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### Appendix 1

**AMBAG Dues Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Amended Dues/ Mlg. Allow ance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>10,015</td>
<td>$ 3,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmel</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>$ 3,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Rey Oaks</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>$ 905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales</td>
<td>8,803</td>
<td>$ 1,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield</td>
<td>17,316</td>
<td>$ 3,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollister</td>
<td>37,051</td>
<td>$ 7,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King City</td>
<td>11,852</td>
<td>$ 1,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>19,171</td>
<td>$ 3,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey</td>
<td>29,322</td>
<td>$ 7,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Grove</td>
<td>15,472</td>
<td>$ 3,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>150,898</td>
<td>$ 26,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Bautista</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>$ 837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand City</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>$ 729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>55,125</td>
<td>$ 12,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>11,697</td>
<td>$ 3,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside</td>
<td>24,194</td>
<td>$ 6,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td>27,905</td>
<td>$ 4,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>51,703</td>
<td>$ 9,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Monterey</td>
<td>107,642</td>
<td>$ 34,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of San Benito</td>
<td>18,839</td>
<td>$ 5,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>84,979</td>
<td>$ 32,895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

| Total Population | $ 752,852 | $ 173,699 |
## Appendix 2

### TAMC SINGLE COUNTY MPO BUDGET

#### INCREMENTAL ADDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO Functions</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-12</td>
<td>Jul-13</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 FTE Staff</td>
<td>$82,600</td>
<td>$86,730</td>
<td>$91,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office support (supplies, legal, etc.)</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Time Costs</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Model Share</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$110,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHNA consulting support</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS consulting services</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP Consulting costs</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total additional cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$230,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$215,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>$255,317</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Planning Funds Available</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-12</td>
<td>Jul-13</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$253,896</strong></td>
<td><strong>$253,896</strong></td>
<td><strong>$253,896</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carry Over Savings (Usage)</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul-12</td>
<td>Jul-13</td>
<td>Jul-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$23,296</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,166</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$1,421</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Services as MPO

- **OWP:** Engage FHWA and Caltrans directly (annual)
- Regional Model: Contribute funding to 3-county model effort (ongoing)
- **MTIP:** Maintain Transportation Improvement Program and amendments with FHWA (ongoing)
- **RHNA:** Conduct Regional Housing Needs Analysis (periodic)
- **RTP:** Prepare stand-alone regional plan (periodic)
- **Clearinghouse:** Collect and provide notice on data on regionally significant projects (ongoing)
- **GIS:** Secure contracted Geographical Information System mapping as needed (ongoing)

