4 from Congestion Relief to Traffic Volume/Usage. Revised and previous point values are shown for each category.

In addition to the criteria, a draft resolution is also attached for adoption. The resolution includes specific recommendations from the Executive Committee and reflects current conditions. The RTIP project application, scoring form, and instructions have also been updated to reflect changes in the criteria and resolution and are included for adoption.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Adopt the resolution updating MCOG's STIP funding policies to reflect current state and local conditions and priorities. Approve the revised STIP funding criteria and score values, application, and instructions.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** Make changes to the resolution and related documents prior to adoption.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Adopt the resolution updating MCOG's STIP funding policies to reflect current state and local conditions and priorities. Approve the revised STIP funding criteria and score values, application, scoring sheet, and instructions.



## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RIP) - APPLICATION FORM

Applicant Agency: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Contact: \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_

### PROJECT INFORMATION (USE ADDITIONAL SHEETS AS NECESSARY)

Project Mode: *(Check all that apply)*

Highways/Streets/Roads \_\_\_\_\_ Transit \_\_\_\_\_ Bike & Pedestrian \_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Project Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Location: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Description: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Need: What transportation deficiency will this project address? (safety, congestion, operations, plan implementation, etc) \_\_\_\_\_

		<u>Committed</u>	<u>Pending</u>
Proposed Funding:	Total Project \$ _____	_____	_____
	RIP Request \$ _____	_____	_____
	City \$ _____	_____	_____
	County \$ _____	_____	_____
	State \$ _____	_____	_____
	Federal \$ _____	_____	_____
	Other \$ _____	_____	_____

Leverage: Requested RIP Funds/Total Funding Needs \$ \_\_\_\_\_ / \$ \_\_\_\_\_

What alternative sources of funding have already been sought for this project?

Source: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Status: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Funding Available: \_\_\_\_\_

#### Project Cost

Project Component	Cost Estimate
Environmental Studies & Permits	\$ _____
Plans, Specifications & Estimates	\$ _____
Right of Way	\$ _____

Construction	\$
for Caltrans projects only:	
R/W Support	\$
Construction Support	\$
<b>Total</b>	\$

Project Readiness: Use "Project Milestone" section of Project Programming Request Form.

Does project have a completed Project Study Report (PSR) or equivalent? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, submit PSR with application.

If no, will PSR be performed in-house, by state, or through MCOG? \_\_\_\_\_  
 estimated PSR completion date \_\_\_\_\_ (PSRs due prior to RTIP approval)

Is project consistent with current Regional Transportation Plan? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If no, has an RTP amendment been requested? \_\_\_\_\_

Is project identified in other plans? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, which one(s)? \_\_\_\_\_

Will project implement a specific plan that has been developed for the area? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, which one? \_\_\_\_\_

**Environmental Clearance Status**

NEPA/CEQA (underline one or both) Status \_\_\_\_\_

Categorical Exemption \_\_\_\_\_ Negative Declaration \_\_\_\_\_ EIR \_\_\_\_\_

Adoption Date \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Filing \_\_\_\_\_

Permits Required \_\_\_\_\_ Status \_\_\_\_\_

If the project is on or adjacent to a highway, street, or road, what is the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) of the facility? \_\_\_\_\_ For transit project, what is the annual ridership on the affected route? \_\_\_\_\_

Is this project considered urgent? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

If yes, explain why. \_\_\_\_\_

How does this project address the 2008 Complete Streets legislation (AB 1358)?

Explain \_\_\_\_\_

To what degree does this project improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gases (GHG), or provide environmental enhancement? Refer to scoring criteria for more information.

Describe the regional benefit of the project. Refer to scoring criteria for more information.

Describe any community engagement that took place during the planning of this project. If negative impacts have been identified, describe how these impacts are being mitigated and how the mitigation strategy was developed in coordination with the impacted community.

---

Describe the project's safety benefit. Local knowledge and observation may be used if recorded accident history isn't available. Include data if available.

---

How well does the project meet the need to preserve or improve the condition of, fill gaps in, or complete the current facility or system? Please describe the condition of and the project's effects on the specific facility/vehicle as well as the overall network/fleet. Include relevant data, such as PCI, if applicable.

---





**REGIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM  
PROJECT RATING CRITERIA**

**PROJECT RATING CRITERIA**

The order in which the following criteria are presented does not indicate priority or weighting. Discreet point values must be selected under each criterion (no half-points). Points should be selected from all categories in which a candidate project qualifies. Point ranges (high, medium-high, medium-low, etc.) are provided for reference only. The reviewer is free to select any point value (6, 9, 11, 14, etc.) up to the maximum. The maximum score obtainable will be 100 points.

**1. URGENCY (10 points possible) *PREVIOUSLY 15***

In the process of rating project urgency, any one or more of several different scenarios may satisfy this condition. The scenarios cited below are considered to be urgent, but are not intended to be an exclusive list.

