



**VENTURA COUNCIL
OF GOVERNMENTS**

AGENDA

Thursday, November 10, 2005

5:00 p.m.

City of Camarillo

Council Chambers

601 Carmen Drive, Camarillo, California 93010

1. **CALL TO ORDER**
2. **FLAG SALUTE**
3. **ROLL CALL**
4. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time, members of the public may comment on any item not appearing on the agenda upon completion of a speaker card. Individual Board Members may briefly respond to Public Comments or ask questions for clarification.

5. **BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**
6. **APPROVAL OF THE FINAL AGENDA**
7. **CONSENT CALENDAR**

SUGGESTED MOTION: *Motion/Second to adopt the Consent Calendar as presented.*

- A. **Minutes** – Adopt the Minutes of the September 8, 2005 Meeting.

MEMBERS

City of Camarillo
Jan McDonald, Member
Kevin Kildee, *Alternate*

City of Oxnard
Thomas Holden, Member
Tim Flynn, *Alternate*

City of Simi Valley
Paul Miller, Member
Steven Sojka, *Alternate*

City of Fillmore
Ernie Villegas, Member
Ken Smedley, *Alternate*

City of Port Hueneme
Jonathan Sharkey, Member
Murray Rosenbluth, *Alternate*

City of Thousand Oaks
Jacqui Irwin, Member
Dennis Gillette, *Alternate*

City of Moorpark
Patrick Hunter, Member
Clint D. Harper, *Alternate*

City of San Buenaventura
Carl Morehouse, Member
Brian Brennan, *Alternate*

County of Ventura
Linda Parks, Member
John Flynn, *Alternate*

City of Ojai
Sue Horgan, Member
Rae Hanstad, *Alternate*

City of Santa Paula
Mary Ann Krause, Member
John Procter, *Alternate*

8. **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

- A. **Authorization for Cover Letter – Concurrence with Report Findings Regarding Five-Year Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Review Report:** Acting as the AB 939 Local Task Force, authorize the Chair to sign a letter to the California Intergrated Waste Management Board requesting an update to the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan. Assistant Manager, County Energy and Resources Department Peter Kaiser’s report dated November 10, 2005.
- B. **Report on Advancement of Programs Identified in “Taking Action Regionally” and Confirmation of Santa Barbara/Ventura Issues Subcommittee:** Receive the report “Implementation Steps for Two Strategies Promoting Jobs/Housing Balance: Local Preference Housing & Shared Work/Communications Center” and confirm continuation of Santa Barbara/Ventura Issues Board Subcommittee. Interim Executive Director Wally Bobkiewicz’s report dated October 19, 2005.
- C. **Development and Adoption of 2006 Workplan:** Receive staff report, develop and adopt 2006 Workplan. Interim Executive Director Wally Bobkiewicz’s report dated October 12, 2005.
- D. **2006 VCOG Dinner Meeting:** Consider hosting a dinner meeting in 2006 for governing bodies of VCOG member agencies and provide direction to staff. Interim Executive Director Wally Bobkiewicz’s report dated October 12, 2005.

9. **AGENCY REPORTS**

- A. Southern California Association of Governments
- B. Ventura County Transportation Commission
- C. League of California Cities
- D. Other Agencies

10. **INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT**

11. **REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Any Board Member may propose items for placement on a future agenda. Members may discuss whether or not the item should be agendized and the description of the agenda item.

12. **ADJOURNMENT TO JANUARY 12, 2006**

Copies of staff reports or other written documentation relating to each item of business referred to on this agenda are on file in the City of Santa Paula City Manager’s Office and are available for public inspection. If you have any questions regarding any agenda item, contact the Interim Executive Director at (805) 933-4200.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Interim Executive Director. Notification 48 hours before the meeting will allow VCOG to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting (28 CFR 35, 102-35.104 ADA Title II).

ITEM 7.A.

Minutes of September 8, 2005 Meeting



**VENTURA COUNCIL
OF GOVERNMENTS**

Draft MINUTES

Thursday, September 8, 2005

5:00 p.m.

City of Camarillo

Council Chambers

601 Carmen Drive, Camarillo, California 93010

1. **Call to Order:** Vice Chair Krause called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.
2. **Salute to the Flag:** Vice Chair Krause led the Salute.
3. **Roll Call:**

Member Jan McDonald	City of Camarillo
Member Ernie Villegas	City of Fillmore
Alternate Tim Flynn	City of Oxnard
Member Jon Sharkey	City of Port Hueneme
Member Carl Morehouse	City of San Buenaventura
Member Many Ann Krause	City of Santa Paula
Member Paul Miller	City of Simi Valley
Member Jacqui Irwin	City of Thousand Oaks
Member Linda Parks	County of Ventura
4. **Public Comments** (with completion of speaker card): None
5. **Board Member Comments:** Member Parks distributed registration packets for the Senior Summit being held at Cal State University Channel Islands. Member Parks noted this is a working conference with workshops designed to identify gaps in services for the growing senior population and to discuss how those gaps can be filled. Member Parks encouraged all to attend.
6. **Approval of the Final Agenda:** Alternate Flynn moved to approve the final agenda; Member Miller seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously by a voice vote.

MEMBERS

City of Camarillo
Jan McDonald, Member
Kevin Kildee, *Alternate*

City of Oxnard
Thomas Holden, Member
Tim Flynn, *Alternate*

City of Simi Valley
Paul Miller, Member
Steven Sojka, *Alternate*

City of Fillmore
Ernie Villegas, Member
Ken Smedley, *Alternate*

City of Port Hueneme
Jonathan Sharkey, Member
Murray Rosenbluth, *Alternate*

City of Thousand Oaks
Jacqui Irwin, Member
Dennis Gillette, *Alternate*

City of Moorpark
Patrick Hunter, Member
Clint D. Harper, *Alternate*

City of San Buenaventura
Carl Morehouse, Member
Brian Brennan, *Alternate*

County of Ventura
Linda Parks, Member
John Flynn, *Alternate*

City of Ojai
Sue Horgan, Member
Rae Hanstad, *Alternate*

City of Santa Paula
Mary Ann Krause, Member
John Procter, *Alternate*

7. **Consent Calendar:** Member McDonald asked why support was withdrawn on Agenda Item 7B. Interim Executive Director Bobkiewicz responded it was felt at this time it would be prudent to wait until the process moves further along and then come back with some additional information. Member Miller moved to approve Items #7A and #7B. The motion was carried by a unanimous voice vote.

A. Minutes of July 14, 2005 Meeting

B. Communication from Ventura County Agricultural Water Quality Coalition

8. **Order of Business**

8A. **VCOG Structural Options:**

Interim Executive Director Wally Bobkiewicz stated that in response to the Board's July 14th direction that options for VCOG's structure be identified, staff has developed the following five options for discussion and direction:

1. **Continue existing structure.** VCOG would retain solid waste and housing responsibilities and continue to deal with regional issues on an ad hoc basis.
2. **Merge with the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC).** This option would require State legislation to make the composition of the bodies compatible.
3. **Revitalize the existing VCOG.** Under this option, VCOG would identify other areas of regional cooperation, new and/or existing, separate from transportation.
4. **Make VCOG less formal.** An option that was considered in the 2001 study, this would make VCOG an opportunity for elected officials at the City and County levels to come together for the cooperative exchange of ideas. There would still be the roles of solid waste and housing.
5. **Some combination.** As noted in the 2001 report, regional governance is approached in different ways throughout the State. No one model seems to work better than another.

VCOG members and alternates expressed their ideas, concerns, and what options they felt would work with respect to the five options outlined by Interim Executive Director Bobkiewicz.

Member McDonald made a motion that VCOG continue forward with its existing structure, retaining solid waste and housing responsibilities, identifying specific issues and/or programs to address and promote a cooperative exchange of ideas, and continuing to operate under its Joint Powers Agreement and adopted by-laws. Further, the City/County Managers group will continue to serve as the Executive Director until March 31, 2006 at which time the Administrative Committee will make a recommendation to the Board whether to hire an Executive Director.

There was discussion as to the necessity for a formal motion and specific timeframe at this point in the process. There was further discussion as to the information members would like to receive for further evaluating the various options.

Interim Executive Director Bobkiewicz summarized the key concepts discussed by members and alternates, and recommended staff return to the November meeting with a review of what issues VCOG has been working on for prioritization of the key three or four issues that VCOG could immediately pursue. Staff would also present ideas on informal activities in which VCOG might engage. At a future meeting, staff would present information on transportation/planning regional governance models, as well as other possible responsibilities for VCOG (such as air quality management).

Member McDonald recapped what Interim Executive Director Bobkiewicz had outlined and motioned to approve the recommendation.

Vice-Chair Krause asked if anyone opposed the motion. Hearing none, the motion carried.

8B. **Discussion of Anti-Coagulant Poisons:**

Member Parks reported on the increasing mortality of wildlife, which the Parks Service has linked to the use of anti-coagulant poisons, particularly at the urban edge. She presented this issue to the Board of Supervisors and they are studying ways to avoid the use of such poisons. Member Parks encouraged cities adjacent to open space to also consider and act on the issue, and suggested VCOG consider a position to encourage efforts to curb the use of anti-coagulant poisons.

Vice-Chair Krause requested staff place the matter on the Administrative Committee agenda.

8C. **Presentation on SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan:**

Mr. Ted Harris from SCAG made a power point presentation on the Regional Comprehensive Plan Update, the purpose of which is to guide and coordinate regional planning activities. Mr. Harris encouraged members to become involved in the process and referred them to the SCAG website for additional information.

8D. **CIWMP Update:**

Peter Kaiser, Manager of the County's Environmental and Energy Resources Division, did a brief presentation and introduced David Goldstein, the project lead on the CIWMP Update process. Mr. Kaiser explained that, upon receiving input on local conditions, the California Integrated Waste Management Board staff recommended that Ventura County conduct a plan update rather than pursuing the more involved CIWMP Amendment process. As a result, County staff will recommend at the November VCOG meeting a letter from the VCOG Chair authorizing submittal of the Countywide CIWMP Update.

8E. **Designing Road Crossings for Safe Wildlife Passage:**

Nancy Settle with the Ventura County Planning Division reported the County recently concluded a study of the impact of the countywide major road network on wildlife areas and passageways. The study was funded by a grant received from the Southern California Association of Governments. Elizabeth Chattin discussed the study's findings, including wildlife mortality and movement affected by the roadway system within the County, and recommended measures that could be employed to alleviate the impacts of the roadway system on wildlife movement and safety.

As next steps, additional funding will be sought from SCAG to continue this project and discussions will be held with Caltrans and other agencies to discuss what types of mitigation measures are acceptable to them, so that appropriate guidelines may be implemented.

9. **Agency Reports**

A. **Southern California Association of Governments:** None

B. **Ventura County Transportation Commission:**

City Manager Mike Sedell noted that in October VCTC anticipates having an agenda item to discuss consolidation of VCTC and VCOG.

- C. **League of California Cities:** None
- D. **Other Agencies:** None

10. **Interim Executive Director Report**

Interim Executive Director Bobkiewicz distributed a sheet for Administrative Committee meeting dates. He noted the City of Simi Valley will be providing administrative assistance to VCOG, and introduced Elizabeth Amador from the City of Santa Paula, who will also provide administrative support.

11. **Request for Future Agenda Items:**

Direction given earlier

12. **The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m. to November 3, 2005.**

ITEM 8.A.

Authorization for Cover Letter – Concurrence
with Report Findings Regarding Five Year
Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan
Review Report



November 10, 2005

TO: Ventura Council of Governments Board of Directors

FROM: Peter Kaiser, County of Ventura Environmental & Energy Resources Division

SUBJECT: Authorization for Cover Letter--Concurrence with Report Findings Regarding Five-Year Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Review Report

RECOMMENDATION:

Acting as the AB939 Local Task Force, authorize the chair of the Ventura Council of Governments (VCOG) to provide the attached cover letter to the Environmental & Energy Resources Division (EERD), concurring with the unanimous consensus of staff of all 11 jurisdictions in Ventura County regarding the Five-Year Review Report on the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP).

DISCUSSION:

In a presentation to the VCOG on September 8, 2005, the EERD updated VCOG members on the status of and plans for the five-year review of Ventura County's Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP). This five-year review is mandated by Public Resources Code Section 41770 and 41822 and Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations Section 18788.

At that meeting, EERD staff described the review and analysis conducted by staffs of all eleven jurisdictions in Ventura County. EERD staff explained why it was the consensus of city and County staff that the EERD follow the "update" process rather than the "amendment" process for the CIWMP Five-Year Review Report. Specifically, city and county staff unanimously determined that, rather than revising the Summary Plan, Siting Element, or any jurisdiction-specific documents that comprise the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP), each jurisdiction would continue to use its Annual Reporting process as "updates" to these documents. This was in concurrence with a recommendation made by staff of the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB).