### Assumptions:

- Rideshare services budgeted separately
- Sustainable Community Strategies completed by AMBAG
- Regional Model current update completed by AMBAG
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### Cost-Benefit Analysis Summary Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue area</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit Issues</td>
<td>Taking on the MPO designation would subject TAMC and SCRTTC to more stringent auditing and an increased financial workload.</td>
<td>Both agencies are subject to the same requirements now, but would be under greater scrutiny.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Data Center</td>
<td>This is a rather low cost, low effort item due to computerization. Information could be more readily available to the cities through the single-county agency public outreach activities (technical advisory committees).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Among Agencies</td>
<td>With fewer agencies that have overlapping duties, coordination can be improved. Removal of the middleman would reduce transaction costs and the impression that the tri-county agency is taking on activities appropriate to another agency.</td>
<td>Coordination across county boundaries could require increased communication among single-agency directors and county supervisors.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Reducing the number of agencies from four to three will reduce the overall amount of transportation expenditures by approx. $297,500 per year yet retain the required planning and programming products. This does not count the additional reduction of $173,700 in AMBAG dues that would no longer be required. Essentially, it will take fewer people and lower administrative costs to perform the same activities.</td>
<td>Normally agencies are not interested in returning funds back to the state. State funds saved will not return to the taxpayers per se, but will be redistributed to other smaller rural counties for transportation planning.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of Efforts</td>
<td>Three instead of four long-range planning documents (RTPs/MTP) and short-range programming documents (RTIPs/MTIP) will be required. Confusion among stakeholders on who oversees transportation planning and prioritization would be significantly reduced. Concerns by the public as to duplicative agencies would also be reduced.</td>
<td>There remain several assigned areas that are not transportation-related but are more land use-related that would need to be performed by the single county agencies that are now performed by AMBAG.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue area</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Flexibility</td>
<td>TAMC and SCCRTC would lose some of the flexibility that they have under the state planning funds that they would no longer receive under this scenario. This would be compensated by receipt of increased federal funds.</td>
<td>The single-county agencies would still be more flexible than AMBAG due to multiple funding sources.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Stability</td>
<td>The proposed single-county MPO structure will remove the ongoing financial challenges experienced by AMBAG by centralizing functions at the county transportation agency level. Without this consolidation, AMBAG is requesting additional funding. Shifting dollars from one agency to another without reducing costs will only shift instability from one agency to another.</td>
<td>The lack of absolute certainty in the amount of federal or state transportation planning funds that the region receives would be the same under either option.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Coordination</td>
<td>Dissolution of AMBAG would remove an established forum for regional coordination at a time when the State and Federal government are encouraging increased coordination. Agencies would need to create a new forum for regional coordination without the benefit of a separate staff or offices. The result could be positive if a San Joaquin-like model were followed, or could be negative if no new forum were developed.</td>
<td>In order to be a benefit, a formal structure for multi-agency regional coordination would need to be developed. It could result in a more direct coordination of TMC/SCCRTC/San Benito COG activities if it were done well.</td>
<td>More informal; less costly</td>
<td>more formal; more costly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Housing Needs Assessment</td>
<td>This calculation must occur every eight years. The next required cycle is in 2013. There is no funding to perform this state-required mandate. Transfer of this responsibility to countywide agencies would result in more local control and would avoid one county overriding another county. Any disputes would move to the state or countywide level.</td>
<td>The countywide agencies may have to use non-transportation funds to perform this review. Depending on the level of controversy, it could be costly or rather routine.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Communities Strategy</td>
<td>California and the federal government are requiring increased coordination between land use and transportation activities. Delegating the sustainable communities strategy development to the single-county transportation planning agencies would improve that coordination. Land use recommendations would be closer to the cities and counties who control land use decisions.</td>
<td>AMBAG has already received grants for the development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Transfer of this activity to the single-county agencies could occur but would require a transfer of the grants. Transition of the process could be disruptive.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>potentially high transition costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue area</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Issues</td>
<td>There could be increased availability of transit planning funds; due to AMBAG funding issues the federal transit money is no longer provided to MST, Santa Cruz Metro or San Benito transit. Transit agencies are also interested in being designated the sole federal transit funding recipient; this designation would further streamline the receipt of funds by removing AMBAG as the middleman.</td>
<td>The proposed budget assumes transit planning money would pay for ongoing regional model costs. Depending on those costs, there may be flexibility to devote those funds to transit planning activities. Federal action is required for the transit agencies to become &quot;designated recipients&quot;.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Issues</td>
<td>Transition to single-county MPOs would take a great deal of staff time and effort over a 6 to 12 month period. Federal and state coordination would be required and approval may be slow. The City of Salinas must agree, as must cities/counties representing 75% of the population, requiring presentations and action at each city council and County Board. Creation of a formal process would likely be required for a multi-agency regional forum. Each county agency may want to develop a regional housing needs assessment process and would have to readopt the federal Public Participation Plan.</td>
<td>The long transition time and even the discussion of proposals is hard on staff. There is a risk that if all are not in agreement that hard feelings will develop that harm future interactions.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>very high transition costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Forecast Model</td>
<td>All parties agree that an update to the three-county travel forecast model is needed. Such an update is underway. The single-county MPO model would free up resources to improve the annual upkeep of the model without taking money away from other planning/programming activities. A joint agreement among the single-county agencies and perhaps the Air District would be required.</td>
<td>The risk is that the model will demand increasing resources whomever is administering it. Federal agencies have raised a question about the use of single-county money for a multi-county model; however, other agencies do use multi-county modeling.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>transition costs and need for federal approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Activities:</td>
<td>Each of these activities can be handled by agencies with greater expertise on the issue at hand. For instance, Ecology Action could take on the Energy Watch program in keeping with its environmental mission. An agency specializing in water issues could take on the Pajaro Valley Water Management activities. The Sanctuary activities are already handled by a multi-agency Board.</td>
<td>One of the issues raised in the AMBAG survey is aligning grants to better fit the agency's primary mission. Letting go of these activities that could be performed by others could build better partnerships with these agencies.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not all activities may be easily absorbed by another agency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE LEAGUES
OF WOMEN VOTERS
of the Monterey Peninsula, Salinas Valley and Santa Cruz County

June 22, 2011

Stephany Aguilar
President
AMBAG
P.O. Box 809
Marina, CA 93933

SUBJECT: SUPPORT FOR REGIONAL PLANNING

Dear President Aguilar and Members of the Board of Directors:

The Leagues of Women Voters of Santa Cruz County, Monterey Peninsula and Salinas Valley would like to take this opportunity to support regional planning in the three county area. We are aware of efforts to change or eliminate the regional planning functions of AMBAG. Because of our long-standing support for regional planning for land use, transportation and air quality, we urge the Board to make every effort to assure that those functions continue within the region while addressing short-comings of the existing organization that may exist.

AMBAG was formed in 1968 as a forum for collaboration and communication. It played an invaluable role in coordinating such efforts as opposing exported wastewater from the Santa Clara Valley and the Kesterson drain to the Monterey Bay and supporting formation of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary. The functions identified below are currently performed by AMBAG. They are regional in scope and cannot be effectively performed by single county organizations:

1. As the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), AMBAG is responsible for preparing the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).
2. If transportation conformity determinations are required again because the North Central Coast Air Basin fails to meet the federal ozone standard, the MPO plays a critical role in transportation and general conformity determinations.
3. As the MPO, AMBAG is required to approve federal plans to meet federal ambient air quality standards for ozone.
4. AMBAG prepares population, employment and housing forecasts that are used in regional plans including those for water, transportation and air quality. Using a common set of forecasts assures consistency from one regional plan to another.
5. AMBAG's transportation model is used by the Air Resources Board (ARB) to prepare mobile source emission inventories for air quality plans. The population, employment and housing forecasts are used to forecast population-related emissions.
AMBAG negotiates with the California Department of Housing and Community Development regarding regionwide fair share allocations for housing and works with cities and the counties to disaggregate allocations.

AMBAG is preparing the SB375 plan having already laid the ground work with the Blueprint. AMBAG has also prepared baseline emission inventories for local GHG action plans, a unique accomplishment in California.

The Board may wish to review regional structures currently used throughout California to determine their applicability to our three county region. For example, the Bay Area has a transportation planning agency (Metropolitan Transportation Commission) which combines the functions of all county transportation agencies into a single organization leaving other regional planning efforts to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). In Southern California, the Southern California Association of Governments performs functions very similar to those currently performed by AMBAG.

The Leagues appreciate your dedication to effective regional governance, and we look forward to your efforts to assure that regional cooperation continues.