- a. Is there a one-time opportunity to complete this project which will be lost if this funding source is not secured?
- b. Will other participating funding sources be lost if MCOG funds are not secured for this project?
- c. Is there an urgent non-funding related concern which the proposed project will address (such as safety)?
- d. Is the project already in an advanced component of project development? Is it nearly shovel-ready?

SCORE:	High	Med	Low	None
	(10-8 pts)	(7-4 pts)	(3-1)	(0 pts)

**2. LEVERAGE OF FUNDS (5 points possible) *PREVIOUSLY 15***

To what degree are MCOG funds leveraged in the proposed project to provide the maximum cost effectiveness of the local investment?

Ranges based on percentage participation in the proposed project by other funding sources indicate cost effectiveness.

SCORE:	High	Med	Low	None
	40-50% or more	20-30%	10%	No Leverage
	(4-5 pts)	(2-3 pts)	(1 pts)	(0 pts)

(1 point for each 10% of leveraged funding up to a maximum of 5 points for a project with 50% or more other sources)

**3. AIR QUALITY/ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT (10 points possible) PREVIOUSLY 15**

To what degree does this project improve air quality, reduce greenhouse gasses, or provide other environmental enhancement? Are there sensitive receptors (schools, hospitals, day-care, senior care facilities) which will benefit by this project? Will the project help protect or improve water quality with drainage/stormwater improvements? Will the project encourage mode shift to reduce GHG emissions, reduce VMT and/or mitigate for other projects?

SCORE: High	Med-High	Med-Low	None
(7-10 pts)	(4-6 pts)	(1-3 pts)	(0 pts)

**4. TRAFFIC VOLUME/USAGE (10 points possible) PREVIOUSLY 15**

What is the average daily traffic volume of the facility? For bike/ped projects or new roadway facilities, the volume of the existing facility that will be relieved or complemented by the new facility will be considered. For transit projects, the route ridership will be considered.

SCORE: High	Med-High	Med-Low	None
>7,000≤10,000	>4,000≤6,000	≥1,000≤3,000	<1,000 vpd
(7-10 pts)	(4-6 pts)	(1-3 pts)	(0 pts)

Points are assigned at a rate of 1 point per 1,000 vehicles per day on the affected street/road (the project street/road or the street/road to be relieved by the project).

TRANSIT SCORE: High	Med	Low	None
>24,000≤40,000	>12,000≤24,000	≥4,000≤12,000	<4,000
(7-10 pts)	(4-6 pts)	(1-3 pts)	(0 pts)

Points are assigned at a rate of 1 point per 4,000 passengers annually on the affected route.

**5. REGIONAL BENEFIT (25 points possible) PREVIOUSLY 20**

Do benefits of the proposed project extend beyond the immediate area of the project? Regional benefit can be demonstrated in a number of ways. Examples include but are not limited to: (1) functional classification of the roadway proposed for improvement (arterials are more important than collectors), (2) average daily traffic on the facility, (3) inter-modality characteristics of the project, (4) city/county projects on major corridors, (5) interchange improvements, (6) improving or providing access from a community to a major corridor, (7) project- specific qualities of a project which extend beyond the immediate improvement area

**ORIGINALLY ADOPTED BY MCOG 11/2/98**  
**REVISED BY MCOG 5/7/01 & 9/6/11**  
**Proposed Revision 2023 – Exec. Com. Recommendation**

(8) project implements area-wide plan (9) cost effectiveness of project, (10) project enhances equity or improves an underserved community, (11) project improves access to existing housing or proposed housing sites, (12) project will help to reduce VMT, (13) provides quality of life benefits for the community and traveling public.

SCORE: High            Med-High            Medium            Med-Low            Low  
          (21-25 pts)    (16-20 pts)        (11-15 pts)      (6-10 pts)        (0-5 pts)

**6. SAFETY BENEFIT (25 points possible) PREVIOUSLY 20**

Does the project have an identifiable safety benefit? The safety benefit may be based on local knowledge and observation. Recorded accident history is not required to be scored in this category.

SCORE: High            Med-High            Medium            Med-Low            Low  
          (21-25 pts)    (16-20 pts)        (11-15 pts)      (6-10 pts)        (0-5 pts)

**7. SYSTEM CONDITION/PRESERVATION/COMPLETION (15 points possible)**

How well does the project meet the need to preserve or improve the condition of, fill gaps in, or complete the current facility or system. For roadway rehabilitation or reconstruction projects, consider the current PCI, and PCI following project completion. For bicycle and pedestrian projects, will the project improve existing facilities or fill a gap in the network? For transit vehicle projects, consider the condition of the existing vehicles (if proposed project is replacement) or how the project completes/fills a gap in the transit system/fleet, as well as overall condition of the fleet as a whole.

When scoring a project, both the condition of the overall network or fleet, as well as the specific facility or vehicle will be considered to determine need and degree of system condition, preservation, or completion.