Over the past three months, concluding on October 15, 2005, City and CIWMB staff provided updated data to EERD for use in the attached report reviewing the CIWMP. The report is now complete. Within 45 days after approval by the VCOG, the EERD will submit the CIWMP Five-Year Review Report to the CIWMB. A copy of the report will also be provided to the VCOG.

If you have any questions regarding this item, please contact Peter Kaiser, at (805) 289-3107.

Attachments: CIWMP Five-Year Review Report
Cover Letter for Signature by VCOG Chair

VENTURA COUNTY

**COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE
MANAGEMENT PLAN (CIWMP)**

FIVE YEAR REVIEW REPORT

November 3, 2005

**Prepared by the
Environmental & Energy Resources Division
Waste & Sanitation Services Department
Ventura County Public Works Agency**

**in partnership with the cities of
Camarillo, Fillmore, Moorpark, Ojai, Oxnard, Port Hueneme, San
Buenaventura, Santa Paula, Simi Valley, and Thousand Oaks**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Description	Page
1.0	COUNTY OR REGIONAL AGENCY INFORMATION	3
2.0	BACKGROUND	6
3.0	LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW	7
4.0	TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE of REGULATIONS SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H) ISSUES	8
4.1	Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency	
4.2	Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County or Regional Agency; and Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Quantities of Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency	
4.3	Changes in Funding Source for Administration of the Siting Element and Summary Plan	
4.4	Changes in Administrative Responsibilities	
4.5	Programs that were Scheduled to be Implemented but were not	
4.6	Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials	
4.7	Changes in the Implementation Schedule	
5.0	ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW	22
6.0	OTHER ISSUES	22
7.0	SUMMARY of FINDINGS	23
8.0	REVISION SCHEDULE	23
9.0	SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	23

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill 989) required cities and counties in California to reduce the amount of solid waste transformed and/or disposed in landfills by 25% by 1995; and by 50% by the year 2000. Local governments were also required to effect the reduction in solid waste disposal through a hierarchy of integrated waste management practices defined in Public Resources Code Section (PRC) 40051. The hierarchy stated in PRC 40051 is:

1. Source reduction
2. Recycling and composting;
3. Environmentally safe transformation and land disposal.

Pursuant to AB 939, counties were required to prepare and submit to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) which includes three jurisdiction specific elements and two countywide elements. These are the Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE), the Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE), and the Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE); and two, countywide elements (i.e. the Countywide Siting Element (CSE) and the Summary Plan (SP).

The SRREs, HHWEs and NDFEs for all eleven jurisdictions in Ventura County were originally submitted to and approved by the CIWMB in 1995 and 1996. Final Drafts of the CSE and SP were originally prepared and submitted by EERD, then known as the Solid Waste Management Department (SWMD), to the CIWMB for their review and approval in November 1995. However, ongoing CIWMB-County disputes regarding the appropriate level of environmental review for the CSE and SP countywide elements precluded final CIWMB approval of those last two documents until June of 2001.

Public Resources Code Section 41770 and CIWMB implementing regulations (i.e. Section 18788 of Title 14 CCR) require that the CIWMP be reviewed, updated, and if necessary, revised and then submitted to the State every five years, beginning with the first five years after the CIWMB deemed our local CIWMP complete (i.e. June 19-20, 2001 CIWMB Meeting in Sacramento).

Specifically, Section 18788 of Title 14 CCR states that prior to the fifth anniversary of CIWMB approval of the CIWMP, the AB 939 Local Task Force shall complete its review of the CIWMP to assure that the integrated waste management plans, programs and practices in place by each of eleven general purpose governments in Ventura County remain consistent with the hierarchy of integrated waste management practices defined in PRC Section 40051.

The County of Ventura (specifically the Environmental & Energy Resources Division (EERD), Water and Sanitation Department, Public Works Agency) has the lead role in coordinating the 5-Year CIWMP Review Process involving all eleven jurisdictions. Regional coordination of EERD's work tasks occurs in consultation with VCOG, acting as the AB 939 Local Task Force (LTF). EERD must complete the following specific work tasks in order to assure compliance with the schedule required to submit a 5 Year CIWMP Review Report to the CIWMB *by no later than June of 2006*.

Five-Year CIWMP Plan Review Report Work Schedule

1. Environmental & Energy Resources Division (EERD) presentation to Ventura Council of Governments (VCOG) regarding the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) Five-Year Review Process (*presentation delivered during the July 14, 2005 VCOG Board meeting*).
2. Meeting with representatives from the California Integrate Waste Management Board (CIWMB) and city integrated waste management staff to review and discuss the CIWMP Five-Year Review process and Discussion Draft of the Five Year Review Report Template (*July 27, 2005 at the Del Norte Regional Recycling Center*).
3. County staff consults with staff of the ten cities regarding the adequacy of their SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE documents as well as the countywide Summary Plan (SP) and Siting Element (SE). Incorporation of their comments into the Five-Year Review Report, using the CIWMB Template. (*July 27 through September 8, 2005*)
4. Presentation to VCOG on the results of the review by city staff. Update to VCOG on the unanimous recommendation of city staffs, County staff, and State staff that we follow the “update” rather than the “amendment” process. Presentation of plan for conclusion of that process at the November 3, 2005 meeting of VCOG. (*September 8, 2005 VCOG Board meeting*).
5. City integrated waste management staff review Completed Draft of the Five-Year Review Report (*September 16, 2005 to October 16, 2005*).
6. VCOG AB 939 LTF Action to review city staff responses and evaluate the adequacy of CIWMP documents (each jurisdiction’s SRRE, HHWE and NDFE as well as the CSE and SP and Environmental Justice issues). VCOG determines whether the VCOG Chair may authorize submittal of the Five-Year Review Report, relying on the update rather than the amendment process for any changes to the above documents. (*November10, 2005 VCOG meeting*).
7. If VCOG authorizes submittal of Five-Year Review Report and agrees on an “update” rather than “amendment” process, EERD submits the CIWMP Five-Year Review Report to CIWMB with letter from VCOG Chairperson (*No later than end of June 2006*)

Five-Year CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report Template

Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 41770 and 41822, and Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 require that each countywide integrated waste management plan (CIWMP), and the elements thereof, be reviewed, revised, if necessary, and submitted to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) every five years. This Five-CIWMP Review Report template was developed by the CIWMB in an effort to provide a cost-effective method to streamline the Five-CIWMP review and reporting process. The purpose of this Five-CIWMP Review Report template is to document compliance with these regulatory review and reporting requirements and to request Board approval of the Five-CIWMP Review Report findings.

After reviewing and considering the Local Task Force (LTF) comments submitted to the county or regional agency and the Board on areas of the CIWMP that need revision, if any, the county may use this template for its Five-CIWMP Review Report. The Five-Year County or Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Review Report Guidelines describe each section of this template and provide general guidelines with respect to preparing the report. Completed and signed reports should be submitted to the Office of Local Assistance (OLA) at the address below:

California Integrated Waste Management Board
Office of Local Assistance, MS-25
P. O. Box 4025
Sacramento, CA 95812-4025

OLA staff may request additional information from the county's jurisdictions if the details provided in this form are not clear or are not complete. Within 90 days of receiving a *complete* Five-CIWMP Review Report, OLA staff will review the request and prepare an agenda item with their findings for Board consideration.

General Instructions

Please complete Sections 1 through 9, and then all other applicable subsections.

SECTION 1.0 COUNTY OR REGIONAL AGENCY INFORMATION			
I certify that the information in this document is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and that I am authorized to complete this report and request approval of the CIWMP or RAIWMP Five-Review Report on behalf of County of Ventura			
County or Regional Agency Name County of Ventura		County Ventura	
Authorized Signature		Title: Director Water & Sanitation Dept.	
Type/Print Name of Person Signing R. Reddy Pakala, P.E.	Date	Phone (805) 289-3105	
Person Completing This Form (please print or type) Peter Kaiser, M. URP	Title Assistant Mgr., EERD	Phone (805) 289-3107	
Mailing Address 1000 Hill Road, Ste, 100	City Ventura	State CA	Zip 93003
E-mail Address peter.kaiser@ventura.org			

SECTION 2.0 BACKGROUND

This is the first Five-Year Review Report for Ventura County’s eleven general purpose government jurisdictions since the approval of the Ventura Countywide CIWMP by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), which occurred during their June 19-20, 2001 meeting in Sacramento.

The eleven general purpose government jurisdictions in Ventura County include the cities of Camarillo, Fillmore, Moorpark, Port Hueneme, Ojai, Oxnard, San Buenaventura, Santa Paula, Simi Valley and Thousand Oaks, and the County of Ventura for the unincorporated areas.

☒ *The following four jurisdictions in Ventura County obtained a CIWMB approved time extension in order to demonstrate compliance with 50% diversion requirements found in AB 939. The details are provided in the table below.*

Jurisdiction	Type of Alternative Diversion Requirement	Diversion Requirement (%)	Goal Compliance Extension Date
Fillmore	Board Approved Time Extension	50	12/2005
Ojai	Board Approved Time Extension	50	12/2005
Port Hueneme	Board Approved Time Extension	50	12/2004
Santa Paula	Board Approved Time Extension	50	12/2005

Sources CIWMB Jurisdiction Diversion Rate Summary webpage:
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/DRMCMMain.asp?VW=In>

Additional Information (e.g., recent regional agency formation, newly incorporated city, etc.)
 No changes since adoption of CIWMP.

SECTION 3.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

1. The Local Task Force (LTF) includes the following members:

Name	Representative Of (e.g., City or County)
Jan McDonald	City of Camarillo
Ernie Villegas	City of Fillmore
Patrick Hunter	City of Moorpark
Sue Horgan	City of Ojai
Thomas Holden	City of Oxnard
Jon Sharkey	City of Port Hueneme
Carl Morehouse	City of San Buenaventura
Mary Ann Krause	City of Santa Paula
Paul Miller	City of Simi Valley
Jacqui Irwin	City of Thousand Oaks
Linda Parks	County of Ventura

2. In accordance with Title 14 CCR, Section 18788, the LTF reviewed each element and plan included in the CIWMP or RAIWMP and finalized its comments:

- LTF Final Comments at the November 3, 2005 LTF meeting.
 Other (Explain): _____

3. The county received the written comments from the LTF on November 3, 2005, beginning the 45-day period for submitting the Five-CIWMP/RAIWMP Review Report to the Board and the LTF.

4. A copy of the LTF comments:

- is included as a cover letter to this report.
 is included as Appendix _____ .
 was submitted to the Board on _____ .

In summary, the LTF comments conclude that the solid waste relevant planning documents do not require revision at this time, and that each jurisdiction's Annual Report to the CIWMB may serve as an update to those planning documents.

**SECTION 4.0: TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE of REGULATIONS
SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H)**

The subsections below address not only the areas of change specified in the regulations, but also provide specific analysis regarding the continued adequacy of the planning documents in light of those changes, including a determination as to whether each necessitates a revision to one or more of the planning documents.

Section 4.1 Changes in Demographics in the County or Regional Agency

The following tables document the demographic changes in Ventura County since 1990. The analysis addresses the adequacy of the planning documents in light of these changes and the need, if any, for revision.

- ☒ *The residential/non-residential generation percentages have changed significantly since the preparation of the original planning documents. The following table documents the new percentages and the data source (i.e., corresponding Board-approved new generation study).*

Table 1. Sources of Generation

JURISDICTION	RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE		NON-RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE	
	OLD	NEW	OLD	NEW
City of Camarillo	37	25	63	75
City of Fillmore	46	49	54	51
City of Moorpark	40	38	60	62
City of Ojai	47	25	53	75
City of Oxnard	32	37	68	63
City of Port Hueneme	27	31	73	69
City of San Buenaventura	36	43	64	57
City of Santa Paula	33	26	67	74
City of Simi Valley	43	No NBY%	57	No NBY%
City of Thousand Oaks	44	No NBY%	56	No NBY%
Unincorporated Area	60	34	40	66

Data Sources The OLD percentage numbers reflect 1990 Solid Waste Generation Study (SWGS) estimate found in each jurisdiction’s CIWMB adopted Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE). The NEW percentage numbers reflect more recent Board-approved new base years [NBY], generation-based studies [GBS], alternate diversion requirement (ADR) and/or SB 1066 Time Extensions [TE]. The applicable date that each jurisdiction’s selected NBY or GBS that was approved by the CIWMB is found below in [in parentheses] for each of the above jurisdictions, except for the Unincorporated Area, which has not been updated): *Camarillo*: March 18-19, 2003 (2000 NBY); *Fillmore*: January 14-15, 2003, (TE); *Moorpark*: February 11, 2003 (2000 NBY); *Ojai*: February 11, 2003 (2000 GBS); *Oxnard*: February 23-24, 2000 (1998 NBY); *Port Hueneme*: February 11, 2003 (TE); *San Buenaventura*: February 23-24, 2000 (1998 NBY); *Santa Paula*: March 18-19, 2003 (2000 ADR & TE); *Simi Valley*: (1990 SWGS %’s Not Updated); *Thousand Oaks*: May 29, 1997 (1990 SWGS %’s Not Updated); and *Ventura Unincorporated Area (UA)*: December 10-11, 2002 (2000 NBY). The above Time Extension residential percentages were based upon New Base Year or Generation Studies. The City of Simi Valley provided data in the above table for their city 8/05, based on hauler reports.