Sincerely,

Beverly Bean
LWV of the Monterey Peninsula

Jan Karwin
LWVoof Santa Cruz County

Mary Ellen Dick
LWV of Salinas Valley

cc: Rich Stedman, MBUAPCD
    TAMC
    SCCRTC
    San Benito County COG
    AMBAG Cities and Counties
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San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies MOU
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
OF THE
REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCIES
IN THE
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY

THIS MEMORANDUM OF THE UNDERSTANDING, which shall be effective upon the 21st day of September 2006, between and among the Council of Fresno County Governments, the Kern Council of Governments, the Kings County Association of Governments, the Madera County Transportation Commission, the Merced County Association of Governments, the San Joaquin Council of Governments, the Stanislaus Council of Governments, and the Tulare County Association of Governments, herein referred to as regional planning agencies, hereby enter into this Memorandum of Understanding;

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, the above listed regional planning agencies first entered into a Memorandum of Understanding on September 21, 1992, agreeing to coordinate regional planning activities; and

WHEREAS, this memorandum of understanding shall supersede and replace the existing memorandum of understanding; and

WHEREAS, since 1992 the above listed regional planning agencies have cooperatively addressed issues pertaining to transportation planning and related air quality responsibilities, transportation modeling, geographic information mapping; and

WHEREAS, the regional planning agencies of the counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Tulare are federally designated metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) responsible for implementing the federal comprehensive transportation process and have specified air quality/transportation planning responsibilities for their respective areas; and

WHEREAS, the eight regional planning agencies of the counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Tulare (hereinafter referred to as the "Eight Valley RPAs" are state designated regional transportation planning agencies (RTPA) or local transportation commissions (LTC) responsible for the state comprehensive transportation planning process; and

WHEREAS, the Eight Valley RPAs shall cause to be developed and adopted a Valley Chapter of the Regional Transportation Plan, which shall be included within each regional planning agency's own plan. This chapter shall address issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries and specifically affect several counties, such as a transportation corridor, and may include air quality, highways, streets and roads, aviation, rail, goods movement, and transportation demand management efforts; and

WHEREAS, the regional planning agencies of the counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Tulare are responsible for the allocation of projected housing needs to their respective cities and county; and

WHEREAS, the San Joaquin Valley is designated as:
- a nonattainment area for the 8-hour ozone standard,
- a nonattainment area for both PM-10 and PM-2.5 standards, and
- the urban areas of Bakersfield, Fresno, Modesto and Stockton are designated as maintenance areas for carbon monoxide, and
WHEREAS, the Federal Clean Air Act requires nonattainment area plans to include transportation control measures; and

WHEREAS, the California Clean Air Act requires nonattainment area plans to include reasonably available transportation control measures; and

WHEREAS, the Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users of 2005, and any successor federal act, requires that when multiple Metropolitan Planning Organizations exist within designated air quality nonattainment areas they shall consult with each other and with the state in the coordination of plans and programs; and

WHEREAS, the Eight Valley RPAs shall develop and maintain a unified and coordinated approach to air quality management planning process issues; and

WHEREAS, the cities and counties within the San Joaquin Valley are projected to have significant increases in population, housing and employment during the next thirty years requiring a cooperative, comprehensive, and coordinated planning process.

WHEREAS, the Eight Valley RPAs shall serve as a forum to encourage and facilitate regional data sharing, GIS development and mapping; and

WHEREAS, the Eight Valley RPAs shall rely, as much as practicable, on existing regional planning agencies for its financing, data and expertise, but may jointly contract for services if provided for in each of their individual Overall Work Programs and Budgets.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED that the regional planning agencies of the counties of Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus and Tulare shall coordinate as the San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies with respect to the performance of the following tasks when interregional issues are involved:

1. Preparation of multi-modal transportation plans that will include coordinated forecast methodologies for future population, housing, employment, land use, and air quality, and identify other common elements in relationship to the San Joaquin Valley and major interregional transportation corridors.

2. Preparation of regional transportation plans and policies addressing identified common transportation issues occurring within the Valley.

3. Preparation and development of regional transportation improvement programs and other short-range programs to provide for timely implementation of transportation control measures consistent with schedules included in applicable Air Quality Attainment plans.

4. Coordination with the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District on emission reduction projects necessary for the implementation of the California Clean Air Act.

5. Coordination with Caltrans District Offices on transportation system planning efforts.

6. Coordinate planning efforts with the appropriate state and federal agencies to insure good communication is maintained on issues important to the San Joaquin Valley.

7. Development and use of coordinated transportation and traffic database information for transportation modeling and related emission modeling.

8. Preparation of interregional technical and transportation systems studies in developing transportation corridor or plan alternatives.
9. Coordination on rail issues (both passenger rail and goods movement) within the Valley, including the development of plans and policies that affect rail service.

10. Provide a leadership role for all Valley Blueprint activities by planning for future growth and quality of life through the integration of transportation, housing, land use, economic development and environmental protection elements. Such integration to result in a more efficient and effective transportation system and land use pattern to achieve the three outcomes (3Es) that define quality of life—prosperous economy, quality environment, and social equity.

11. Provide a leadership role and act as a forum for Valley issues and concerns, where such issues and concerns transcend boundaries, allowing the development and consensus of policy questions of mutual interest in order to pursue a coordinated course of action without infringing on the jurisdictional powers of the individual governments.