SCORE: High            Med-High            Med-Low            None  
          (11-15 pts)    (6-10 pts)        (1-5 pts)        (0 pts)



## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RIP) POLICIES AND APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) has established the following process to identify and select local projects for programming in future Mendocino County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIPs). As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Mendocino County, MCOG is required by California State Law to prepare and adopt a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) by December 15 of each odd-numbered year, for inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

Pursuant to this requirement, the following process was developed by the MCOG's Technical Advisory Committee (*comprised of representatives from the County, cities, Caltrans, MTA, and Rail*) and adopted by the Mendocino Council of Governments on November 2, 1998; revised on May 7, 2001, on September 6, 2011 to conform to MCOG policies as established in the Strategic Planning Workshops of 2010, on August 26, 2013, and again on August 14, 2023, for consistency with current MCOG policies and practices. This process shall be followed to identify and select projects for funding and programming in future Mendocino County RTIPs.

### II. ELIGIBILITY

**Applicants** - All partners to the Joint Powers Agreement creating the Mendocino Council of Governments (the County of Mendocino and cities of Ukiah, Fort Bragg, Willits, and Point Arena), as well as the Mendocino Transit Authority are eligible applicants.

**Projects** - Only capital projects will be considered for SB 45 funding per MCOG policy. Maintenance and operations projects are ineligible under this program. Details regarding eligibility are outlined in STIP Guidelines developed by the California Transportation Commission.

**Modes** - The following modes are eligible for SB 45 funding: Highways/Streets/Roads; Transit; and Bike & Pedestrian.

### III. PROJECT RATING CRITERIA/EVALUATION PROCESS

Projects shall be evaluated based on the Project Rating Criteria, as revised August 14, 2023. Evaluations and scoring will be conducted by the Technical Advisory Committee. In formulating funding recommendations to MCOG, the TAC may consider other relevant factors (such as: consistency with overall transportation goals and priorities, cost effectiveness, overall cost, relationship to other projects, alternative funding sources, etc.) and through the exercise of professional judgment, may vary from that priority order which may have been established through the numerical ranking process. Final project selection shall be made by MCOG.

### IV. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) REQUIREMENT

All projects recommended for funding and programmed in the RTIP shall be identified in, or consistent with, the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

**V. PROJECT STUDY REPORT (PSR) REQUIREMENT**

All projects recommended for funding shall have a draft PSR or equivalent prior to the application due date. A final PSR, consistent with state requirements, must be completed prior to approval of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

**VI. PERFORMANCE/REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

All projects recommended for funding and programmed in the RTIP will be subject to all applicable state and federal requirements (timely use of funds, project delivery, reporting requirements, etc.). Successful applicants will be required to submit quarterly status reports to MCOG in a form acceptable to MCOG.

**VII. APPLICATION FORMS/PACKAGE**

The attached RIP application form shall be utilized. Applicants may expand the answer fields on the form to accommodate longer answers. Additional information may be attached to the application form, if desired. The application package shall consist of: application form, project rating criteria forms, scoring forms, and these policies and instructions.

**VIII. APPLICATION CYCLE**

The 2024 RIP application cycle shall be from August 15 – September 29, 2023, with applications due to the MCOG office by 5:00 p.m. on September 29, 2023.

**X. APPLICATION SUBMITTAL**

Three (3) hard copies of the completed application, and one electronic copy (including attachments) must be submitted to the MCOG office, 525 S. Main Street, Suite B, Ukiah, CA, 95842, by the indicated due date. If there are attachments that are too large to transmit electronically, additional hard copies may be requested.

**XI. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

For additional information on MCOG's RIP please contact James Sookne, MCOG Program Manager at 707-463-1859.

# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

BOARD of DIRECTORS

RESOLUTION No. \_\_\_\_\_

## ESTABLISHING GENERAL POLICIES FOR THE COMMITMENT OF REGIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM SHARES IN THE STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS,

1. The Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Mendocino County; and
2. MCOG, as the RTPA, is the responsible agency for programming Regional Improvement Program (RIP) shares from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for transportation projects in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and submitting an adopted document to Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) by December 15 of each odd numbered year; and
3. MCOG has historically programmed RIP shares for a variety of capital projects across multiple modes; and
4. MCOG has adopted a Regional Transportation Plan/Active Transportation Plan through a process including significant public, stakeholder, and government/agency outreach that identifies needs and projects that may be implemented through programming in the RTIP; and
5. MCOG has previously determined that “major local roadway” shall include Major Collector streets/roads in rural areas and on Collector streets/roads in urban areas approved by the Federal Highway Administration and as identified on California Road System maps; and
6. Transit capital improvement projects remain eligible for RIP funding even though the dedicated source of transit funding has greatly diminished; and
7. Non-motorized projects such as bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects enjoy a high level of local support, and may be needed to advance Complete Streets law objectives, and remain eligible for RIP funding; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, THAT:

This resolution and the policies it contains replace any previously approved policies regarding programming of Regional Improvement Program funds.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

The following policy guidance has been established for development of the 2024 RTIP and shall remain in effect in subsequent years unless rescinded, amended, or replaced:

- A. Roadway safety, operational, reconstruction and rehabilitation projects primarily on State highway and major local roads (or facilities that qualify for this designation) shall be eligible for RIP funding on a competitive basis.
- B. Transit Capital Improvement projects identified in the Transit Capital Improvement Plan shall be considered for RIP funding on a case-by-case, competitive basis, with no specific set-aside or target, and dependent on fund type eligibility in the STIP.
- C. Bicycle and Pedestrian projects shall be considered for RIP funding on a competitive basis, with no specific set-aside or target.
- D. The factors to be used in scoring projects for funding in the RTIP include urgency, leveraging of funds, air quality/environmental benefit, volume/usage, regional benefit, safety benefit, and system condition/preservation/completion.