Table 2. Demographics*

POPULATION ⁽¹⁾			
Population For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2003	% Change
City of Camarillo Population	52,297	60,720	16.10%
City of Fillmore Population	11,992	14,736	22.88%
City of Moorpark Population	25,494	34,643	35.88%
City of Ojai Population	7,613	8,016	5.29%
City of Oxnard Population	142,560	182,352	27.91%
City of Port Hueneme Population	20,322	21,864	7.58%
City of San Buenaventura Population	92,557	104,593	13.00%
City of Santa Paula Population	25,062	29,056	15.93%
City of Simi Valley Population	100,218	118,055	17.61%
City of Thousand Oaks Population	104,381	124,387	19.16%
Unincorporated County Population	86,520	95,451	10.63%
Countywide Population	699,016	793,873	13.57%

EMPLOYMENT ⁽²⁾			
Labor Force Employment Factor For Each Jurisdiction	1990	2003	% Change
City of Camarillo Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
City of Fillmore Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
City of Moorpark Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
City of Ojai Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
City of Oxnard Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
City of Port Hueneme Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
City of San Buenaventura Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
City of Santa Paula Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
City of Simi Valley Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
City of Thousand Oaks Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
Unincorporated County Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%
Countywide Employment	349,300	407,700	16.7%

Note: A single number is used for each jurisdiction because the CIWMB uses a Countywide figure for its adjustment factor.

TAXABLE SALES TRANSACTIONS ⁽³⁾

Taxable Sales Factor For Each Jurisdiction	1990 (x \$1,000)	2003 (x \$1,000)	% Change
City of Camarillo Taxable Sales	327,114	876,719	168.01%
City of Fillmore Taxable Sales	47,392	85,218	79.81%
City of Moorpark Taxable Sales	76,381	190,622	149.58%
City of Ojai Taxable Sales	69,984	89,176	27.42%
City of Oxnard Taxable Sales ⁽⁵⁾	1,075,668	1,996,700	85.62%
City of Port Hueneme Taxable Sales	64,021	68,250	6.60%
City of San Buenaventura Taxable Sales	1,285,466	1,798,072	39.87%
City of Santa Paula Taxable Sales	108,979	155,046	42.27%
City of Simi Valley Taxable Sales	623,675	1,251,864	100.72%
City of Thousand Oaks Taxable Sales	1,082,249	2,439,880	125.44%
Unincorporated County Taxable Sales	340,306	403,115	18.46%
Countywide Taxable Sales Transactions	5,101,235	9,397,180	84.21%

Consumer Price Index ⁽⁴⁾

Statewide Consumer Price Index	1990	2003	% Change
	135.0	190.4	48.75%

*Data Sources: California Integrated Waste Management Board's Default Adjustment Factors
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp>

Footnotes:

- (1) Department of Finance E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and State, (1990 through 2003)
- (2) California Labor Department, Labor Market Information Division – Ventura Countywide Labor Force Numbers (1990 through 2003)
- (3) California State Board of Equalization (BofE), Research and Statistics Division (1990 through 2003)
- (4) California Department of Industrial Relations – Division of Labor Statistics (1990 through 2003)
- (5) City of Oxnard figures are from Economic Development Corporation of Oxnard and are provided at the request of the City of Oxnard.

Table 3. Dwelling Information ⁽¹⁾

Jurisdiction	1990 Single Family Dwellings	2003 Single Family Dwellings	% Change	1990 Multi-Family Dwellings	2003 Multi-Family Dwellings	% Change	1990 Mobile Homes	2003 Mobile Homes	% Change
City of Camarillo	14,815	18,194	22.8%	2,873	3,750	30.5%	1,042	1,058	1.5%
City of Fillmore	2,620	3,231	23.3%	505	554	9.7%	323	326	0.1%
City of Moorpark	6,719	8,341	24.1%	899	1,222	35.9%	297	332	11.8%
City of Ojai	2,429	2,501	3.0%	694	741	6.8%	7	8	14.3%
City of Oxnard	25,441	31,177	22.5%	13,017	13,634	4.7%	2,898	2,940	1.4%
City of Port Hueneme	4,325	4,556	5.3%	3,112	3,372	8.3%	44	41	-6.9%
City of San Buenaventura	23,652	26,412	11.7%	11,539	11,704	1.4%	2,148	2,623	22.1%
City of Santa Paula	5,458	5,726	10.9%	1,780	1,850	3.9%	824	787	-4.4%
City of Simi Valley	27,180	32,022	17.8%	5,033	6,092	2.1%	899	892	-0.7%
City of Thousand Oaks	29,588	35,578	16.8%	7,094	8,456	19.1%	1,090	1,090	0%
Unincorporated Area	25,185	28,378	12.7%	2,239	2,177	-0.3%	2,629	2,152	-18.1%
Total County	167,412	196,116	17.1%	48,865	51,375	5.1%	12,201	12,231	0.2%

Source: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/E-5text.htm> CA Demographic Research Unit. The figure for mobile homes in 2003 in Thousand Oaks was altered at the request of city staff from 1,072, which would have represented a 1.6% decline.

Footnotes:

(1) Department of Finance E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties and State, (1990 through 2003)

Analysis

These demographic changes do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided below.

The increases in population and housing documented in Tables 2 and 3 above naturally resulted in the generation of additional solid waste in Ventura County during the 1990 through 2003 reporting period. Source reduction, reuse, and recycling programs identified in each jurisdiction's SRRE have, with few exceptions, been able to expand to meet this growth in population and housing. Disposal facilities serving Ventura County's eleven jurisdictions have adequate capacity to accommodate waste materials destined for landfill disposal.

Section 4.2 Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County or Regional Agency; and Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency

1. *Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County or Regional Agency (as it relates to diversion program implementation)*

The data below document changes in reported disposal compared to original SRRE projections. Additionally, the Biennial Review findings for each jurisdiction are provided in Table 6 below to demonstrate progress in implementing the SRRE and achieving diversion mandates. The analysis at the end of this section describes how these changes are being addressed (e.g., how existing, new or planned programs deal with the reported changes in the quantities of waste) relative to the jurisdictions’ ability to meet and maintain the diversion goal and the lack of a need for a revision to planning documents.

Table 4. Disposal Totals (Tons)

The following table provides disposal data for the ten cities and the unincorporated area of Ventura County contained in 1990 Solid Waste Generation Study and each jurisdiction’s AB 939 Annual Reports to the CIWMB covering the 1995 through 2002 reporting period. It is important to note that the disposal tons reported in the table below reflect the DRS numbers reported to the County and the CIWMB. For purposes of determining compliance with the AB 939 diversion requirements, disposal numbers for each jurisdiction are not considered final until the CIWMB adopts the biennial reports for that jurisdiction.

Year	1990	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
City of Camarillo	75,473	63,019	62,304	58,261	68,142	71,589	79,483	69,148	74,562
City of Fillmore	10,345	9,092	7,648	8,712	11,441	8,236	9,672	8,512	10,373
City of Moorpark	28,134	26,804	24,041	24,266	29,966	28,149	31,989	33,689	31,771
City of Ojai	11,250	10,126	11,872	12,485	13,711	12,849	11,623	12,632	12,518
City of Oxnard	170,276	189,295	177,358	199,071	206,854	196,229	222,814	236,712	227,874
City of Port Hueneme	25,116	22,970	17,075	20,704	21,573	31,346	23,097	19,684	24,280
City of San Buenaventura	139,028	113,885	108,946	96,955	130,014	138,329	123,846	130,857	142,275
City of Santa Paula	27,390	21,294	13,610	15,376	29,292	29,415	34,961	33,439	31,548
City of Simi Valley	172,270	116,156	105,859	109,112	123,086	131,328	125,650	130,027	136,145
City of Thousand Oaks	191,176	115,477	114,321	109,417	111,959	93,306	99,656	102,513	121,886
Uninc. County	100,586	105,445	129,976	128,767	110,152	122,963	129,768	123,180	109,243
Countywide Total	951,044	793,563	773,010	783,126	856,190	863,829	892,589	900,393	922,475

Sources (e.g., the Board’s *Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility* <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/JurDspFa.asp>, *Single-year Countywide Origin Detail* at <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/Origin/WFOrgin.asp>):

Table 5. Comparison of SRRE 2000 Projected Disposal Tonnage vs. 2000 Disposal Totals

The following table is a comparison of the SRRE-projected disposal tonnage to the 2000 disposal tonnage reported for each jurisdiction by haulers, MRF's and landfills through the State-mandated Disposal Reporting System (DRS).

Jurisdiction	SRRE 2000 Projected	Disposal 2000 Reported	% Difference
City of Camarillo	55,932	79,483	42%
City of Fillmore	7,335	9,672	32%
City of Moorpark	22,100	31,989	45%
City of Ojai	7,540	11,623	54%
City of Oxnard	143,908	222,814	55%
City of Port Hueneme	17,445	23,097	32%
City of San Buenaventura	109,350	123,846	13%
City of Santa Paula	31,484	34,961	11%
City of Simi Valley	121,000	125,650	4%
City of Thousand Oaks	130,000	99,656	-23%
Unincorporated County	65,500	129,768	98%
Countywide Total	711,594	892,559	25%

Sources (e.g., the Board's *Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility* at <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/JurDspFa.asp>, *Single-year Countywide Origin Detail* at <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/Origin/WFOrgin.asp>):

Table 5 above compares the amount of disposal tons projected for the year 2000 in each jurisdiction's SRRE that was required to attain 50% diversion with the actual disposal tons reported that year originating from each jurisdiction through the State-mandated DRS. Positive percentage differences indicate that the SRRE year 2000 disposal ton projections were significantly less than actual disposal tons reported that year. Positive percentage differences ranged from a low of 4% for the City of Simi Valley to a high of 98% for the Unincorporated Area. Negative percentage differences indicate that the jurisdiction's year 2000 disposal ton projections were higher than actual year 2000 disposal tonnages reported for that jurisdiction through the DRS. The City of Thousand Oaks was the only such jurisdiction in Ventura County.

Diversion

The Biennial Review findings for the County of Ventura and associated cities are listed in Table 6 to demonstrate each jurisdiction’s progress in implementing its SRRE and achieving the mandated diversion requirements. Additionally, following these data is an explanation of any significant changes in diversion rate trends (e.g., report year tonnage modification, new or corrected Solid Waste Generation Study, newly implemented programs).

Table 6. Biennial Review Data for Ventura County Jurisdictions (1995 to 2002)

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
City of Camarillo	1995	31%	Board Approved
	1996	34%	Board Approved
	1997	41%	Board Accepted
	1998	35%	Board Accepted
	1999	N/A	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2000	48%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2001	55%	Board Approved
	2002	52%	Board Approved
City of Fillmore	1995	30%	Board Approved
	1996	33%	Board Approved
	1997	N/A	Board Accepted
	1998	N/A	Board Accepted
	1999	34%	Board Approved
	2000	26%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	N/A	Board Approved Time Extension Biennial Review Delayed
	2002	N/A	Board Approved Time Extension Biennial Review Delayed
	2003	31%	Board Approved Time Extension with New Base Year

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
City of Moorpark	1995	25%	Board Approved
	1996	36%	Board Approved
	1997	37%	Board Accepted
	1998	20%	Board Accepted
	1999	N/A	Board Approved
	2000	51%	Board Approved with New Base Year
	2001	49%	Board Approved
	2002	52%	Board Approved
City of Ojai	1995	40%	Board Approved
	1996	44%	Board Approved
	1997	39%	Board Accepted
	1998	43%	Board Accepted
	1999	35%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2000	47%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2001	43%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2002	44%	Board Approved Time Extension

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
City of Oxnard	1995	25%	Board Approved
	1996	31%	Board Approved
	1997	24%	Board Accepted
	1998	66%	Board Accepted
	1999	70%	Board Approved
	2000	67%	Board Approved
	2001	66%	Board Approved
	2002	67%	Board Approved
City of Port Hueneme	1995	28%	Board Approved
	1996	39%	Board Approved
	1997	38%	Board Accepted
	1998	37%	Board Accepted
	1999	19%	Board Approved
	2000	39%	Board Approved Time Extension
	2001	N/A %	Board Approved Time Extension Biennial Review Delayed
	2002	N/A %	Board Approved Time Extension Biennial Review Delayed

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
City of San Buenaventura	1995	32%	Board Approved
	1996	41%	Board Approved
	1997	43%	Board Accepted
	1998	59%	Board Accepted
	1999	58%	Board Approved
	2000	65%	Board Approved
	2001	63%	Board Approved
	2002	60%	Board Approved
	City of Santa Paula	1995	31%
1996		25%	Board Approved
1997		34%	Board Accepted
1998		19%	Board Accepted
1999		23%	Board Approved
2000		30%	Board Approved Alternate Diversion Requirement
2001		N/A	Board Approved Alternate Diversion Requirement – Biennial Review Delayed
2002		N/A	Board Approved Alternate Diversion Requirement – Biennial Review Delayed

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
	1995	44%	Board Approved
	1996	49%	Board Approved
	1997	50%	Board Accepted
City of Simi Valley	1998	45%	Board Accepted
	1999	44%	Board Approved
	2000	50%	Board Approved
	2001	50%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	2002	48%	Board Approved Good Faith Effort
	1995	52%	Board Approved
	1996	53%	Board Approved
	1997	57%	Board Accepted
City of Thousand Oaks	1998	58%	Board Approved
	1999	66%	Board Approved
	2000	66%	Board Approved
	2001	65%	Board Approved
	2002	59%	Board Approved

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
	1995	32%	Board Approved
	1996	34%	Board Approved
	1997	45%	Board Accepted
Unincorporated Area	1998	34%	Board Approved
	1999	N/A	Board Approved
	2000	54%	Board Approved with New Base Year
	2001	58%	Board Approved
	2002	58%	Board Approved

Sources (e.g., the Board's *Countywide, Regionwide, and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report*
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/jurdrsta.asp>)

Explanation of Disposal and Diversion Rate Trends (if applicable)

(None as of 7/27/05, pending review and comment by integrated waste management staff of the cities and county, and/or VCOG, acting as the AB 939 LTF)

- These changes in quantities of waste, as they relate the meeting and maintaining the mandated diversion goals, do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided in the analysis section below.
- These changes in quantities of waste, as they relate the meeting and maintaining the mandated diversion goals, warrant a revision to one or more of the countywide planning documents. Specifically, .

2. Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Quantities of Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency

The following addresses whether changes in permitted disposal capacity and waste quantities (both imported from out of county and generated in the county) affect the county's ability to maintain 15 years of disposal capacity and includes a determination regarding the need for planning document revision.

- The county or regional agency (if it includes the entire county) continues to have adequate disposal capacity (i.e., greater than 15 years). Analysis is provided below .*

Section 4.3 Changes in Funding Source for Administration of the Countywide Siting Element (SE) and Summary Plan (SP)

Funding for development and administration of the Countywide Siting Element (CSE) and the Summary Plan (SP) comes from a Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) Fee. This fee is currently \$0.05 per ton. These funds may be augmented by contributions from the County's General Fund if costs exceed revenues. There have been no changes in the funding source for the administration of the CSE and SP.

Section 4.4 Changes in Administrative Responsibilities

The County of Ventura is statutorily responsible for developing and administering the Countywide Siting Element (CSE) and the Summary Plan (SP). Fulfillment of this statutory responsibility rests with the Environmental and Energy Resources Division (EERD), Water and Sanitation Department, Public Works Agency, County of Ventura. This does not represent a change since the June 2001 adoption of the CIWMP.

Section 4.5 Programs that Were Scheduled to Be Implemented But Were Not

Programs that were dropped have been described in updated annual reports and do not constitute significant enough changes to trigger thresholds for new documents. If additional programs were required, they were included in SB 1066 time extension processes.

1. Progress of Program Implementation

a. Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE)

All program implementation information has been updated in the Board's Planning and Reporting Information System (PARIS), including the reason for not implementing specific programs, if applicable. Additionally, the analysis below addresses the progress of the programs that have been implemented.

b. Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE)

No jurisdiction requires changes to their NDFE at this time. The major non-disposal facilities in use at this time are Del Norte Regional Recycling and Transfer Station and Gold Coast Recycling and Transfer. These were also the major non-disposal facilities in use as of June 2001, when the initial CIWMP was adopted. There have been some changes in other facilities since 2001; however, these have not required modification of NDFEs. For example, California Wood Recycling moved from a facility in the south of Ventura to a facility to the east of Ventura, and various haulers have adapted to market conditions by changing the destinations of one or more of the recyclables they haul. Some items, such as curbside recyclables from the eastern portion of the county, are often processed at out-of-County facilities (such as Burbank Recycling) rather than at in-County facilities, but such changes did not require an amended NDFE in order to proceed and do not require one at this time. The County and other jurisdictions anticipate the potential for future changes to NDFEs as new facilities are developed. When it becomes necessary and appropriate, any jurisdiction may amend its own NDFE independently of the Five-Year review process for the CIWMP.

c. Countywide Siting Element (SE)

The staffs of all eleven jurisdictions in Ventura County have determined that it is not necessary or advisable at this time to update the Countywide Siting Element (CSE). Due to the expansion of the Simi Valley Landfill in November 2002, Landfill Disposal Capacity projections within Ventura County remain adequate (in excess of 15 years). In a July 2005 Material Receipt Questionnaire, Simi Valley Landfill and Recycling Center reported that they are permitted to operate until 2022. Additionally, they report that, at present loadings, they have 20 years of remaining disposal capacity. A comparable form from VRSD for Toland also shows sufficient capacity. In their July 2005 Monthly Waste Receipt Questionnaire (in compliance with SWFP conditions 16a & 17, with adjustments made each May), they reported that they have an expected site life of 22 years.

d. Summary Plan

The staffs of all eleven jurisdictions in Ventura County have determined that it is not necessary or advisable at this time to update the Summary Plan (SP) Element of the CIWMP. Two jurisdictions have made suggestions for changes to the SP in the event that it is updated at some point in the future. However, these suggestions for changes are non-substantive (updating demographic information, contact names, phone numbers, and related matters). None of the jurisdictions' staffs suggest doing this as part of the five-year revision of the CIWMP adopted in June of 2001.

2. Statement regarding whether Programs are Meeting their Goals

- The programs are meeting their goals.
- The programs are not meeting their goals. The discussion that follows in the analysis section below addresses the contingency measures that are being enacted to ensure compliance with PRC Section 41751 (i.e., what specific steps are being taken by local agencies, acting independently and in concert, to achieve the purposes of the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989) and whether the listed changes in program implementation necessitate a revision of one or more of the planning documents.

Analysis

Although not all jurisdictions have met and retained their AB 939 mandated levels of diversion, the programs that they have implemented are meeting the goals of bringing their jurisdictions toward this mandate. Increased and improved implementation of these programs is expected to help all jurisdictions meet and maintain 50% diversion rates. Some jurisdictions were granted SB 1066 time extensions, but none obtained from the CIWMB an alternative diversion requirement.

- The aforementioned changes in program implementation do not warrant a revision to any of the planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided below.
- Changes in program implementation warrant a revision to one or more of the planning documents. Specifically, .

Section 4.6 Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials

Markets for recyclable materials have generally improved since adoption of the CIWMP and do not affect the adequacy of the CIWMP to the extent that they would require revisions to planning documents.

Section 4.7 Changes in the Implementation Schedule

Implementation schedules have not changed in such a way that they affect the adequacy of the CIWMP and require revisions to planning documents.

SECTION 5.0 OTHER ISSUES

No other significant issues in the county affect the adequacy of the CIWMP in such a way that would require a revision.

SECTION 6.0 ANNUAL REPORT REVIEW

- The Annual Reports for each jurisdiction in Ventura County have been reviewed, specifically those sections that address the adequacy of the CIWMP elements. No jurisdiction reported the need to revise one or more of these planning documents.
- The Annual Reports for each jurisdiction in the have been reviewed, specifically those sections that address the adequacy of the CIWMP or RAIWMP elements. The following jurisdictions reported the need to revise one or more of these planning documents, as listed:

The discussion below addresses Ventura County's evaluation of the Annual Report data relating to planning document adequacy and includes determination regarding the need to revise one or more of these documents.

SECTION 7.0 SUMMARY of FINDINGS by THE COUNTY OF VENTURA

Annual Reports have provided all necessary updates, and the unanimous consensus of the staffs of all jurisdictions is that amendments or changes are not necessary as part of this five-year review process.

SECTION 8.0 REVISION SCHEDULE (if any)

Due to unanimous consensus, there is no need to schedule a revision at this time. However, four jurisdictions (Camarillo, Moorpark, Ventura, and the unincorporated areas) are studying the potential for future revisions to Non-Disposal Facility Elements, and two jurisdictions (Moorpark and Camarillo) have requested that minor non-substantive updates be made to the Summary Plan in the event that it is revised at some point in the future. These potential changes may be scheduled in the future, but they will not occur as part of this five-year review process.

SECTION 9.0 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION (if any)

n/a



VENTURA COUNCIL
OF GOVERNMENTS

Ventura Council of Governments

c/o City of Santa Paula
P.O. Box 569
Santa Paula, CA 93061
805-525-4478

November 10, 2005

Tara Gautier, Local Government Liaison
Office of Local Assistance
California Integrated Waste Management Board
PO Box 4025
Sacramento, CA 95812-4025

Subject: VCOG Approval of Attached Five-Year Review Report

Dear Ms. Gautier:

The Ventura Council of Governments (VCOG), which serves as the Ventura County AB 939 Local Task Force, has authorized that this cover letter be submitted by its chairperson with the attached Five-Year Review of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP).

VCOG members, having received a staff report regarding the unanimous consensus of city and County staff that Ventura County should follow the “update” process rather than the “amendment” process for the CIWMP, approve of the attached Five-Year Review Report. None of the Countywide or jurisdiction-specific documents of the CIWMP require revision at this time, so instead each jurisdiction will continue to use its Annual Reporting process as “updates” to these documents. This is in accordance with Title 14, CCR Sections 18794.3 and 18794.4.

Sincerely,

Patrick Hunter
Chair, Ventura Council of Governments

ITEM 8.B.

Report on Advancement of Programs Identified
in “Taking Action Regionally” and Confirmation
of Santa Barbara/Ventura Issues Subcommittee



**VENTURA COUNCIL
OF GOVERNMENTS**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Wally Bobkiewicz, Interim Executive Director

SUBJECT: **Report on Advancement of Programs Identified in “Taking Action Regionally” and Confirmation of Santa Barbara/Ventura Issues Subcommittee**

DATE: October 19, 2005

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Board of Directors receive the report “Implementation Steps for Two Strategies Promoting Jobs/Housing Balance: Local Preference Housing & Shared Work/Communications Center” and confirm continuation of Santa Barbara/Ventura Issues Board Subcommittee.

Discussion: At its October 18, 2005 meeting, the Administration Committee asked that this issue be placed on the agenda for the November 10, 2005 meeting.

VCOG received a grant from the Southern California Association of Governments to advance programs identified by the Santa Barbara-Ventura Inter-Regional Partnership Report, “Taking Action Regionally.” VCOG chose to study three policy recommendations from the report as well as possible immediate next steps that would lead to defining implementation initiatives. The study, “Implementation Steps for Two Strategies Promoting Jobs/Housing Balance: Local Preference Housing & Shared Work/Communications Center,” was completed by former Executive Director Jacki Bacharach in June, 2005. Ms. Bacharach distributed the report to Board Members, but the report has not been reviewed and received by the VCOG Board. Staff recommends that the Board do so at its November meeting. The report is attached.

In addition, the Administration Committee suggested that the Board also take this opportunity to confirm the continuation of its Santa Barbara/Ventura Issues Subcommittee. This subcommittee was created in May, 2004 to discuss issues pertaining to the two counties. Members of the subcommittee were Board Members Steve Bennett, Carl Morehouse, Mary Ann Krause and Jon Sharkey.

Attachment:

“Implementation Steps for Two Strategies Promoting Jobs/Housing Balance: Local Preference Housing & Shared Work/Communications Center” Report

**Implementation Steps for
Two Strategies Promoting Jobs/Housing Balance:
Local Preference Housing &
Shared Work/Communications Centers**

Final Report

Prepared For

**Ventura Council of Governments
with funding from the
Southern California Association of Governments**

By

**Jacki Bacharach
Executive Director
Ventura Council of Governments**

**Walter Siembab
Principal
Siembab Planning Associates**

June 30, 2005

Introduction

The Ventura Council of Governments (VCOG) received a grant from the South California Association of Governments (SCAG) in the spring of 2005 to advance the programs identified by the Santa Barbara-Ventura Inter-Regional Partnership report entitled “Taking Action Regionally”.

VCOG chose to study 3 policy recommendations from the report as well as possible immediate next steps that would lead to defining implementable initiatives. This would allow for implementation leading to action on at least one or two policies, and possibly become a catalyst for advancing the inter-regional dialogue which the Partnership had initiated.

Background

The Santa Barbara County Association of Governments with the support of the counties of Santa Barbara and Ventura received a California Housing and Community Development Department grant in 2002 to create an “inter-regional partnership” comprised of the local governments, government agencies, and business and community leaders in the two-county area.