BE IT FURTHER UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED that to oversee the coordination efforts the following organizational structures shall be established:

12. The San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies Policy Council is hereby created consisting of two elected officials (and one alternate) appointed from each of the regional planning agencies policy boards listed herein. The Policy Council shall meet at least twice each fiscal year to provide guidance on common interregional policy issues. The Policy Council shall also represent the San Joaquin Valley at public forums, including before the California Transportation Commission, the Governor and his/her administration, and before State and Federal legislative bodies that require a common voice. The Policy Council shall also provide direction and guidance to the Regional Planning Agencies Executive Directors Committee.

a. The Policy Council shall cause to be created a set of By-Laws which shall further describe its operational structure and the operational structure of any subcommittees it may create.

b. The Policy Council shall provide direction to the Regional Planning Agencies Executive Committee on the development of an Annual Work Program and Budget for activities to be carried out jointly, including identifying revenue for the implementation of these activities. The Annual Work Program and Budget is to be reflected in each respective regional planning agency’s budget documents as appropriate.

c. Nothing herein shall be construed as limiting in any manner the authority and responsibilities of the respective regional planning agencies, and all plans, programs and activities shall at all times be carried out in such manner as to maintain and recognize the separateness and autonomy of the individual regional planning agencies.

13. The San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies Executive Directors Committee consisting of the regional planning agencies’ Executive Directors (or their designees) shall hereby continue to provide coordination and direction on all administrative work required to carry out the development of plans that address interregional issues. The Executive Directors Committee may establish technical committees to assist in research and plan development that address interregional issues as defined herein and on other interregional issues as directed by the Policy Council. One of the primary roles of the Executive Directors Committee shall be as the primary advisory body to the Policy Council on all items appearing on its agenda, and one of its functions shall be to recommend agenda items for the Policy Council’s regular agenda. The Executive
Directors Committee shall implement the Annual Work Program and Budget as approved by the Policy Council.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Memorandum of Understanding to be executed by their respective officers to be effective on the date first above written.

COUNCIL OF FRESNO COUNTY GOVERNMENTS

Mayor Pro Tem Trinidad M. Rodriguez, Chairman
Barbara Goodwin, Executive Director

KERN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Councilmember David Couch, Chairman
Ropald E. Brummett, Executive Director

KINGS COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Councilmember Sid Craighead, Chairman
Terri King, Executive Director

MADERA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Councilman Gordon Skeels, Chairman
Patricia Taylor, Executive Director

MERCEDES COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Councilmember William Spriggs, Chairman
Jesse Brown, Executive Director

SAN JOAQUIN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Councilman John W. Harris, Chairman
Andrew Chesley, Executive Director

STANISLAUS COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Mayor James Ridenour, Chairman
Vince Harris, Executive Director

TULARE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

Supervisor Allen Ishida, Chairman
George Finney, Executive Director
Appendix 6
State Law on Withdrawal and Formation of Metropolitan Planning Organizations

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Highway Administration
23 CFR Parts 450 and 500

Statewide Transportation Planning;
Metropolitan Transportation Planning

Excerpt:

§ 450.310 Metropolitan planning organization designation and redesignation.

(a) To carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process under this subpart, a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) shall be designated for each urbanized area with a population of more than 50,000 individuals (as determined by the Bureau of the Census).

(b) MPO designation shall be made by agreement between the Governor and units of general purpose local government that together represent at least 75 percent of the affected population (including the largest incorporated city, based on population, as named by the Bureau of the Census) or in accordance with procedures established by applicable State or local law.

(c) Each Governor with responsibility for a portion of a multistate metropolitan area and the appropriate MPOs shall, to the extent practicable, provide coordinated transportation planning for the entire MPA. The consent of Congress is granted to any two or more States to: (1) Enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance in support of activities authorized under 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303 as the activities pertain to interstate areas and localities within the States; and (2) Establish such agencies, joint or otherwise, as the States may determine desirable for making the agreements and compacts effective.

(d) Each MPO that serves a TMA, when designated or redesignated under this section, shall consist of local elected officials, officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan planning area, and appropriate State transportation officials. Where appropriate, MPOs may increase the representation of local elected officials, public transportation agencies, or appropriate State officials on their policy boards and other committees as a means for encouraging greater involvement in the metropolitan transportation planning process, subject to the requirements of paragraph (k) of this section.

(e) To the extent possible, only one MPO shall be designated for each urbanized area or group of contiguous urbanized areas. More than one MPO may be designated to serve an urbanized area only if the Governor(s) and the existing MPO, if applicable, determine that the size and complexity of the urbanized area make designation of more than one MPO appropriate. In those cases where two or more MPOs serve the same urbanized area, the MPOs shall establish official, written agreements that clearly identify areas of coordination and the division of transportation planning responsibilities among the MPOs.
(f) Nothing in this subpart shall be deemed to prohibit an MPO from using the staff resources of other agencies, non-profit organizations, or contractors to carry out selected elements of the metropolitan transportation planning process.

(g) An MPO designation shall remain in effect until an official redesignation has been made in accordance with this section.

(h) An existing MPO may be redesignated only by agreement between the Governor and units of general purpose local government that together represent at least 75 percent of the existing metropolitan planning area population (including the largest incorporated city, based on population, as named by the Bureau of the Census).

(i) Redesignation of an MPO serving a multistate metropolitan planning area requires agreement between the Governors of each State served by the existing MPO and units of general purpose local government that together represent at least 75 percent of the existing metropolitan planning area population (including the largest incorporated city, based on population, as named by the Bureau of the Census).

(j) For the purposes of redesignation, units of general purpose local government may be defined as elected officials from each unit of general purpose local government located within the metropolitan planning area served by the existing MPO.

(k) Redesignation of an MPO (in accordance with the provisions of this section) is required whenever the existing MPO proposes to make:

1. A substantial change in the proportion of voting members on the existing MPO representing the largest incorporated city, other units of general purpose local government served by the MPO, and the State(s); or
2. A substantial change in the decisionmaking authority or responsibility of the MPO, or in decisionmaking procedures established under MPO by-laws.