ADOPTION OF THIS RESOLUTION was moved by Director \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Director \_\_\_\_\_, and approved on this 14th day of August, 2023, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAINING:

ABSENT:

WHEREUPON, the Chairman declared the resolution adopted, AND SO ORDERED.

---

Dan Gjerde, Chair

---

ATTEST: Nephele Barrett, Executive Director





## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS STAFF REPORT

---

**TITLE:** Discussion of 2024 STIP Fund Estimate & RTIP

**DATE PREPARED:** 08/4/23

**MEETING DATE:** 08/14/23

**SUBMITTED BY:** James Sookne, Program Manager

---

### **BACKGROUND:**

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the Transportation Investment Fund and other funding sources. STIP programming generally occurs every two years. The programming cycle begins with the release of a proposed fund estimate in July of odd-numbered years, followed by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adoption of the fund estimate in August (odd years). The fund estimate serves to identify the amount of new funds available for the programming of transportation projects.

The CTC is scheduled to adopt the Fund Estimate (FE) for the 2024 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) at their August 16 meeting. The FE identified a target of \$11,731,000 available to the region in Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funding. The target combines new capacity of \$8,137,000, including our target for Planning, Programming, & Monitoring (PPM), and an unprogrammed balance of \$3,479,000. A maximum funding amount is identified for the region of \$36,177,000, which includes funding expected in the next County Share Period (through FY 31/32). After deducting \$407,000 available for PPM, a target of \$11,324,000 is available for programming on new or existing projects, with a maximum of \$35,770,000.

Over the next few months, MCOG staff, in conjunction with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), will be developing the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) which is a program of highway, local road, transit, and active transportation projects that a region plans to fund with State and Federal revenue programmed by the CTC in the STIP. The RTIP is developed biennially by the regions and is due to the CTC by December 15 of every odd numbered year. The program of projects in the RTIP is a subset of projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a federally mandated master transportation plan which guides a region's transportation investments over a 20 to 25-year period.

In the 2022 RTIP, future funding commitments, when capacity allows, were identified for the following projects:

- N. State Street Intersection/Interchange – \$1,464,000 (County of Mendocino)
- Gualala Downtown Streetscape – CON \$3,050,000 (Caltrans)

The \$1,464,000 identified for the County's North State Street project was allocated in May 2023 to fully fund the PS&E component of that project and is not a factor in the current FE. Funds for the Gualala project could remain earmarked in this STIP cycle, or the Board could consider freeing up some or all of those funds for programming on other projects. Staff will be meeting with Caltrans prior to the MCOG Board meeting to discuss project needs. If funds from the 2024 STIP remain earmarked for the Gualala project, that would leave a target balance of \$8,274,000.

Staff recommends that a call for projects be announced following the Board meeting allowing agencies to compete for the funds using MCOG's adopted application and criteria. The determination regarding a continued future funding commitment for the Gualala project can be made at this meeting or at a future meeting based on additional information and other funding needs.

We anticipate presenting a draft RTIP to the MCOG Board in November and the final RTIP in December. If any additional information becomes available prior the meeting, staff will provide an updated verbal report.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Discuss the 2024 STIP Fund Estimate and provide direction to staff for a call for projects and preparation of the 2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** None identified.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Discuss the 2024 STIP Fund Estimate and provide direction to staff regarding a call projects and preparation of the 2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program. If updated project needs for the Gualala Downtown Streetscape project are available at the time of the meeting, consider releasing a portion of the existing future funding commitment for the current call for projects.



## MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Agenda #13**  
Regular Calendar  
MCOG Meeting  
8/14/2023

### STAFF REPORT

---

**TITLE:** Amendment of Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Reserve Policy

**SUBMITTED BY:** Janet Orth, Deputy Director & CFO

**DATE:** 8/4/2023

---

#### **BACKGROUND:**

In June 1999, the Council adopted its Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Reserve policy, amended in April 2001. This was in response to a shortfall of the sales tax revenues allocated to Mendocino Transit Authority's (MTA) public transit operations. The policy conforms to the state Transportation Development Act (TDA), which regulates management of these funds.