The purpose of the grant was to identify and address issues related to mobility and jobs/housing balance, create new analytical tools and develop strategies for promoting jobs-housing balance in the future.

A report on the process and its findings was completed in July, 2004 for the Inter-Regional Partnership specifically focusing on jobs, housing and mobility entitled Taking Action Regionally. The report was prepared by John Jostes, Interactive Planning and Management, LLC along with several sub-contractors.

One of the key components of the report is the section on policy recommendations. In it, there are 52 policies for either immediate or near term actions grouped into 7 broad categories as follows:

- Inter-Regional Communication and Collaboration – 8 policies
- Advancing Housing Policy that Reflects Regional Priorities and Perspectives – 12 policies
- Integrating Regional Thinking into Job Creation and Economic Development – 4 policies
- Local Permit Processing and Streamlining Improvements – 5 policies
- Support Ongoing Programs to Address Congestion – 8 policies
- Public Education and Involvement Opportunities – 5 policies
- Legislative Advocacy for Change – 10 policies

Twenty-four, or almost half of the policies, were identified for immediate (within 6 months) implementation. Although the project identified a valuable set of policy options, there was no funding to develop steps necessary to implement its recommendations.

Recommendations Chosen for Implementation

Attaining jobs-housing balance as a congestion mitigation strategy was the foundation of the report recommendations. The goal of jobs-housing balance is to reduce the vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled associated with the journey to work. The basic idea is to get more people to live close to where they work.

It should be noted, if only tangentially, that jobs-housing balance can be seriously questioned as a means for reducing inter-regional traffic flows. For example, that the journey to work accounts for less than half of all trips in contemporary society and the fact that the number of two-worker families has grown substantially are just two of the issues. (See **Travel By Design**, Boarnet and Crane, Oxford University Press, 2001, for a more complete discussion of jobs-housing balance).

The policy recommendations chosen for study in this report are two opposite approaches to creating more physical proximity between home and work. One can help some people live physically closer to their workplace and the other can help move some workplaces virtually closer to where people live. The former is a strategy for the long run, the latter lends itself to benefits in the short run.

The recommendations are from those identified in the Report for *immediate action – within six months*.

Housing Policy #3

“Encourage local agencies, housing developers, larger employers, not-for-profit foundations, and others to jointly establish local waiting lists for below-market rental and purchase housing. Such waiting lists would be used to place local employees with less than 200% average median income in local housing to the greatest extent allowed by fair housing law.” (Page 18)

This will be discussed as *local preference housing*.

- Local Preference Housing has been discussed at a number of meetings attended by elected officials and city and county staff of both counties since the report was published, but no plan for implementation has been developed.

Congestion Relief Policy #3:

“Initiate the development, funding and use of video conferencing centers as satellite work/conferencing stations by business, business parks, industry and government. These video conference centers would be designed to function as neighborhood work sites and

minimize unnecessary vehicle trips between Santa Barbara South Coast and Western Ventura County.” (Page 21)

This will be discussed as *shared work and communications centers*.

According to John Jostes, there have been no formal attempts to advance this recommendation since the Report was published.

A third issue – permit streamlining - was briefly considered but due to limited time and funding the inter-county planning group encouraged a focus on the issues of local preference housing and shared work and communications centers.

Local Preference Housing (LPH)

Housing prices in Santa Barbara and Ventura counties have risen greatly and make it difficult for those who work in the area to live there. The idea of LPH is for local government to intervene in the housing market to provide opportunities for the essential employees who are priced-out of increasingly expensive local housing markets – the moderately paid teachers, store clerks, police and others. Housing affordable to these people tends to be available only at more remote locations. That robs the community of some of its most valued members and generates unnecessary vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

LPH requires local government to go a step beyond ensuring that new housing is produced and sold at affordable prices. It requires that local governments arrange to give local employees preference in buying the affordable housing that is produced. For example, the Ventura City Housing Authority reported that the affordable units in a recent large private housing development in the City of Ventura were purchased almost entirely by people who work in Santa Barbara County.

When looking closely at the theory and practice of LPH, it is clear that there are different opportunities depending on the context. LPH can be applied in the following housing programs:

First Time Home Buyers (FTHB)

Some local governments provide financial assistance to prospective buyers of their first home, usually in the form of a partial down payment in exchange for a long term residence commitment or a small equity position. Housing developers are not directly affected, unlike with inclusionary zoning programs. However, FTHB programs tend to target middle income rather than low income families.

Cities that offer FTHB programs can decide whether to add a requirement to give preference to local employees or residents. Of course, providing the preference for existing

residents does not affect mobility. Two programs in Ventura County – Santa Paula and Port Hueneme – illustrate the difference in policies.

Santa Paula which is just beginning its FTHB program is planning to restrict eligibility to existing residents or employees of Santa Paula. Port Hueneme's policy is different. First time home owner assistance is available to any qualified buyers, regardless of their current residence or employment location. Port Hueneme has the lowest rate of home ownership in the county and the city wants to encourage anyone who is ready and willing to purchase. Of those in the program so far, only 16% previously lived in the city. Local employment status was not tracked.

The limiting factor on the reach of FTHB programs is the size of the fund that supports the loan program. Initial funding for the Santa Paula program is \$400,000. It is distributed in \$40,000 increments as a loan to buyers who stay in the house for 10 years. (Short of that, the city requires payback of 90% of the loan plus a percentage of the profit from the sale.) Therefore, only 10 buyers can be accommodated without additional funding for the program.

There is currently \$230,000 in the City of Ventura's fund, with \$450,000 having been invested in 2003 and 2004 together (to make 10 loans). Ventura loans \$45,000 per family, so the current fund will support about 5 more families.

A second problem is that even that level of support is not enough in the current housing market. Houses in Santa Paula are selling for between \$400,000 and \$500,000 which requires \$80,000 to \$100,000 down payment and a substantial monthly mortgage payment. So Santa Paula staff is working with a number of other agencies in the county to create a package of financial aids that they can bundle to offer as part of its FTHB program.

Inevitably, the fund size versus the proceeds needed to make a significant contribution will always severely limit the number of beneficiaries.

Local Public Housing

Many cities develop a small amount of housing annually, usually working with community-based non-profit corporations. Community Development Block Grants, housing development fees (paid by developers in lieu of providing low or very low income units), redevelopment funds, condominium conversion taxes and other sources are combined to provide the funds for municipal housing projects.

It would appear clear that when a local jurisdiction pays to build a housing project, the jurisdiction can impose whatever public interest obligations it can justify. The main barrier is concern for *fair housing laws*. The Fair Housing Act requires that policies established cannot create the effect of denying admission to a program on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. While the appearance of discrimination is a legitimate

issue, there appears to be no actual legal problem so long as preferences for residents or employees clearly do not have this effect and findings are made to address this issue.

A second issue is that there appears to be different interpretations as to whether or not a local preference can be established when federal funds are used in a project. Section 960.206 of Title 24 states that a local Public Housing Authority “may adopt a system of local preference for selection of families admitted to the authority’s public housing program.” The caveat, which may be the source of the conflicting interpretations, is that while it’s okay, for example, to make residency a preference, residency should not be made a requirement. Any waiting lists established are acceptable so long as they do not have a discriminatory effect, as described above. Some of the agencies surveyed do allow anyone to be placed on waiting lists but then prioritize those lists to accommodate local preference.

Note, however, that the authors of this paper are not attorneys. Therefore, the first recommendation in the steps to proceed is for Ventura County cities to establish their own legal interpretation. See page 8.

Casa de las Fuentes, developed by the Housing Authority of the City of Santa Barbara, was the best example found in our research to illustrate a useful and legal application of LPH for employees in locally produced housing. Casa de las Fuentes is a 42 unit downtown housing project that gave preference for all 42 units to downtown workers. Those who were downtown workers and who didn’t own a car got additional preference.

There is no underlying policy document such as the General Plan supporting this initiative. The City Council mandated the policy as part of its project approval. Attorneys for the City and the Housing Authority reviewed the policy and approved it because it addressed a stated need. The building was financed by the Housing Authority and the Santa Barbara Redevelopment Agency. No federal money was used.

The attorneys found a legal precedent in other cases offering local preference. University student housing requires students to qualify for the housing if they are registered and carry a specified course load. Senior housing seems to be another example. Although a Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) waiver is required, public housing can be targeted specifically for seniors.

As with FTHB programs, the limiting factor is the funds available to build public housing.

Section 8 rental housing

Section 8 is a federal rent subsidy program for those who meet the income guidelines. Section 8 programs are typically administered by the local housing authority and waiting lists are common. Apparently each housing authority is free to establish priorities for local residents and employees on the waiting lists but the practice is not widespread for at least two reasons.

We were told that HUD at one time gave bonus points to jurisdictions that did not have a residence requirement. And, of course, the Section 8 certification is portable. A candidate can be certified in City A, and once certified can search for housing in City B. In other words, the certification process verifies the qualifications of the individual; it does not allocate some specific set of housing units.

Like FTHB programs and public housing, the limiting factor is the pool of funds available to distribute. Section 8 funds originate with the federal government and the current administration has reduced support for the program, a situation expected to continue at least until 2008.

Private Developments

Private developments, of course, generate the most new housing units in every region. Local jurisdictions sometimes have inclusionary zoning ordinances and sometimes simply negotiate affordable housing units with the developer through development agreements in exchange for density bonuses, reductions in parking requirements or other waivers from adopted policies. Developers commonly agree to provide 25% of the project as low or moderate income units or 10% as very low income units (or in some cities they pay fees into a housing fund).

Local governments can use ordinances or development agreements to further impose local priorities on the moderate, low and very low income units developers agree to produce. In other words, the city could rationally argue that affordable housing needs to benefit either existing residents or people employed locally rather than people with no connection to the community.

The city or its housing authority can help by maintaining lists of moderate, low and very low income candidates who are also current residents or locally employed. Of course, every constraint sets up enforcement issues. For example, the City of Ventura is currently considering litigation against a developer who failed to actually sell the low income units at the price he promised.

The limiting factor is not available public funds for once but the volume of housing built in any particular city, as well as the political will to consider additional constraints on developers (low income units and local preferences) and the energy to enforce them.

The context in which LPH could have its greatest impact would be when applied to market rate housing. For example, if a local jurisdiction were to require some percentage of market rate housing to be dedicated to existing local residents or employees, the housing product itself and its prices could be affected. If a developer were required to build specifically for the local market, then the housing product would be tailored to the needs and income of that market segment.

This aggressive approach would fit conditions where local housing is being produced specifically for a distant upscale labor market and where low income long time residents are being displaced in the process. Salinas is an example where low income housing is being replaced by housing being developed for Silicon Valley professionals who cannot afford housing near their work place.

While we could find no cases where a jurisdiction has actually applied local preference requirements to market rate units, activists in this field such as the Executive Director of Monterey Land Watch believe that the policy is within the discretionary police powers of the city, if the underlying need is well documented.

An interesting development applying preference strategies is Lagunitas, an innovative mixed industrial, commercial and residential project in Carpinteria that is at its final approval stage. As part of the development agreement with the city, the developer will market the project's housing units in tiers of declining exclusivity. The project's 74-unit housing component will consist of condominiums as well as both small and large-lot single family houses. These units will be marketed exclusively to employees of the project's commercial and industrial tenants during the first 45 days. Eligibility to buy will expand to include employees of the tenants of the adjacent one million square feet of commercial/industrial space during the next 30 days. Eligibility will expand again to include any employee or current resident of greater Carpinteria during the following 30 days. After that period of time, any remaining units will be sold to any interested buyer. The project is awaiting final approval contingent on construction of a highway improvement. If this project is eventually developed and if this complex eligibility arrangement is implemented, the practice should be evaluated for application elsewhere.

The Lagunitas experience notwithstanding, in order to pursue an aggressive LPH policy regarding private housing development in Ventura County, a candidate city with the right conditions and the political will would need to step-up and become a test case. It would be necessary to document the need for such a policy with a study of the dynamics of the local housing market. Such a policy might be considered for inclusion in the General Plan where it could be implemented by ordinance. Substantial legal assistance would be required for both steps, but the benefits would also be substantial.

Assessment of Potential

LPH programs will not be expensive to apply to first time home buyer programs, public housing, Section 8, or affordable units in private developments. And they will not prove to be administratively complex.

The recommendations in Taking Action Regionally were supported by various scenarios evaluated by a model designed to forecast inter-regional traffic in the year 2010. The Report states that "the only scenarios that significantly reduce commuting relative to the baseline are [those] which assume increased housing production, especially for the workforce." (Page 9) "Those scenarios were found to generate the fewest new commuters

for many reasons, including lower job growth and higher housing production, which leads to lower housing prices than in the baseline. Also, the emphasis on affordable and workforce housing means more jobholders are able to afford houses near their jobs... Also, local preference is what really gives new housing policy some impact on commuting.”
(Page 10)

The scenarios described included assumptions about San Luis Obispo County, Northern Santa Barbara County, Santa Barbara South Coast and Western Ventura County. While the forecast may well be realized for that extended region, the number of vehicle trips that could be saved by LPH in Western Ventura County appears to be relatively modest.