(l) The following changes to an MPO do not require a redesignation (as long as they do not trigger a substantial change as described in paragraph (k) of the section):

1. The identification of a new urbanized area (as determined by the Bureau of the Census) within an existing metropolitan planning area;
2. Adding members to the MPO that represent new units of general purpose local government resulting from expansion of the metropolitan planning area;
3. Adding members to satisfy the specific membership requirements for an MPO that serves a TMA; or
4. Periodic rotation of members representing units of general-purpose local government, as established under MPO by-laws.
Appendix 7

AMBAG 2011 Survey Results
APPENDIX C1 - AMBAG Board Surveys
Survey – Board members

1. What are three or four key policy and/or organizational issues you have observed relative to how AMBAG carries out its functions and responsibilities?

Collaboration:
- AMBAG policies in maintaining good working relationships with outside organizations, both public and private appear to be very good.
- Work on regional coordination.
- Lack of cooperation with other entities on grant planning. AMBAG has a reputation for a “go it alone” attitude that has cost the region some grant opportunities as well as caused hard feelings by competing with others for the same dollars rather than working together.

Communication:
- Work on regional communication. (6)
- AMBAG should develop a strong communication/information process via an e-mail newsletter and send to all board members. (2)

Lack of Leadership:
- Too much done “behind the scenes”.
- Need an effective leader (Ex Director) of the organization in the future
- Previous E.D. appears to have alienated people inside and outside the organization.
- Failure to demand and receive high quality staff work.

Finances/Operating Expenses:
- Funding appears to be a constant issue.
- Need to be clearer about how funding is tied to reimbursements

Staff Performance/Training:
- Reputation for less-than-stellar work product. (4)
- Staff seems unclear on their role. One example experience is the SB375 Regional Advisory Committee. The staff work was terrible, unfocused and confused. Board members needed to “reinvent” the process which resulted in delays. I do not know the staff background as to why this particular process was so poor, it seems to me to indicate the lack of clear direction and leadership from the CAO, which is understandable since he was in the process of leaving. (2)
- Staff presentations should be brief and too the point.
- Budget presentations are lacking—no budget message, lack of PowerPoint’s and graphics, too technical and need to tell a budget story not just a bunch of numbers
- The AMBAG Board is an action board with the responsibility to provide leadership, policy direction and financial accountability for AMBAG. In order to carry out these responsibilities, the AMBAG Board needs strong and focused staff work. It is my observation and with my experience on other boards that AMBAG has not had the quality of staff work that serves the Board well.
- At times, financial staff seemed at odds with the CAO which led to the Board’s inability to fulfill their fiduciary responsibility.
- Lack of professional staff reports, well written and well presented
- Too much attention paid to getting grants to keep staff paid rather than to serving the region.

Duplication of Services:
- There seems to be duplication of transportation work. (6)
• Competition from other agencies for limited fiscal resources. (3)

Mission/Vision/Regional Role:
• Lack of coherent vision of the role of AMBAG. (2)

Organization Structure:
• Board too large for effective communications—may even be some overlap.
• Pass-through contracts with the two transportation agencies must be eliminated and brought in-house.
• Need more Board committees and keep the Ex Committee to smaller size as it is now.
• Board packets are delivered too late and that is a poor practice by staff.
• The Board agenda also seemed full of “educational” items rather than action items.
• I believe a strong Executive Committee structure is a weakness of the agency. I believe that issues are clear and board members are experienced enough that the Board should be acting as a committee of the whole. Certainly there is a role for the Chair of the Board, but I feel all discussion and deliberation should take place in front of the Board as a whole.

Miscellaneous:
• A lack of trust that AMBAG won’t (again) “gang up” on a jurisdiction and damage it.
• A project like the Sanctuary (being a balanced regional forum for discussion of Sanctuary issues) fits a regional role but doesn’t make money

2. What three actions would you take to improve how AMBAG functions?

Collaboration:
• AMBAG should strengthen its role as the MPO for the tri-county area.
• AMBAG needs to show that it provides feasible and valuable services to the region that are not available to obtain from other agencies or it should be realigned.

Communication:
• Outreach to partner agencies on a regular basis (regularly scheduled meetings, agendas, agreements) through technical staff committees, CEO to CEO and President/CEO with Presidents and CEOs of other organizations like RTC’s Air District. (4)

Finances/Operating Expenses:
• Explore alternative funding streams.

Staff Performance/Training:
• Staff training on presentations
• Improve readability of budget and budget presentations
• Explore contracting out all or part of AMBAG overhead functions—at the minimum accounting
• Need to do cash flow analysis and better communicate fiscal position of AMBAG

Mission/Vision/Regional Role:
• Update the vision, mission, and organizational culture.

Organization Structure:
• Email newsletter with up to date information on grants/programs. The info should include upcoming action items and related information, as well as, actions taken by the Board. (4)
• If AMBAG is going to continue to exist, it will need a skillful permanent executive director who can work closely with the AMBAG Board and work closely with AMBAG staff to meet the goals of organization. (2)
• need to better inform Board of Executive Committee actions
• work on sending out more understandable Board packets
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3. What three suggestions do you have for improving Board meetings?

Board Meetings:
- The Board meetings are run very efficiently. (2)
- The Board meeting should allow for the Board to see the public.
- The meetings should not last for more than three hours
- Stay on the subject (both board members and staff)
- Provide food, other than cookies and water. We ask Board members to come to dinner time meetings and many drive an hour each way. Board members don't have time to get dinner before the meeting and they often run until 9 p.m. Some small sandwiches or something like that. Nothing elaborate or expensive.