At the time, the full amount of the County Auditor-Controller's LTF revenue estimate was allocated annually in the budget, so in the event that actual revenues fell short of budget, funds had to be withheld from MTA or else returned by MTA in some manner, causing a hardship for the transit agency. As a result of that actual event, MCOG's Board adopted the policy that has remained in force to this day (then councilmember Richard Shoemaker and I drafted the policy text consistent with TDA and Executive Committee direction.) It sets aside a percentage of the LTF estimate to be available for eligible uses that benefit MTA.

This policy was first implemented when the economy was hit by the Great Recession in 2008/09 and 2009/10. Once again we are facing a downturn, and fortunately the reserve has been well funded in better economic times, so that we have the resources to make the FY 2022/23 transit allocation whole.

The issue now is with the procedure for claims on the reserve. When the policy was written, revenues were calculated on a cash basis, i.e. when monthly deposits are received in the fund. In 2016, then County Auditor-Controller Lloyd Weer caused MCOG to shift to accrual basis as a result of the County's independent fiscal audits. As a result, there is a two-month time lag between the month taxes are collected and when deposits are received in the fund. The reserve policy is written assuming 12 fiscal months of revenue are known in June; now the final deposit is received in August. The existing policy does not accommodate the new timeline. Therefore, an amendment of the policy is called for.

Staff also recommends allowing the flexibility of administrative action using available state data to determine actual revenues, with the full Council to subsequently ratify eligible withdrawals from the fund. This will eliminate unnecessary delay in releasing funds to MTA, which otherwise faces severe cash flow problems. I have attached the proposed revisions for consideration.

Be advised that I am continually working with our administrative staff to develop and update MCOG's policies and procedures manuals. I intend to fit the same content into new formats for consistency and ease of use in the new manuals. The Council will have the opportunity to view all materials, so I appreciate your confidence and support in developing these resources for future use.

---

#### **ACTION REQUIRED:**

Approve staff's proposed amendments to the LTF Reserve Policy, in order to facilitate efficient and timely withdrawals for eligible uses, specifically to fulfill transit allocations when actual revenues fall short of budget estimates. Allow staff to format the revised policy content into updated policies and procedures manual formats, e.g. outlines, numbering, and task checklists.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:**

Discuss any alternative revisions to amend the policy consistent with current fiscal conditions. Staff is available to provide further information.

If no amendments are made, the resulting delay of cash flow to MTA will cause hardship.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve staff's proposed amendments to the LTF Reserve Policy as attached, in order to facilitate efficient and timely withdrawals for eligible uses of the fund, consistent with current fiscal conditions and the Transportation Development Act.

Enc: Draft LTF Reserve Policy amendment in track-changes format

**Policy Statement – Proposed Amendment August 14, 2023**  
**MCOG Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Reserve**

A Local Transportation Fund (LTF) reserve account is allowed under the Transportation Development Act (TDA) as long as the correct procedures are followed in administering the fund, as set forth in Sections 6655.1 and 6655.5 of the Act.

Based on the Executive Committee’s recommendations of May 3, 1999 and February 21, 2001, Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG) has determined that a Local Transportation Fund (LTF) reserve shall be established and maintained. The fund shall be named “LTF Reserve.”

The reserve shall be administered as follows:

TDA Compliance. MCOG shall administer the LTF Reserve according to all applicable sections of the Transportation Development Act, including Sections 6655.1 and 6655.5 (attached).

Reserve Balance. The minimum balance shall be established at the larger of \$100,000 or five percent of the County Auditor's official LTF estimate for the next fiscal year, rounded to the nearest thousand. In the event that five percent of the Auditor's estimate is lower than the current year's budgeted reserve and no expenditures from the reserve were required, the minimum LTF Reserve balance shall remain at the current year's budgeted amount. The balance shall be evaluated annually when the prior year's fiscal audits are completed, the Auditor's estimate is known, and before the new budget is adopted.

When the fund balance exceeds the amount established under this policy, the surplus amount “shall be carried over and be available for apportionment and allocation in the following fiscal year,” according to TDA Section 6655.5. Funds carried over shall be added to the County Auditor’s estimate for allocation according to MCOG’s established priorities for LTF allocations. All eligible claimants shall be notified of the area apportionments according to TDA Section 6655.1.

Deposits. The audited balance of ~~any-sales tax~~ revenues to the Local Transportation Fund for the fiscal year in excess of all monies allocated shall be deposited to the LTF Reserve annually.

Eligible Withdrawals and Uses. LTF Reserve funds shall be used for transit services provided by Mendocino Transit Authority (MTA) that have been funded by MCOG through the annual transit claim process, when 1) actual LTF revenues fall short of LTF budget allocations, or 2) extreme or unusual circumstances warrant an additional allocation.