According to the report’s Table 1, Baseline Scenario Implications, Western Ventura County will add about 11,500 dwelling units between 2004 and 2010. If there are 1.5 commuters per new household, 17,205 new daily trips will be generated to a variety of destinations. To put this in perspective, that total would be a little less than 10% of the 180,000 average daily traffic volume on Highway 101 between Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties.

LPH cannot be applied retroactively so these new units are the only candidates for local preferences. For simplicity, assume that all 11,500 dwelling units are privately developed, and that 25% are income restricted, that all of those units are reserved for local residents and employees, and that employees get half of those units. The result will be 1,437 of the new units will be owned by households with at least one person who works close by. One and a half trips per household (2,150 VT/Day) means that 87.5% of the newly generated vehicle trips (VT) would occur anyway despite a successful LPH program.

The actual number of VT reduced will probably be lower because of the following factors:

- Not all jurisdictions feel the need to apply LPH to FTHB and inclusionary private units.
- Where LPH programs have been adopted, they cover both existing residents and employees. We found no jurisdictions that monitored the actual split.
- While some of the 11,500 units added in the Western County will be public, an increasing portion of public units will be dedicated to seniors because of the aging population, for which employee distinctions are of little value.
- The confusion about the legal bounds for LPH is holding back the implementation of such programs.

LPH programs could have a very significant impact on jobs housing balance if they were applied to market rate housing. This however is legally and politically daunting and probably not feasible unless housing and traffic conditions dramatically decline.

Despite the likely modest traffic impact, LPH is relatively low cost and easy to implement in more places than it is now practiced. It can potentially improve the sense of community in those places by helping some of its service workers live locally.

Steps to Implementation

Even when the steps are clear, implementation still requires a lead organization or individual, i.e. a champion. A good choice would be a community-based non-profit housing advocate in Western Ventura or Santa Barbara South Coast. The Ventura Council of Governments could act as a facilitator to bring the stakeholder organizations together.

The following are recommendations for implementation:

1. Convene a committee of city attorneys to develop a legal opinion on LPH in each of its various contexts, including the politically aggressive option of applying LPH to new market rate developments.
 - Circulate the legal opinion to Ventura County and cities and possibly Santa Barbara County and cities, as well as housing authorities, non-profit housing developers, and leading for-profit housing developers.
 - Assuming a favorable legal opinion, hold a half-day conference to promote LPH by explaining the legal memorandum and feature practitioners of LPH explaining their procedures. Encourage all practitioners to monitor the use of the program by residents and employees in order to facilitate evaluation.
2. Request that the Local Government Commission and the League of California Cities (Institute for Self Government) include LPH in the “toolbox” of housing policies and independently or jointly assemble resources that support the policy. As it now stands, neither organization recognizes LPH as a strategy that should be encouraged although both provide resources on other housing policies.

LPH is a policy with statewide application. It would be most practical and effective for statewide organizations to monitor the practices and collect the resources that would support individual cities interested in adopting the LPH policy. In addition to the examples previously mentioned in this report, the following experiences could be centrally and more thoroughly documented:

- The City of San Francisco targeted housing specifically for teachers and police in 1994.
- California State University Channel Islands is building housing for students, employees and teachers.
- The Santa Barbara School District is building employee housing on the site of a closed school.
- The Lagunitas Project in Carpinteria, described above.

Shared Work and Communications Centers

The prospect of moving work to the workers instead of the other way around has had great potential since it was first proposed in the mid 1970s. Ironically, the initial insight by the acknowledged father of telecommuting, Jack Nilles, occurred while he was commuting from his home in Santa Barbara to his job in the Goleta Valley.

The concept of telecommuting has broadened considerably in the intervening 30 years. Initially conceived narrowly as tactic for a few employees of an information business to work at home while connected to the office via a telephone line, the modern concept embraces the evolution of a mobile work force and an array of anytime-anywhere electronic services, all supported by virtual private networks and the Internet.

The concept of distributed organizations (de-centralized offices) - is the model for this family of innovations. Technology can be a facilitator but it is organizational change that is at the heart of the matter. This is both good news and bad news. The good news is that implementation of telework initiatives are not expensive, particularly when compared to road widening and street capacity expansion. The bad news is that corporate culture resists change. However, this may be overcome since corporate culture is becoming more open to change in reaction to new technologies and the public interest may be able to capture some of the benefits of those changes.

Public sector attempts to consciously support the telework movement rose and fell during the 1990s. Southern California was a national leader in those attempts although most regions developed some type of telework initiative. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) invested at least \$10 million in shared work facilities. The City and County of Los Angeles conducted high profile work-at-home programs.

From the perspective of 2005, the various initiatives can be seen to have either failed or achieved limited success and have mostly been terminated. Home-based telecommuting continues in many corporations but often as an informal practice. However, the failures were failures of execution rather than of concept. And there were enough successes for an interested region to build upon.

This section will briefly describe four basic options that Ventura County and cities can pursue in implementing the Shared Work and Communications Centers recommendation.

Home-Based Telecommuting

Telecommuting from home is the easiest and least expensive telework initiative since it does not require a dedicated facility and staff, outside of a modest training program. Santa Barbara County Association of Governments recently initiated a flexwork program that includes a home-based telecommuting component as well as flexible work hours. A

consultant was retained to recruit employers, provide policies and procedures, and train participants. The initiative is expected to produce telecommuters starting October, 2005.

The ride-sharing unit of the Ventura County Transportation Commission is responsible for telecommuting. Staff reported that current marketing efforts include a double-sided information sheet on telecommuting in the employer marketing packet. Some of the old SCAG telecommuting handbooks are available upon request. A few employers currently offer the telecommuting work option. Based on 2004 Rule 211 survey data from the APCD, one employer in Thousand Oaks has used telecommuting to reduce about 5% of its total commute trips.

Satellite Work Centers

Satellite work centers are facilities owned or leased by a single employer with work stations that are shared on a rotating basis by employees of that single employer. Facilities-based telecommuting provides an option for remote work for those employees who for a variety of reasons do not want to work at home but would like to avoid the commute and work close to home.

The problem with satellite work centers is that success requires a very large employer and a very central location. The federal government's program with centers in the suburban areas around Washington DC is the best example of currently operating satellite work centers. It is unlikely that there is a great enough concentration of employees of any single employer in Ventura County to support a satellite work center.

Shared work centers

Shared work centers are facilities with work stations that are shared on a rotating basis by employees of several employers. Various public agencies funded a number of such centers throughout Southern California in the 1990s. Caltrans in particular funded three such centers in the wake of the 1992 earthquake including one at the Simi Valley Transportation Management Association as well as one each at Ventura and Moorpark colleges.

Virtually all of those that existed in the 90s are now closed as the sponsoring agencies did not renew their seed investments. They were closed for two basic reasons. The first is that despite offering rates that were well below market or even free, occupancy averaged around 30%. The reasons for that were:

- There were operating inefficiencies. For example, despite the existence of a number of such facilities in a given region, there was no unified regional marketing effort that would have approached all major employees with all available work stations.
- The funding agencies (like SCAQMD) restricted use to telecommuters with regular offices in a central location. Free-lance, self-employed and home-based workers were not allowed.

- The facilities were often at locations convenient for the sponsors but not strategically located to attract telecommuters.
- The sponsors and their facility managers were generally inexperienced in the shared work center enterprise.
- The office product was not attractive – small cubicles were generally offered when the demand was for private offices.
- Recruitment was aimed at attracting individual telecommuters rather than at encouraging organizations to distribute their work sites.

The second reason that the facilities are now closed is the expense of operating them. Each paid their own marketing person, site management, maintenance expense, space rent, furniture expense and utilities expense. Operational subsidies were required but could not be justified beyond a demonstration period due to the low occupancy rate.

Projections based on figures available from the non-commercial shared work centers of that era suggest that a breakeven facility would have the following characteristics (costs expressed in the year 2000 dollars):

The facility would have about 60 computer equipped work stations mostly in private offices of about 12,000 square feet. That would require an initial capital investment of about \$500,000 (for furniture, carpeting, computers, printers and other ancillary equipment, and signage) with operating expenses of \$18,000 per month. Total investment needed for start-up and three years of operations would be almost \$1.15 million. In order to break even over the three year period (including recovering the initial capital investment), the center would need to charge \$590 per month for each work station and operate at 90% occupancy. Assuming rotating usage by one day per week telecommuters, the facility would accommodate 300 workers.

The executive suites industry provides a commercial version of a shared work center. A commercial shared work center typically serves the following markets:

- Micro-business – a single person with perhaps one or two employees that locates in an external office rather than in a home office.
- Corporate field office – two or three representatives/sales persons of a regional corporation share a field office in order to maintain a presence close to customers.
- Corporate outpost – one to three individuals from a corporation located in another region staff a remote office.

The economics of commercial executive suites and non-commercial shared work centers are roughly the same.

An alternative approach to a public shared work center was demonstrated between 1992 and 1995. The Telework Facilities Exchange (TFX) was sponsored by the Institute for Local Self-Government (ILSG - the non-profit research and education arm of the League of California Cities) and funded by the SCAQMD as part of the ILSG's Telecommunications for Clean Air initiative.

The TFX matched government employees working and living in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino counties to government work stations near their residence. So, for example, an employee of the Agoura Hills Public Works Department worked one day a week in a vacant work station located in a Metropolitan Water District office two blocks from his home in San Dimas in the San Gabriel Valley.

The advantages of the TFX over a designated shared work center include the following:

- There were no facility costs such as rent, furniture, maintenance and site management since the program used vacant work stations in existing facilities.
- There was no excess capacity since the system was demand driven. No work stations were procured until a telecommuter entered the system.
- All facilities were conveniently located for the telecommuter since the search focused on finding an available work station in a government facility very near the candidate.

The TFX was operated for 12 months. At the end of that period, there were 31 active telecommuters, 34 had been matched to a work station but had not yet started telecommuting, 23 had been approved by their management but not yet matched to a nearby work station, 2 were awaiting approval by their management and 220 were in some state of completing an application. Active participants reduced their commute distance by 88%. Detailed findings for the project are in the Final Report available from the League of California Cities or Siembab Planning Associates.

The SCAQMD made it clear that no continuing funding beyond the seed grant would be forthcoming. In the end, one year of operating subsidy was insufficient to develop a business plan and segue to self-sustaining operation. Should this type of project be tried again, the start-up package should include two years of full operational subsidy and a third year of partial funding.

Multi-Function Communications Centers

Multi-function Communications Centers (MFCC) are the most complex and potentially powerful option available – and they are more specifically what was implied by Congestion Relief Policy #3.

The idea of MFCC is to provide a public facility as a local delivery point for electronic services, many of which are now on the Internet. Examples can be found in virtually every sector, including e-government, distance education, telemedicine, e-retailing, e-commerce, and others. Electronic services are expected to grow substantially as public corporations and private enterprise transition to the modern model of distributed organizations. These shared public communications facilities would also offer meeting space equipped for video and audio conferencing; and would host meetings of all sorts by all parties – public and private.

The Greater Thousand Oaks Telecommunity (www.gtot.org) is a local facility originally funded by Caltrans which continues to operate in Thousand Oaks. It primarily provides video conferencing as a substitute for long distance travel (Trans-Pacific and Transcontinental) rather than intra-regional trip reduction. And it provides services to the local school district. It is not currently providing trip reducing services to the public. Nevertheless, the facility can provide a good building block for a MMFC initiative. It has a significant amount of unused capacity so the opportunity exists to program it for the functions needed by the public without disrupting its existing programs.

Making such facilities programmable – offering a variety of functions that can be changed over time in response to demand – makes them more functionally robust than a facility dedicated to a single purpose. To expedite this, most of the key institutions in the county will need to move some of their functions out of their central facility and onto a broadband network for delivery to the MFCCs. For example, the community colleges, colleges, and universities in Ventura County could aggressively offer a wide variety of classes with a distance education option. These video-conferenced or streaming video classes could then be offered to the public through the MFCCs. Organizations in the county that currently engage routinely in some form of video conferencing include the Navy, the county courts which use video in some aspect of their arraignment or parole processes, and some private corporations. None of these examples offer public access to their infrastructure or services to the public at large.

MFCCs could also offer shared work stations as an add-on function to its core services, thereby avoiding the large investments needed in speculative development of a large dedicated telework center.

MFCCs can then literally be *programmed* to provide the functions needed by the neighborhood in which they are placed. A center in the middle of a community of seniors could specialize in telemedicine while one in the middle of young singles could specialize in education and workforce preparation.

The Blue Line TeleVillage (in which the authors of this paper were directly involved) in Compton, funded by the LACMTA through the Congestion Management Air Quality (CMAQ) program, demonstrated the proof of concept. Its final report is available either from the LACMTA or Siembab Planning Associates (www.siembab.com).