Agenda/Items/Staff Reports:
- Give time to review reports - Blueprint was a last minute item where there wasn’t sufficient time for Board members to read
- Clear and full financial reporting.
- Staff should be conscious of bureaucratic language that can be difficult to understand for inexperienced council members.
- Agenda items should be sent via e-mail and in hard copy at least five days prior to the meeting
- Make the agenda and staff reports more transparent about the real issues at stake.
- Streamline packets-number pages (staff should analyze packets from the perspective of elected, lay-Board members)
- Keep the focus on important issues when discussing the Sanctuary.
- Better staff work preparing for Board meetings.
- An agenda that reflects the Board’s responsibility as an action board.

Presentations:
- Coach staff so their presentations are consistent with printed material, highlights important areas for discussion/direction, and frame the information to encourage substantive board interaction.
- Brevity by staff, eliminate technical jargon, be prepared, 5-10 minute presentations max, Presentations should also be staggered and not brought in all at once.

Team Building:
- Team building meetings of board members- barbecue is a great way in Corralitos. (2)

4. What three or four issues do you believe have prompted questions about dissolving AMBAG or significantly reducing its role in the region?

Duplication/Streamline/efficiency:
- Transportation planning funds in a tight economic time. (5)
- There is likely some "duplicity" that should be looked at. Streamlined, within reason and without driving AMBAG
out of business.
- AMBAG is duplicating other work and services in our communities, such as AB 375 which is on AMBAG’s agenda as well as other jurisdictions and other regional agencies such as the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District.
- Some individuals are not pro regional planning.
- Is there duplications, e.g. Energy Watch.

Lack of Leadership:
- AMBAG’s leadership, specifically its executive director and the lack of communication with partnering agencies and board members. (5)
- Previous leadership did not communicate with the Board the negative encounters with TAMC’s director and AMBAG cannot solve issues/problems unless they are brought forward.
- Previous E.D.’s unfortunate, alienating style.
- Involvement in a real estate venture without having the proper expertise.
- Poor financial management.
- Poor staff management and low productivity.
- Some folks have strong opinions about AMBAG, Regional Government, etc. The change in leadership at AMBAG helped to prompt these discussions.

Lack of Value/Effectiveness:
- A lack of confidence that AMBAG is serving a valuable role in the region.
- Lack of understanding of what AMBAG does (need brief monthly or bimonthly updates that Board members (who are the leaders of the organization) can distribute to fellow elected officials with their names on it—something readable and substantive that serve as written documents for updating their respective councils and boards.
- Some groups do not understand how important it is to have a regional agency have oversight when local decisions are being made for roads and housing that effect the entire area.

Financial Instability:
- Financial constraints dictate looking at various operations including AMBAG (3)

Staff Performance:
- A lack of trust and a lack of confidence in AMBAG staff.
- The Blueprint was a contentious regional issue.
- AMBAG needs to focus on explaining projects in the context of adopted regional goals

Lack of Coordination/Collaboration/Communication:
- AMBAG should dialogue and keep closer / tighter relationships with other organizations that depend on it’s data, planning, etc...

Organization Structure
- There is also a concern that AMBAG is politically weighted in favor of other jurisdictions.
- The old anger in Santa Cruz County over AMBAG’s role in allocation of Regional Housing Needs Allowance numbers. Years ago (7 or 8 I think), the Monterey County members of the AMBAG board outvoted the Santa Cruz County members and forced higher housing numbers on SCC, in spite of an agreement worked out in a technical task force.

5. Are there issues, policies, activities or additional regional services that you would like to see addressed in the AMBAG report to the Board about the future role of AMBAG

Regional Role:
- It is imperative that AMBAG, who was instrumental in the development of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, remain a key player in the organizations decision making via the Sanctuary Advisory Committee and
provide letters of issues to our congressional delegates. (3)
- Regional approaches to facets of public safety. (2)
- Look at homelessness on a regional basis—feds would like regional approaches and there may be funding to support it.
- Vanpool operation good example of a regional benefit
- Expansion of AMBAGs functions by working to assist agencies who would like to merge Public safety, e.g., police/fire.
- Pacific Grove has been attempting to get parking meters in its jurisdiction; however, it has been stymied by the Coastal Commission. Perhaps we can assist this jurisdiction with this particular item.
- More information should be made available on ways to reduce PG&E usage to smaller locals who may not be using energy as efficiently as possible.
- I think AMBAG is the right organization to play a leadership role in coordinating and facilitating climate change strategies in the region – beyond transportation-land-use as envisioned by SB375.
- Regional approaches to other services such as public works, parks and recreation, etc.

Organization Structure:
- MOU with RTPAs should be eliminated
- Review activities that aren’t critical and may be single county only—need to carefully evaluate functions
- Need to engage Board in a way that helps to connect them interpersonally because AMBAG as a forum allows for rare occasions to connect a broad base of elected officials around common regional interests

Collaboration/Communication:
- AMBAG should communicate the importance of bringing monies into the region via grants.

Finances/Operating Expenses:
- AMBAG may consider “contracting” some of its planning services to smaller jurisdictions / cities.

Miscellaneous:
- How much money can be saved by the member agencies by eliminating AMBAG and how easily can this be accomplished?
- I think the non-profit end of AMBAG has all kinds of potential. Grants, fundraising, etc...People could fall in love with some of its programs.
- an honest, thorough and complete analysis of AMBAG that covers its history, its legal requirements, the options for the region and the advantages and disadvantages of keeping AMBAG.

6. Do you feel you have a good understanding of the mission, functions, programs, projects and benefits to members of AMBAG? If not, what would you do to improve the overall messaging and public information regarding AMBAG and its direct benefits to member agencies?