Procedure for Claims. LTF Reserve funds may be expended by one of two methods:

1) *Revenues Short of Allocation:* After a report from California Department of Tax & Fee Administration’s webpage “Local Jurisdiction Statement of Tax Distribution” of twelve accrual months of LTF revenue for the fiscal year annually by August 31 (year-end closing), to be confirmed by the County Auditor-~~Controller/Treasurer-Tax Collector’s records in the Munis Finance System and subsequent MCOG fiscal audit, to the MCOG Board annually in June, and upon the Board's review and concurrence,~~ the Executive Director may instruct the County Auditor-~~Controller/ Treasurer-Tax Collector~~ to make a funds transfer to MTA if actual revenues fall short of MCOG's budget allocation for transit operations and current-year capital at fiscal year end, with such action to be ratified by the MCOG Board of Directors at the next available

meeting. Potentially an amendment to a future budget may be adopted by the Board as a result of LTF Reserve transactions-

If necessary, as determined by the Executive Director, an earlier withdrawal for partial payment of MTA's allocation may be made from the LTF Reserve prior to the August 31 fiscal year-end closing for cash flow purposes, subject to subsequent reconciliation.

2) *Additional Allocation*: MTA may submit a written request to MCOG, justifying and documenting the need for additional funds to ensure continuance of existing funded transit services, for the Board's consideration at a regular MCOG meeting.

**Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Reserve**  
Attachment to Policy Statement

The following sections of the Transportation Development Act (TDA) apply to this policy:

6655.1. UNALLOCATED APPORTIONMENTS RETAINED IN FUND.

The transportation planning agency may allocate to claimants in an area an amount less than the apportionment of the area. However, the amount of the apportionment which is not allocated shall be retained in the local transportation fund for later allocation only to claimants in the same area on such terms and conditions as the transportation planning agency may determine.

6655.5. REVISED DETERMINATION OF APPORTIONMENTS.

The transportation planning agency may, at any time before the close of the fiscal year, issue a revised determination of apportionments based on a revised or updated estimate furnished by the county auditor pursuant to Section 6620. The transportation planning agency may, at any time, request a revised or updated estimate from the county auditor.

**Any revenues to the fund for the fiscal year in excess of all moneys allocated, reserved, or retained in the fund as unallocated apportionments pursuant to Section 6655.1 shall be carried over and be available for apportionment and allocation in the following fiscal year.**

The transportation planning agency may, at any time before the conveyance of initial allocation instructions pursuant to Section 6659, issue a revised determination of apportionments based on a revised determination of populations.







# MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

**Agenda #15d**  
Reports  
MCOG Meeting  
8/14/2023

## STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Summary of Meetings

DATE PREPARED: 8/04/2023

SUBMITTED BY: Jody Lowblad, Administrative Assistant

BACKGROUND: Since our last regular MCOG meeting packet, MCOG Administration and Planning staff have attended (or will have attended) the following meetings on behalf of MCOG:

Date	Meeting/Event	Staff
Jun 6-7	California Association of Councils of Governments (CalCOG) Board Meeting/Legislative Day in Sacramento – call in	Barrett, Ellard & Pedrotti
Jun 6	Covelo Meeting w/GHD	Barrett & Sookne
Jun 6	Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA) Meeting	Barrett, Davey-Bates & Orth
Jun 7	CTF Transportation Forum – Sacramento	Ellard & Orth
Jun 8	Webinar: CARB Workshop – Funding Plan for Clean Energy Transportation Initiatives	Orth
Jun 12	Rural REN (Regional Energy Network) Leadership Team Meeting – Santa Rosa	Barrett, Davey-Bates & Orth
Jun 12	Safe Streets for All (SS4A) Planning Meeting	Ellard & Villa
Jun 13-14	California Climate & Energy Collaborative (CCEC) Forum - Santa Rosa	Barrett, Davey-Bates & Orth
Jun 13	Covelo Ground Breaking Planning Meeting	Barrett
Jun 14	California Transportation/ Regional Transportation Planning Agency (CT/RTPA) Quarterly Meeting	Barrett & Davey-Bates
Jun 20	Hopland Outreach Meeting w/Caltrans	Barrett
Jun 20	MTA Ukiah Transit Center Monthly Meeting	Barrett, Ellard & Sookne
Jun 20	Regional Resilience Grant Workshop	Ellard
Jun 21	MCOG Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting	Barrett, Ellard & Rodriguez
Jun 21	Covelo Tribal Meeting	Barrett
Jun 22	Keeping Public Meetings Accessible: New Open Meeting Laws for Local Governments (ILG) Webinar	Orth & Ellard
Jun 22	Meeting w/ California Transportation Commission (CTC) Staff	Barrett
Jun 27	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Pre-CDFW) Meeting	Barrett & Sookne
Jun 27	RuralREN Leadership Team	Barrett, Davey-Bates & Orth
Jun 27	Mobility Solutions Virtual TAG Meeting	Barrett & Ellard
Jun 27	Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) Meeting	Barrett
Jun 27	Mobility Solutions – Virtual Community Workshop	Barrett, Ellard & Rodriguez
Jun 28	California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Meeting	Barrett & Sookne
Jun 28	California Transportation Commission (CTC) Meeting – Virtual (Suisun City)	Barrett
Jun 28	North State Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Working Group	Orth & Rodriguez
Jun 28	RuralREN Programs Subcommittee Meeting	Orth
Jun 29	Redwood Region RISE Meeting	Barrett
Jun 29	MTA Short Range Transit Development Plan (SRTDP) Meeting	Ellard & Sookne
Jun 29	CA Public Utilities Commission Board Meeting – Approval of RuralREN	Orth
Jun 30	CALCOG Board Meeting	Orth
Jul 6	RuralREN – Public Equity Program Working Group Meeting	Davey-Bates & Orth
Jul 7	Mobility Solutions Meeting w/AMMA Transit Planning	Ellard & Sookne
Jul 10	MCOG Executive Committee Meeting	Barrett, Davey-Bates & Orth
Jul 10	Covelo Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting	Barrett & Sookne
Jul 12-13	North State Transit Symposium - Eureka	Orth & Sookne
Jul 14	Covelo Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting	Barrett & Sookne