Assessment of Potential

Currently, the use of network technology to reduce traffic is nearly non-existent in Ventura County and with some humble beginnings now being established in Santa Barbara County. Ironically, this means that almost any modest initiative has the potential to advance the goal of traffic reduction.

There are about 300,000 jobs in Ventura County. Assuming 80% of those jobs generate a vehicle trip (VT), there are around 240,000 job-related VT per day in Ventura County. If the journey to work makes up about half the travel in the County, then there are at least another 240,000 VT per day for a total of around 500,000 VT per day for all purposes.

The journey to work, journey for work (primarily work related travel to meetings, conferences and the like), and journey to acquire services are the main targets for trip reduction. Audio and video conferencing can have an immediate impact at low cost. The TFX and MMFC initiatives will require an investment but can still be deployed within a couple of years. It is not unreasonable to believe that a 1% reduction of about 5,000 VT per day could be achieved with two years. This is about twice the potential in the short run of LPH over a longer period of time. The eventual target for shared work and communication centers would be at least 30% or about 150,000 VT per day within 10 years, if all options were aggressively pursued.

Compared to LPH, Shared Work and Communication Centers have a potentially much larger impact on travel and can begin to have a significant impact in a shorter time frame – within 3 years. Partnerships with schools or other agencies for the shared use of their facilities could facilitate this timeline. A demonstration project involving a modest network of communication centers would cost a couple million dollars. County-wide expansion to achieve the potential would require a significant investment in network infrastructure which, in the current fiscal environment, would require diversion of some funds now used to increase road and intersection capacity. A Shared Work Exchange project could be accomplished for less investment, also within the timeframe.

As with LPH, capturing significant outcomes from Shared Work and Communications Centers will depend on a strong commitment and political will.

Steps to Implementation

As discussed in the LPH section, no progress toward implementation will occur without a key organization stepping up to provide leadership. In this case, that lead role can probably be best played by the Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC). VCOG could facilitate and coordinate as needed.

VCTC is a good choice because its mission involves planning for county-wide mobility and access. It also brokers the Congestion Management and Air Quality funds that are probably the best source of support for whichever initiative is pursued.

Three self-reinforcing projects should be considered.

The first is quickly and cheaply convert a meeting room in every government facility (city, county, state and federal) in Ventura County into an electronic meeting room with the addition of video and audio conferencing equipment. This network could be established within 3 months for about \$2,000 a site. The equipment needed for the electronic meeting initiative can most likely be funded by the participating organizations themselves. Some funds will be required for marketing the new audio and video conferencing practices to each participating government office so that meetings that staff hold or attend will routinely be electronic rather than face-to-face. If aggressively pursued, inter-governmental conferencing could within the following 3 months reduce travel by government employees by up to 50%.

The second is some version of a Telework Facilities Exchange to cover at least Ventura County and the South Coast Region of Santa Barbara County. It could gradually grow to also include western Los Angeles County and southern San Luis Obispo County. This would be a relatively low cost measure and comparatively easy to implement. It could build on the progress being made in the Santa Barbara Flexwork initiative and the electronic meeting initiative.

Staging a robust demonstration project of at least three MMFCs is the third step. This would extend the same practices established in the electronic meeting initiative and the Telework Facilities Exchange to the public at large and the private sector, including especially small and micro businesses. This initiative could build on the Thousand Oaks Telecommunity Center facility and its experiences and knowledge. However, the start-up cost of this initiative will most likely be around \$3 million for the initial three-year trial period.

We recommend that this report be transmitted to VCTC with the request that its Board consider these three initiatives in their work program for possible funding through the CMAQ program: electronic meetings, Telework Facilities Exchange and MMFC. VCOG should also request that its members communicate their support of this request to VCTC. VCOG should also consider holding a half day meeting of local agencies and business and community leaders to discuss implementation steps.

Initial implementation steps for the projects recommended include:

- All government agencies should be polled about the ability of each of their facilities to host electronic meetings and the status of their existing technology.
- Available work stations and candidate telecommuters in each government agency should be assessed as an evaluation of the potential for a Telework Facilities Exchange
- The services currently or near term network-ready by the post-secondary education institutions (community colleges, colleges, and universities), medical institutions, and government agencies should be assessed for the MMFC initiative.
- To better understand MFCCs, implementers should first familiarize themselves with this specialized field of practice. This could include field trips to the Greater Thousand Oaks Telecommunity Center and the Blue Line TeleVillage in Compton as well as literature searches that cover at least the LCC's Telecommunications for Clean Air program and the LACMTA's Blue Line TeleVillage Final Report

Post Script

The energy market place may sooner rather than later force the issue of live-work-service proximity out of the realm of discussion and policy debate into short term action plans. If the price of oil continues to climb or carbon-induced global warming becomes a regional political priority, the responsible agencies in Ventura County should consider taking immediate action on as many of the recommendations in Taking Action Regionally as possible, particularly those that can be implemented and will realize an impact in a short period of time.

ITEM 8.C.

Development and Adoption of 2006 Workplan



**VENTURA COUNCIL
OF GOVERNMENTS**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Wally Bobkiewicz, Interim Executive Director
SUBJECT: **Development and Adoption of 2006 Workplan**
DATE: October 12, 2005

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Board of Directors receive this staff report, develop and adopt 2006 Workplan.

Discussion: In July, 2004, the Board of Directors adopted a Strategic Plan (attached). This plan outlined multiple issues to be pursued by VCOG.

Staff is requesting that the Board of Directors review this strategic plan and other recommendations from staff to develop a Workplan for 2006. A draft Workplan is also attached. Staff recommends that the Workplan consist of on-going projects and add one or two specific new items. This level of priorities will allow for the maximum attention to be given to implement issues given the current staffing resources of VCOG.

In addition to the issues outlined in the Strategic Plan, staff recommends that the Board may also wish to consider the following areas for inclusion in the Workplan:

- Emergency Preparedness Issues: How can the cities and county work better together to prepare for disasters.
- Building and Safety Policies and Procedures: Are there ways that city and county policies can be streamlined?
- Internet/Public Communication Issues: How can cities and the county provide uniform information on the Internet? Are there ways that the Internet can be better used to communicate with the public?
- Geographic Information Systems (GIS): Are there ways that the cities and the county can better utilize GIS technology?

Attachments:

1. VCOG Strategic Plan
2. Draft 2006 Workplan



VCOG STRATEGIC PLAN

Adopted July 2004

Introduction

The **Ventura Council of Governments (VCOG)** is a voluntary joint powers authority representing the 10 cities of Ventura County as well as the County whose goal is to facilitate cooperative subregional and regional planning, coordination and technical assistance on issues of mutual concern.

VCOG is based on the premise that Ventura County can have more representation without more government and that issues of common concern often extend beyond the purview of local jurisdictions and agencies, requiring insight and input from a wide range of affected interests.

VCOG works efficiently by utilizing existing resources to the greatest extent possible, collaboratively finding new ways to perform needed activities for less, while eliminating duplication of effort.

The following information is intended to provide a framework for establishing future goals and priorities for the Ventura Council of Governments.

Included:

- **VCOG Mission Statement**
- **VCOG Strategy**
The *VCOG Strategy* is being developed as our subregion's 'plan'. It is a result of interviews conducted with elected and appointed officials of the member cities and the county as well as some of the private sector organizations in the county. These interviews were meant to solicit input on priority issues.
- **General Baseline Work Program**
- **Potential Issues To Address**
List of issues in policy areas in which VCOG could participate.
- **Possible Implementation Strategies**
Programs and projects that VCOG could establish to carry out its Mission.

Mission Statement

Work to make Ventura County a unique national model of orderly development and smart growth to promote economic opportunity and environmental sustainability by:

- Promoting cooperation between the municipalities of Ventura County in the discussion of area-wide issues of mutual interest as well as advancing city-county cooperation
- Unifying Ventura County cities and the county to speak with a collective voice on important regional issues
- Seeking solutions to issues of common concern through joint studies and cost-effective, multi-jurisdictional programs
- Supporting members' proposals that further the objectives of the Ventura Council of Governments
- Providing a forum for communication and representation on behalf of the Ventura County cities and the county with other governing bodies and organizations in the county, as well as facilitate the exchange of ideas and information
- Increasing visibility and awareness of Ventura County as an outstanding place to live, work and play

VCOG Strategy

This is the first installment of an evolving strategy which will enable participating cities in Ventura County and the County to identify and act on issues of mutual interest or concern. As such, it is consistent with the rights and limitations prescribed in the VCOG Joint Powers Authority agreement. It is only as strong as the commitment invested by members of the council of governments and its implementation will depend on the priorities established by the members.

Objectives of the Strategy are:

- To identify areas of common concern among the 11 participating jurisdictions;
- To provide a means by which to document ideas and solutions discussed by VCOG;
- To provide a policy foundation for future VCOG planning efforts; and
- To serve as a potential blueprint for future implementation actions within the Subregion.

The focus of this Strategy is to find ways to capitalize on the strengths of the county and its cities at all levels of government and within the private sector. It is intended to enable individual cities and the county to better achieve their visions in collaboration with neighboring communities with whom they share common issues and goals.

General Baseline Work Program

- A. Serve as a forum for consideration, study and recommendation on area-wide and regional problems
- B. Assemble information helpful in the consideration of problems peculiar to the County and its cities
- C. Explore practical avenues for intergovernmental cooperation, coordination, and action in the interest of its members
- D. Seek economies of scale whenever practical in the administration of governmental services
- E. Facilitate intergovernmental coordination with public and private sectors on issues common to Ventura County governmental agencies
- F. Coordinate Public Information and Outreach on issues of local government importance, as needed and/or requested

Potential Issues To Address

- Growth Projections
 - Who are we planning for - demographic characteristics of the future population in the county
- Growth Management
 - Perception of diminishing quality of life
 - Urban form capable of accommodating anticipated growth
 - Land Use/Transportation linkages
- Housing
 - Jobs/Housing imbalance
 - Lack of production of diverse housing choices – ownership/rental, workforce, etc.
 - Homeless
 - Redevelopment agency housing set-aside dollars and the ability to use them outside the defined redevelopment area
 - Making use of existing or new federal, state and local resources for housing development
 - Concern of excessive administrative and economic burdens to meet requirements to build housing
 - Protecting environment and existing neighborhoods
 - Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)
- Integrated Waste Management
 - VCOG is the Local Task Force (in accordance with Sec. 40950 of Public Resources Code) – responsible for coordinating development of the city and county source reduction and recycling elements of the countywide integrated waste management plan and for assisting in the preparation of the countywide facility siting element of the plan.
 - Increased recycling
 - Materials recovery and re-use
- Mobility
 - Few access roads
 - Inter-county traffic concerns
 - Jobs/housing imbalance
 - Lack of funding for infrastructure investment
 - Finding more effective alternative modes of travel
 - Coordination for transportation, land use and economic development planning in major corridors and subareas.
 - Sufficient and well-placed park and ride lots to support use of the transit system and ridesharing

- Use of videoconferencing and teleconferencing for businesses, residents and municipal meetings
- Goods Movement
 - Community impact on increasing truck movements
 - Impact of the growth projected for Port Hueneme and in the region
- Air Quality
 - The quality of the air that we breathe
 - Regional, state and federal air quality plans and requirements
 - Practical transportation control measures
 - Use of new technologies
- Open Space/Green Belts/Preservation of Agricultural Land
 - Conserving the open space and green belts in the face of growing land use demands and worldwide competition
- Water Resources and Water Quality
 - Maintaining sufficient water supply and quality in the face of growing demand
 - Water conservation and re-use
- Energy Issues
 - Adequacy of energy supply at reasonable cost in the face of growing demand
 - Community aggregation
 - Energy efficiency and conservation
 - Energy efficient building
- Public Safety & Hometown Security
 - Sustain low crime rates and safe communities
 - Emergency preparedness
- Economic Development
 - Sustain economic vitality of the county as a whole and its individual city communities
 - Lack of flexibility with use of redevelopment funds to accomplish redevelopment program goals
 - Job Training, re-training and educational needs
 - Competitive posture of Ventura County and its cities
 - Possible federal base closure
 - Role of High Tech, Bio Tech, Agriculture, Trade & Tourism and other important industry clusters in the county
 - Customer service

Possible Implementation Strategies

- Advocacy
 - Legislative Forums with legislators – some social time and questions and answers
 - Legislative Subcommittee – to provide legislative review and VCOG action on legislation
 - Coordinate legislative outreach, and interface on activities affecting member agencies
 - Work collaboratively with California League of Cities & County Supervisors Association of California & California Councils of Government

- Mobility – Growth Management
 - Santa Barbara/Ventura Issues Subcommittee

- Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force
 - Take more proactive role in statutory responsibilities – specifically by facilitating the development, amendments and updates of countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan as the Local Task Force
 - Monitor integrated waste management through a Board subcommittee

- RHNA
 - Coordinate consensus response to regional housing need allocations

- Issues Updates – water, solid waste, open space, land use/transportation linkage

- Information Sharing and Clearinghouse
 - Demographics – repository of data
 - Web site
 - Newsletter focusing on city projects and innovations
 - Commercial Real Estate Web Site - coordinated information base regarding commercial/industrial opportunities in the county

- Training
 - GIS
 - Budget
 - Crisis Management
 - Customer Service
 - Dispute Resolution

- Annual Meeting
 - With Elected officials of all agencies in the county
 - With City Managers and County CAO
 - With Economic Development Agencies

- Other Potential Collaborative Projects
 - Human Resources and Services – form or join an salary survey consortium



2006 WORKPLAN

1. AB 939 Local Task Force: Continue oversight role of Countywide Interegrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP).
2. Regional Housing Needs Assessment: Continue role in establishing Regional Hosuing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for Ventura County.
3. Future Governance Models: Review transportation/planning regional governance models, as well as other responsibilities for VCOG (such as air quality management) and determine any changes or modification to VCOG structure and mission as appropriate.
4. Santa Barbara/Ventura County Issues: Continue work of Board Subcommittee to identify and implement initiatives to support better coordination of policies issues between Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.
5. Legislative Agenda: Continue to identify and take positions on State legislation that impacts Ventura County pursuant to the VCOG Legislative Agenda.
6. Informal Gatherings of Ventura County Officials: Continue to identify ways and host events to bring together Ventura County officials in an informal setting for exchanging ideas and to get to know each other better.
7. _____
8. _____

ITEM 8.D.