Yes:
- I have a good understanding of the mission, functions, programs, projects and benefits to the member of AMBAG. (7)
- Yes but I’d appreciate a concise way to promote that message.
- Yes, I think that I do but I think that clearer information about how AMBAG benefits the region and the member agencies should be looked at if the decision is to retain AMBAG.
- Yes but work on sending out a bi-weekly report and keep refining it

No:
- All members must be educated and provided vital information regarding the organizations mission, functions,
programs/projects and benefits on a regular basis. (3)

- Ex Director needs to emphasize explaining programs and regional benefits of those programs to Board members and public.
- One-on-one orientations should be given to new Board members along with a Board member informational packet.

7. Are there any other key issues or points you would like to add that are germane to the review of the role and functions of AMBAG in the region?

AMBAG Should Focus on:

- AMBAG came into being with a real advocacy role. I’d like to see us be able to re-capture that spirit — and deliver!
- We need to make appropriate changes in how AMBAG communicates and to focus on keeping that avenue open at all times to all member agencies and non-member agencies, along with partner agencies. (3)
- Need a sustainable financial model that eliminates any duplication and allows addressing important regional issues. (2)
- Elected officials need to understand that the direction in Sacramento and Washington is not for less regionalism but for more in terms of delivering coordinated programs
- There is a really good Board now and needs staff performance, particularly at the Ex Director and management level, to match that
- AMBAG and the MBUAPCD had some overlapping roles that should be looked at.
- AMBAG should move its offices to “live” with one of the other coordinating organizations. I would like to recommend the Regional Air Board. They own their office and have plenty of room. There could be some “shared” overhead as well.
- It might be helpful to have information on which entities would take on which AMBAG functions in the event that AMBAG doesn’t continue, and information about the potential challenges and/or opportunities that would be presented.
- How do we save money for the Jurisdiction by collaborating on regional issues that will help our municipalities be more efficient?
APPENDIX C2- Managers and Administrators Surveys

Survey – Managers and Administrators

1. What are three or four key policy and/or organizational issues you have observed relative to how AMBAG carries out its functions and responsibilities?

Collaboration:
- Agency needs to collaborate more with other agencies and let them lead on some projects (3)
- The Agency needs to allow time for collaborative activities, which includes being willing to make changes to a given approach, committee or activity. (2)
- Need collaboration on a continuing basis by defining goals, roles, scope, budget, timelines, and deliverables of projects ahead of time.
- Coordination and communication with regional transportation agencies could be improved. An example of where communication failed is the CaVANS agricultural van pool program.

Communication:
- Communication is spotty at best, loops are not closed and follow-up is poor. (2)
- Effective municipal communication to avoid duplication through consolidation or shared infrastructure governance.

Follow-up:
- There is a lack of follow-through by AMBAG. (4)
- Projects start, workshops are held, and then the project disappears.

Finances/Operating Expenses:
- Rumblings about the financial stability of the organization are worrisome. (3)
- Gets funding without clear idea of how it addresses an AMBAG work program (2)
- Financial viability of current organization
- Reduce operating expenses to match funding or shift activities to other agencies.
- Agency takes on financial obligations and has a level of staffing that it cannot afford and relies on other agencies to provide loans or matching funds
- AMBAG appears to chase funds and thus wastes a lot of energy and/or misses regional opportunities that would really make a difference.
- I have observed AMBAG seek out grant funding that does not seem to clearly relate to the mission of AMBAG. After the grant is received, cities are then asked to undertake significant work to allow AMBAG to fulfill the grant requirements.

Staff Performance/Training:
- Performance, quality and follow up on tasks, projects and/or initiatives are inconsistent. (5)
- Improve performance such as use of transportation model by individual agencies—needs to be more user friendly. (3)
- Staff training: common basic practices—scheduling meetings, notes and minutes, follow-up communications, turnaround times to review documents.
- Turnaround time for requested information is too short; recent example, email
- Too focused on non-core functions

Duplication of Services:
- Duplication of transportation functions with RTPA’s. (4)
- Eliminate duplication or streamline and delegate some functions to other regional/local agencies. (4)
- AMBAG dilutes efforts that might be addressed by RTPA’s resulting in duplication and little value added by AMBAG
Mission/Vision/Regional Role:
- There does not appear to be any consistent direction or clearly defined role for the AMBAG. (6)
- Lack of clear and focused mission—what are regional areas versus more local concerns
- The Agency needs a unified vision that is based on more than the availability of grants.
- Mission is not clear. Is AMBAG really the right place for Energy issues? There has been mission creep and grabbing at funding to maintain the existence of the organization.

Organization Structure:
- Top management needs to be a manager and not a technician i.e. not a Planner.
- Organization seems to be “siload” instead of a team atmosphere

Miscellaneous:
- Building sustainable regional jobs and housing program as the underpinnings/basis for economic and environmental balance.
- Assuring that cross jurisdictional transportation and hydrological issues are addressed by comprehensive programs.

2. What three actions would you take to improve how AMBAG functions?

Collaboration:
- Develop collaborative models within the agency and monitor goal achievement and report regularly on progress.
- The Agency should work collaboratively with affected agencies, allowing them adequate time to provide input and being willing to make changes based on their suggestions.

Communication:
- AMBAG should communicate better to its member agencies on its projects which should include timelines and purpose of the project.
- Regional communication campaign to orient municipalities on the essential need to coordinate regional issues and implement coordinated grant and finance efforts.
- Greater input and interaction with small cities (you may have to come to us for a change!). Literally and figuratively.