Jul 14	Covelo Tribal Consultation Meeting	Barrett, Sookne & Villa
Jul 17	Construction Management Information System (CMIS) Training	Sookne & Villa
Jul 17	Hopland Project Development Team (PDT) Meeting	Barrett
Jul 18	Covelo Project Meeting	Barrett & Sookne
Jul 19	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Workshop	Sookne & Villa
Jul 19	RuralREN Programs Subcommittee Meeting	Barrett & Davey-Bates
Jul 19	City of Ukiah Workshop- Perkins/Gobbi Corridors	Barrett & Ellard
Jul 20	Ukiah Transit Center Monthly Meeting	Sookne & Ellard
Jul 20	MTA Short Range Transit Development Plan (SRTDP) Meeting	Ellard & Sookne
Jul 20	State Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) Steering Committee	Barrett
Jul 20	Rural & Tribal Assistance Program Pilot Webinar	Villa
Jul 21	Complete Streets Workshop-Willits (Blue Zones)	Villa
Jul 21	Rural County Task Force (RCTF) Meeting	Barrett
Jul 24	Meeting w/Mendocino County Department of Transportation Regarding (LTCAP) Local Transportation Climate Adaptation Program	Ellard & Sookne
Jul 25	RuralREN Leadership Team Meeting	Barrett & Davey-Bates
Jul 25	Covelo Weekly Meeting	Barrett & Sookne
Jul 25	FTA 5310 Grant Workshop	Ellard
Jul 26	RuralREN Programs Subcommittee Meeting	Barrett & Davey-Bates
Jul 26	MTA Board Meeting	Sookne
Jul 27	MTA Short Range Transit Development Plan (SRTDP) Communities Workshop	Ellard
Jul 27	FTA Section 5310 Program Grant Workshop with NCO	Barrett, Ellard & Sookne
Aug 1	Covelo Weekly Meeting	Barrett & Sookne
Aug 2	RuralREN Programs Subcommittee Meeting	Barrett & Davey-Bates
Aug 2	REAP 1 CalCOG Meeting	Sookne
Aug 3	Mobility Solutions Grant Monthly Meeting	Barrett & Ellard
Aug 3	RuralREN Public Equity Program Working Group	Barrett, Davey-Bates & Orth

We will provide information to the Board regarding the outcome of any of these meetings as requested.

---

ACTION REQUIRED: None.

---

ALTERNATIVES: None identified.

---

RECOMMENDATION: None. This is for information only.



**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE**

Redwood Coast Energy Authority  
Stephen Kullmann  
[skullmann@redwoodenergy.org](mailto:skullmann@redwoodenergy.org)  
(707) 269-1700

## **New Funding and Formation of Rural Regional Energy Network Offers Energy Efficiency Programs to California's Underserved Communities**

*California Public Utilities Commission approves over \$177 million for expanded access; multi-agency program to be administered by Redwood Coast Energy Authority*

EUREKA, CA, July 10, 2023 — The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), on June 29, 2023, approved the formation of a Rural Regional Energy Network (RuralREN) to expand access to energy efficiency services for customers and communities in rural areas, comprising nearly half the state. Starting in January 2024, a seven-member partnership, encompassing public and non-profit agencies with decades of experience implementing programs in their regions, will collaborate on programs funded by an eight-year investment of more than \$177 million allocated to underserved areas.

The RuralREN will bring energy efficiency programs to underserved and hard-to-reach public, commercial, and residential customers in 31 rural California counties, which include 66 Federally recognized California Native American Tribal Governments. In collaboration with program administrator Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA), member organizations will serve more than seven million customers, or 18% of California's population, spanning over 70,000 square miles.

“The formation of the RuralREN will allow local entities that know their communities and unique characteristics and obstacles, such as climate zones, languages spoken and socioeconomics, to design and implement programs tailored to the distinctive needs of local ratepayers,” said Pam Close Bold, Executive Director of the High Sierra Energy Foundation. “Past ratepayer-funded programs didn’t always equitably serve rural and hard-to-reach customers as a one-size-fits-all approach simply doesn’t work.”