2006 VCOG Dinner Meeting



**VENTURA COUNCIL
OF GOVERNMENTS**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Wally Bobkiewicz, Interim Executive Director

SUBJECT: **2006 VCOG Dinner Meeting**

DATE: October 12, 2005

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Board of Directors consider hosting a dinner meeting in 2006 for governing bodies of VCOG member agencies and provide direction to staff.

Discussion: At your September, 2005 meeting, the Board of Directors directed staff to present ideas on informal activities for VCOG.

Staff recommends that the Board consider hosting a dinner meeting in 2006 for the governing bodies of VCOG agencies. Staff would appreciate direction on date of event. The meeting would consist of a social hour, dinner and a speaker addressing a topic in the 2006 VCOG workplan. The Board would need to consider issues such as location, cost, etc.

ITEM 9

Agency Reports

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR' S MONTHLY REPORT
November 2005**

Each month I establish, with input from the Directors, the priority issues on which management and the staff focus. This report summarizes the work that was accomplished during the month as well as other items I feel will give the Council a better understanding of what the staff and I are doing to accomplish our performance objectives.

I. Improve the efficiency and accountability of management within the organization

- Finance staff created, and distributed to internal managers and sub-regions, software to develop the FY 06-07 Overall Work Program (OWP). The software requires project proposers to create projects consistent with RC adopted outcomes.
- The FY 04-05 internal audit was completed. A draft will be provided to the Audit Committee on November 10th and a final will be presented to the Regional Council at the December meeting.
- Audits for San Gabriel Valley COG and Orange County COG are being finalized and will be presented to the Audit Committee in December.
- The first quarter progress report, using our new software, was completed and submitted to Caltrans in accordance with the due date. SCAG managers have informed us that the software has made it much easier for them to create their quarterly progress reports.
- Business Support Services – On October 17th, Diane Cunningham joined SCAG as the new Business Support Supervisor. Diane has 34 years of public sector experience in administration and operations and holds an MBA from California Lutheran University. This position was created as a result of the recent Administrative Support Study which recommended that administrative support functions be centralized under this position in a new division called Business Support Services. Business Support Services is organized as a new division in the Information Services Department. The benefits of the reorganization are expected to include streamlined and improved administrative support and productivity within SCAG; improved agenda and minute-taking processes; improved teamwork among administrative staff; improved customer service; development of administrative policies and procedures; and professional development of administrative staff.

II. Provide support to the Regional Council in providing direction and Leadership to SCAG

- On October 1st I participated in a Round Table discussion on “Rethinking Regional Governance” at the USC Public Management Research Conference, attended by the universities undertaking research in Public Administration. My session dealt with regionalism. I covered the work of SCAG in general, and our mega region work in particular.
- On October 1st I gave a presentation on the 2% Strategy and what it means to Rialto at the Chino Preserve Club House. The participants were the Council, community, and Commissioners for the city. The objective of the workshop was to start a general plan revision that incorporated the 2% principles.
- On October 6th I was invited as a speaker to the Regional Leadership Conference – “Competing in a Flat World: How the Puget Sound Region Can Succeed in an Integrated Global Economy”. I spoke about Goods Movement, logistics and the changing economic conditions of the global market place. Other panelists included Port Commissioners from Seattle and Vancouver.
- On October 10th I conducted an orientation briefing for Mayor Tim Jasper, Town of Apple Valley.
- On October 17th I met with the Agua Caliente Tribe in Palm Springs. They agreed to work with staff to flush out issues between now and December, and specifically how they might participate in a partnership in getting Maglev out to Palm Springs.
- On October 18th I gave a presentation on the Elasticity Study before the LA Chamber Transportation Committee.
- On October 24th I and Hasan Ikhata met with Councilmember Wendy Greuel and her staff regarding including Compass into the work of the LA City Transportation Committee and the formation status of the Maglev Joint Powers Agency.

III. SCAG Operations

- Recruitment. The Director of Intergovernmental Relations interviews are scheduled for November 30, 2005. A selection is anticipated in December. Several other recruitments are underway.
- Professional Pathways/Training. Scope of work training was provided to all project managers, managers, and sub-regions in October. Several recommendations came out of the training for facilitating more efficient contract management. The recommendations will be presented to the Directors on November 8th.

Preventing harassment/discrimination training will be provided to all Directors and Managers on November 9th.

Speech Communication training for employees who have English as a second language is on-going in November and December for twelve employees.

- Classification/Compensation. The classification/compensation study for the planner series will be presented to the Directors in November.

IV. Implement Adopted Regional Plans

- Goods Movement. SCAG staff continues to pursue opportunities to brief public and private sector decision makers on our current work. The paper “Goods Movement in Southern California: The Challenge, The Opportunity, and The Solution” summarizes our proposed program of voluntary private sector participation in funding of projects that will speed freight through the region while also alleviating public health impacts related to diesel fuel usage in moving goods. Staff presented the findings of the Port and Modal Elasticity Study to the Transportation & Communications Committee. The report will be discussed in a joint Regional Council-policy committee workshop on November 3rd. A key finding of this study is that the container traffic through our ports is more sensitive to congestion than the cost of shipping. A container fee of up to \$190-200 per forty-foot equivalent unit (FEU) will not result in significant diversion of containers from our ports if the revenue from this fee is invested in a wisely planned set of improvements to our goods movement system.

Since the presentation of this material at the August 24th Goods Movement Executive Stakeholder Roundtable Meeting, staff and SCAG consultants have been meeting with additional private sector groups, including CalTrade, Chambers of Commerce, and other shipper organizations. One-on-one briefings of lawmakers and key business leaders also continue. In general, our work is being very well received. In addition, we have prepared a paper for the regional transportation CEOs on the need for new institutional arrangements to assure timely implementation of high-cost multi-county projects.

The California Business, Transportation & Housing Agency and the California Environmental Protection Agency continue their joint work on a state Goods Movement Action Plan. A final Phase I report was released in September. Phase II will be guided by a series of working groups; I have been asked to co-chair the working group on Community and Workforce Development.

V. Develop Additional Planning Efforts

- RTP Update. Staff is continuing to assess the implications of SAFETEA-LU on our current RTP Update efforts. Over the past month, staff has been talking to other

Metropolitan Planning Organizations, transportation agencies as well as umbrella organizations such as National Associations of Regional Councils (NARC) across the nation to get a sense of how others are gearing up to comply with the new requirements of SAFETEA-LU. The federal agencies responsible for implementing SAFETEA-LU are still in the process of rule-making and developing appropriate guidance, which could take anywhere from one to two years. Over the next month staff will consult with the federal representatives and continue to clarify the new regulations so that staff can present a recommendation relative to our RTP update approach to the Transportation and Communications Committee towards the end of this year or the early part of next year.

- Maglev. Staff is working with project managers from City of LA, City of Ontario and SANBAG to refine the Detailed Work Plan for the Alternatives Analysis of the Initial Operating Segment (IOS) based on comments from the Federal Rail Administration. Also, staff has met with IBI Group to discuss the public involvement strategy to be pursued with stakeholders along the IOS as part of Phase 2 led by Lockheed Martin. Lastly, staff has begun efforts to develop a conceptual design for an integrated Maglev/Aviation system that links airports throughout the region, thereby reducing the need to make major costly improvements at LAX.
- Regional Economy. The 9th Annual Regional Economic Forecast Conference will be held on Thursday, January 26, 2006 at Santa Anita Park in Arcadia. This year's conference will take its major theme from SCAG's 2005 State of the Region report, which will be published earlier this year so that it may be linked to the Economic Conference. Planning for the Conference is underway and a Regional Council member is being selected from among several volunteers to work with the Planning Group.

VI. Data & Planning Methods

- Initiation of a Data Advisory Committee. Staff conducted the initial meeting of the Data Advisory Committee to coordinate the acquisition of data/information required by the program staff. The focus of this committee will be to assist the Data & Monitoring staff develop an overall plan for data acquisition. The group will provide input on sources of data and information specific to the needs of the planning divisions. Other roles will be developed including the coordination of planning activities and relevant data, future data needs and input on the development of data and GIS application to assist in the planning activities of staff.
- Travel Model Improvement. The new set of travel simulation models, developed from year 2000 data with consultant assistance, were adjusted to conform to Federal Transit Administration requirements for major capital investment projects. The models are now being calibrated and validated to year 2003 observed data from throughout the region that includes vehicle ground counts from nearly 2,100 locations as well as ridership counts for 60 bus system operators, the four urban rail lines, and the seven commuter rail lines. These checks and associated refinements will insure that the models will replicate

existing travel patterns and represent future travel behavior for planning analyses and studies.

In other developments, the new travel simulation models are being developed on the TransCad software platform for personal computers. This move from the TranPlan software platform on workstations will facilitate use of the models by member agencies and their consultants for future transportation studies. Another project now underway is the Heavy Duty Truck Improvement Project that will refine this important component of the SCAG travel models. The project includes an extensive survey on the travel patterns of 1,100 trucks from trucking firms throughout the region and will contribute to improved analysis of goods movement and related air quality considerations.

Performance Assessment and Monitoring

- 2005 State of the Commute Survey. Staff recently initiated the 2005 State of the Commute Survey with consultant assistance. This is the tenth survey in the region on commuting and the first one since 1999. The purpose of the survey is to develop information about commuters' travel behavior, attitude and associated factors for the purpose of trend assessment. The State of the Commute Survey will include 3,000 samples through telephone interviews in the region. Results of the survey are expected in Spring 2006 that would provide inputs into the RTP and RTIP processes.

VII. Legislative Program

Implement the Legislative Program

- Federal Appropriations. On October 20th, the Senate passed the Fiscal Year 2005-2006 Transportation Appropriations bill (HR 3058) and sent it on its way for a conference with the House of Representatives. In comparison to House funding levels, overall spending was higher in the Senate by about \$2 billion or 4 percent more than Fiscal Year 2005 levels. Furthermore, the Senate did not lower transportation spending as a budget offset for Hurricane Katrina as was it had been expected to do.

However, these spending cuts are not off the table and could arise during the conference committee between the Senate and the House. Several proposals have been offered by both chambers of Congress to achieve the budget cuts needed to account for emergency relief packages passed for Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. At this point, everything, including transportation funding, is vulnerable to budget cuts. I am working with our partners at the county transportation commissions to convey to Congress the serious, negative impact spending cuts could have on Southern California's transportation system, which bears a disproportionate burden for the nation's movement of freight. SCAG's federal representatives, the C2 Group, are strongly advocating our position on Capitol Hill.

- GoCalifornia. While the Legislature is in recess, the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency has been conducting workshops across the state on its 2005-

06 GoCalifornia legislative package. SCAG staff participated in a workshop on October 25th in Orange County and provided feedback on the bills' elements and regional implementation strategies.

SCAG will assist the Governor as he refines the overall scope and magnitude of GoCalifornia to reach consensus on major strategies and priority projects statewide. Design-build, a key component of GoCalifornia, is critically needed to expedite project delivery in Southern California. The Regional Council supported SB 371 (Torlakson) in 2005, which would have permitted the use of design-build in highway construction. Another GoCalifornia component, public/private partnerships, has been advocated by SCAG for years. The Regional Council supported AB 850 (Canciamilla) as well, and we continue on a legislative basis to push for the passage of both measures.