

## State/MPO Working Group

February 18, 2022

2:00 p.m.– 3:45 p.m.

### NOTES

Virtual: Zoom

#### 1. Welcome and Introductions -- 5 Minutes

#### 2. Regional Climate Collaboratives (RCC) Draft Guidelines Release (Kirin Kumar, SGC) -- 5 Minutes

- [https://sgc.ca.gov/programs/cace/docs/20211011-Fact\\_Sheet-RCC.pdf](https://sgc.ca.gov/programs/cace/docs/20211011-Fact_Sheet-RCC.pdf)
- Draft Guidelines for RCC out now, taking Guidelines to SGC in April
- Invest in collaboratives of Community-based organizations, building pipeline of projects at local level, capacity-building to be able to compete for SGC dollars.
- MPOs can play role in identifying community-based partnerships.
- Holding workshops next week. Feel free to join, invite CBOs
- [kirin.kumar@sgc.ca.gov](mailto:kirin.kumar@sgc.ca.gov) - Kirin Kumar contact information.

#### Other RCC Links:

- Guidelines Release Announcement:
  - <https://sgc.ca.gov/news/2022/02-08.html>
- Fact Sheet:
  - [https://sgc.ca.gov/programs/cace/docs/20211011-Fact\\_Sheet-RCC.pdf](https://sgc.ca.gov/programs/cace/docs/20211011-Fact_Sheet-RCC.pdf)

#### 3. AB 285 Presentation (Egon Terplan, OPR) -- 35 Minutes

- The Strategic Growth Council was directed by the legislature to produce the California Transportation Assessment (AB 285 Report), examining how existing transportation funding programs can be aligned to help achieve the State's climate and equity commitments.
- Link to the report; [link here](#)
- [PPT shared]
- Transportation is not an end, it is a means. The end goal is creating a more inclusive, equitable California.

- The paper identifies a gap between the climate and equity vision in the California Transportation Plan and other state reports and where dollars are going. Just 2% of state funds are associated with the programs identified in AB 285 (which are a subset of state programs).
- The SGC identified five issue areas and will convene a collaborative stakeholder process to gather recommendations to address these issues:
- Issue Area #1: Aligning existing funding programs with State climate & equity goals.
- Issue Area #2: Updating and better aligning among existing state and regional plans.
- Issue Area #3: Reviewing current transportation project pipeline to ensure alignment with State goals.
- Issue Area #4: Assessing the roles of State transportation institutions.
- Issue Area #5: Assessing MPO and local government roles and responsibilities.
- The UC ITS papers are available on [e-scholarship](#)

### **Links to 5 UC ITS papers:**

Paper 1 - [‘A Brief History of Transportation Policies and Institutions’](#)

Paper 2 - [‘Review of Statewide Transportation Plans for California’](#)

Paper 3 - [‘MPO Planning and Implementation of State Policy Goals’](#)

Paper 4 - [‘Examination of Key Transportation Funding Programs in California and Their Context’](#)

Paper 5 - [‘Flexibility in California Transportation Funding Programs and Implications for More Climate-Aligned Spending’](#)

### **Q & A**

- (Q): How is the state putting together all of the puzzle pieces of AB 285. How will the next steps enhance the State/MPO relationship?
  - a. (A): SGC is looking to engage a range of stakeholders to solicit actionable recommendations around the issues identified in the report.
  - b. The report identifies the importance of regional planning in CA and the need to strengthen the tools of MPOs to implement plans. One goal for the outcomes is to enhance the viability of the regional planning structure.
- (Q): Are there recommendations in the current report?

- a. (A): UC ITS report has recommendations developed by the academic research team. These are not the State's recommendations but are one of the contributing sources of recommendations for the next phase of work. SGC identified five issue areas where we are specifically soliciting recommendations.
- (Q): The CTP 2050 has significant pricing assumptions built into it. Has analysis been done on what it would actually take to implement the CTP 2050 plan?
  - a. (A): UC ITS Working Paper #2 does discuss this issue but this was not the specific charge in AB 285.
- (Q): How are the state's recommendations different from the paper's recommendations?
  - a. (A): The SGC has not published recommendations. We hired UC ITS academics to independently produce the summary report along with a series of white papers.
  - b. The SGC will be launching a stakeholder outreach process to develop recommendations then publish a summary of that process, which may include specific recommendations. We are not putting forth recommendations right now.
- (Q): It would have been helpful to receive more specificity about the recommendations before they went to the Legislature.
  - a. (A): This is the beginning of a conversation on the recommendations. The UC ITS report includes some initial ideas and we look forward to partnering with MPOs and other stakeholders on the development of recommendations.
- (Q): It would be very helpful to have case studies on how these climate goals can apply to under-resourced, rural areas. How can such areas achieve equity and economic development while they work towards climate goals?
  - a. (A): The reports did not include case studies but did include analysis of all 18 SCSs. We would welcome any suggestions on case studies to include.
- (Q): Many recommendations in the report do not seem to apply to DACs in rural areas in the Central Valley. The state often seems too focused on Coastal California. For rural DACs, climate goals have a double-edged sword. Our communities need economic opportunities such as goods movement. For example, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation studies health outcomes by counties. Rural inland counties rank lowest in the State. Studies identify economic factors as causes of health problems. See:

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Survey:

<https://www.countyhealthrankings.org/app/california/2021/overview>

- a. (A): We are aware of the specific challenges of inland CA and should ensure that any recommendations that come out of the process acknowledge regional differences. As a reminder, we also have the [Community Economic Resilience Fund \(CERF\)](#) which is specifically funding regional economic diversification strategies across 13 economies regions in CA.
- (Q): Timeframe and process for the next steps?
  - a. (A): Now - End of April – We are beginning a stakeholder outreach process now and thereafter we will summarize and share in May.

#### **4. REAP 2.0 Update (Helen Campbell, OPR; Annie Parker, HCD) -- 30 Minutes (PPT Attached)**

- Late February/Early March 2022: Release of Draft Guidelines for MPO and COG formula allocations and Competitive Non-MPO Regions and Tribal Entities funds
- Summer 2022 (Tentative): Priority application period for Competitive Innovative and Integrated set aside.
- December 31, 2022: Final application deadline for all funding
- Advance Application for formula set asides now open
- \$500 million of formula set aside is from Federal Coronavirus State & Local Fiscal Recovery Funds.
- The team is currently revising DOF Final Rule interpretation and ensuring that REAP 2.0 NOFAs are compliant.
- The spreadsheet that went out with the meeting agenda, contains HCD points of contact. HCD Tribal Affairs team will be happy to work with you. REAP 2.0 Team can also facilitate Tribal contact.
  
- (Q): Will dollars be narrowed given the new rule?
  - (A): The issue is the eligibility. Still a lot to be determined.
- (Q): Will the State be ready for this? Can we extend the deadline for submitting our applications?
  - (A): \$51 million available for the Advance Application.
  - We expect to release Draft NOFA for comment.

- Lots of programs have another set of strings due to the the Final DOF Rule released in late January.
- Application deadline & expenditure deadline are written in statute. The application deadline is due on December 31, 2022, and the Expenditure Deadline is June 30, 2026.
- We are only about a month and a half behind on the development of the NOFA.
- (Q): Engagement + Outreach: Fairly significant requirements for outreach & engagement. This seemed unusual for a funding program. We have already done a lot of outreach due to Covid. When there is too much outreach, you start to exhaust communities. Will we see a change to this in the guidelines?
  - (A): We want to ensure that we comply with Federal guidance. If it can be shown that outreach has already been done, this could be eligible. These are Covid recovery funds, so there are special requirements that we want to make sure we satisfy.
- (Q): I recall hearing that state would not consider past outreach as eligible. Is that true?
  - (A): If the outreach has been completed in a way that satisfies all requirements of the NOFA, will not make you repeat work in order to check a box.
- Holding Office Hours for the non-MPO side of the funding sometime this Spring.

## **5. Other State Agency Updates -- 15 Minutes**

- CARB Update: We anticipate discussing SB 150 framing and messaging at next month's meeting.

## **6. Suggestions for topics for future meetings**

- RHNA

### **Attendance:**

AMBAG: Heather Adamson

Butte CAG: Chris Devine

CalCOG: Bill Higgins, Jennifer Hargrove-Tendick

Fresno COG: Tony Boren, Meg Prince, Jennifer Soliz, Kristine Cai

Kern COG: Rob Ball

Kings CAG: Terri King

Madera CTC: Dylan Stone, Jeff Findley, Patricia Taylor

Merced CAG: Stacie Guzman

MTC: Matt Maloney

SACOG: Clint Holtzen

SANDAG: Tuere Fa'aola

San Joaquin COG: Kim Anderson, Ryan Niblock

SBCAG: Mike Becker

SCAG: Frank Wen, Courtney Aguierre

Shasta RTA: Dan Wayne

SLO COG: James Worthley, Rich Murphy

Stanislaus COG: Elizabeth Hahn, Rosa De Leon Park

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency: Nick Haven

Tulare CAG: Benjamin Kimball

CARB: Jen Gress, Lezlie Kimura Szeto, Ian Peterson

CalTrans: Jeanie Ward-Waller

CalSTA: Darwin Moosavi

CTC: Laura Pennebaker

DoC: David Shabazian

HCD: Paul McDougall, Joseph Spano, Annie Parker, Weston Starbird, Connor Finney

OPR: Egon Terplan, Helen Campbell, Erik de Kok, Emily Tibbott

SGC: Kirin Kumar, Justin DeWaele