Approval of the RuralREN is part of a larger investment in energy efficiency as a foundational element of the CPUC’s energy, environmental, and social justice policies to increase equitable access to energy efficiency programs for all Californians served by CPUC-regulated entities. “Our decision continues California’s decades-long commitment to pursuing energy efficiency as the first and best choice for energy procurement,” said Commissioner Darcie L. Houck in a CPUC press release on the milestone investment. “I am particularly enthusiastic about the creation of the Rural Regional Energy Network, which will fill an essential gap in delivering energy efficiency upgrades and training to rural



communities across the state.” <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/news-and-updates/all-news/cpuc-adopts-milestone-investment-in-energy-efficiency-2023>

Energy efficiency is an integral part of meeting California’s aggressive decarbonization policies and goals to combat climate change, yet the most vulnerable of utility customers often do not have equitable access to utility energy efficiency programs in which they pay into every month. In fact, the average energy burden in the RuralREN region is 45% higher than the rest of California. The availability of newly funded and locally implemented programs will help customers access financing options for energy projects, workforce education and training, energy codes and standards training, as well as energy assessments, rebates and incentives for cleaner, energy efficient equipment.

RuralREN member organizations include the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments and County of San Luis Obispo on the Central Coast; the San Joaquin Valley Clean Energy Organization in the San Joaquin Valley; the High Sierra Energy Foundation and Sierra Business Council in the Sierra Nevada region and the Redwood Coast Energy Authority (RCEA) in the North Coast, in partnership with the Lake Area Planning Council and Mendocino Council of Governments. The County of Ventura is a non-implementing member of the RuralREN leadership team.

The genesis of this effort goes back to 2015 with the formation of the Rural Hard-to-Reach (RHTR) Working Group, which in 2019 voted to form the RuralREN. “By focusing on the rural hard-to-reach sector across the entire state and leveraging the expertise of the RuralREN partners, we will be able to provide services to often-overlooked segments. Rural ratepayers deserve the same level of service as those in more densely populated areas, even if it requires greater effort. The RuralREN is created to fulfill that need,” said Stephen Kullmann, Director of Demand Side Management at RCEA.

According to Amaury Berteaud, Sustainability Program Manager with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, “The promise of the RuralREN is to bring a diversity of perspectives and knowledge to the table along with a deep commitment to providing as many opportunities to rural communities as possible. This approach will not only drive the creation of successful programs but also enable partners to learn from each other on energy efficiency issues along with the numerous other issues that our respective agencies engage in.”



Map of California showing the territory served by the new RuralREN

###





MENDOCINO COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
STAFF REPORT

Agenda #15f  
Reports  
MCOG Meeting  
8/14/2023

---

**TITLE:** Feasibility Study - MTA Ukiah Transit Center

**DATE PREPARED:** 8/7/23

---

**SUBMITTED BY:** Loretta Ellard, Deputy Planner

**MEETING DATE:** 8/14/23

---

**BACKGROUND:**

This report is to give you an update on the feasibility study and location analysis for MTA's new Ukiah Transit Center planning project that's been in process since last December. The purpose of this project is to evaluate potential locations (including opportunities for multi-modal improvements) for a new transit center in the greater Ukiah area.

MCOG and MTA staff have continued to attend meetings, review materials, and coordinate with the consultant team (LSC Transportation Consultants). The last project team meeting was held on July 20, 2023 and discussion centered on scoring the potential sites against identified criteria. Technical Memorandum #2, a Site Analysis report, was received on July 25. Potential transit center sites have now been narrowed down to three remaining locations – Mason Street, East Perkins Street, and North Orchard Avenue. The consultant will be presenting the results of the site analysis to the MTA Board at their August meeting (*or in September, if there is no August meeting*).

As previously reported, the main community engagement effort occurred this past spring with an online survey, online recorded virtual workshop, and two in-person charrette events (on-site at Pear Tree Center Bus Stop, and on-site at Ukiah Farmer's Market). A project page is posted on MCOG's website at <https://www.mendocinocog.org/ukiah-transit-center> where individuals may learn about the project, view a virtual workshop presentation, and review project deliverables/reports.

This project remains on schedule, as follows:

December 2022: Kick-off meeting, Potential Site Location Tour, Stakeholder Workshop – *completed*

February 2023: Tech Memo 1: Program and Potential Site Analysis – *completed*

April 2023: Online Survey, Planning Charrette, and Stakeholder Interviews – *completed*

July 2023: Tech Memo 2: Scoring Criteria and Site Selection – *completed*

September 2023: Draft Final Report

November 2023: Final Report

MTA will utilize the recommendations in the final report to pursue next steps of property acquisition, environmental process, design, and construction of the new facility and multimodal improvements. This planning study is included in MCOG's FY 2023/24 Overall Work Program (Work Element 3), as a carryover project. The total project budget is \$152,696 (*\$150,000 consultant + \$2,696 MCOG staff*). The awarded consultant contract came in under budget at \$134,231.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Information only.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** N/A.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Information only.