Finances/Operating Expenses:
- Consider administering AMBAG on a contractual basis by another government agency to reduce o/h costs. (2)
- Make sure financing matches work program
- Be transparent with the budget and connect mission and priorities to funding
- The Agency should reduce its operating expenses to match its funding; or, if this is not possible, shift activities to other agencies with relevant expertise.
- Identify programs without funding and either delete them or find specific funding sources

Staff Performance/Training:
- Improve the quality of the staff. (3)
- Ensure staff has adequate training and tools to provide essential MPO activities.
- Restructure staffing to be a stronger professional core accessing regional consultant support for programs.
- Focus resources and personnel only on those activities required of the MPO.
- Work on organization team expectations instead of individual performance.
- Counsel staff on scheduling of work and lead times needed to get response from outside agencies.

Duplication of Services:
- The Agency should have a strategic vision that guides its activities, that does not take on the activities that more appropriately rest with other agencies. (4)
- Discontinue pursuing non MPO essential activities. (2)
- Establish partnerships for improving competitiveness for economic/business opportunities and state/federal support programs.

**Mission/Vision/Regional Role:**
- Define purpose and mission of AMBAG and ensure it is providing the desired function(s). (2)
- Define a clear role and expectations

**Organization Structure:**
- Disband the organization and divide up the duties to TAMC and other. (3)
- Hire an Executive Director with proven leadership skills and public fiscal management knowledge and capacity and experience to develop staff. (3)
- Take the organization under management of another organization.
- Farm out the functions to other entities and keep the political structure intact.

**Miscellaneous:**
- Priorities shift with individual Board member interest and grant funding availability.
- Priorities and funding need to be explicitly agreed to by Board, staff and agencies.

**3. What three suggestions do you have for improving Board meetings?**

**Board Meetings:**
- Need for public comment on each Board item and microphone and location for public comment (2)
- maximum time for public comment
- Establish policies and procedures for how items are introduced and/or discussed at the meeting
- The Board meetings should be shorter and more focused. Board meetings should focus on the core mission of AMBAG. Subcommittees should be established to address projects that are not of general interest to the entire Board.
- Add concise three sentence introductory summaries of each agenda Item.
- Establish an expectation and/or procedure to eliminate and/or at the least minimize the discussion of items not relevant to the majority of the member agencies (the sanctuary comes to mind).

**Agenda/Items/Staff Reports:**
- Clear and concise Agenda Items.
- Clear and concise Staff Reports.
- Ensure that all stakeholders who have expressed an interest in receiving Board agenda receive the agenda in a timely fashion.

**Presentations:**
- Better presentation skills by staff, slower pacing, set context of issues, minimize use of technical jargon, think before answering.
- Provide clear/concise graphic support for items.

**4. What three or four issues do you believe have prompted questions about dissolving AMBAG or significantly reducing its role in the region?**

**Duplication/Streamline/Efficiency:**
- TAMC's aggressive approach to a hostile takeover.
- Perceived duplication of effort between AMBAG and other regional transportation planning agencies and public transit operators. (4)
Streamlining planning and programming of federal and state transportation funding
AMBAG takes on single county activities.
Overlap of MPO and RTPA work.
The Agency takes on single county activities that would more properly be referred to other agencies.
Regional efforts to consolidate work and obligations led to discussions about the need for all agencies and whether some could be eliminated.

**Lack of Leadership:**
- Opportunity created by the vacancy at the top. In an environment where all agencies are looking at ways to reduce cost, eliminate redundancies and/or consolidate functions it presents a good opportunity for AMBAG to do the same. (3)
- Proposal by former Ex Director to shift funding from RTPA’s to AMBAG
- Lack of communication between AMBAG Executive director and other stakeholders.

**Lack of Value/Effectiveness:**
- Lack of understanding of the need and value of functions AMBAG performs. (2)
- Inability to show value to the projects beyond pass through.
- Is AMBAG really necessary?
- Increase the efficiency and cost effectiveness of government services.
- Inability to show effectiveness.

**Financial Instability:**
- Financial instabilities requiring loans and in-kind matches to “stay afloat” (2)
- Budget and inadequate funding levels and duplication.
- Ongoing problems AMBAG has had with administration of Federal funds and compliance with federal regulations.
- Financial viability of the Agency.
- Failure to pay debts and obligations.
- Other agency funding issues surfacing questions about reducing contributions and participation in AMBAG functions.

**Staff Performance:**
- Insufficient investment and upkeep in the regional transportation forecast model which has increased project costs (4)
- Some work lacks substance and does not really benefit the region
- Not clearly stating when Board approval in needed, and not clearly having agreement on funding arrangements but purporting that AMBAG had such commitments
- Poor quality and follow through on some projects
- Improve the quality of work product produced by AMBAG.

**Lack of Coordination/Collaboration/Communication:**
- Improve active collaboration (2)
- More effective communication and coordination with partner agencies.
- Lack of coordination with other entities in the region who are expected to help fund and do work on AMBAG projects and experience in dealing with certain issues

5. **Are there issues, policies, activities or additional regional services that you would**
like to see addressed in the AMBAG report to the Board about the future role of AMBAG

Regional Role:
- With respect to public transit operators, I would like to see if AMBAG can be relieved of the role as designated recipient for federal funds and have this responsibility passed to public transit operators. This would relieve AMBAG of administrative duties already being performed by MST, and METRO. AMBAG as MPO would still retain responsibility to perform MTIP and provide concurrence on programs of projects, etc. but the administration of supplemental agreements and other aspects of federal grant administration could be handled directly by the transit operators. This would require an action by the Governor’s office to change the designated recipient status from AMBAG to MST/METRO/San Benito LTA.
- I would like to see an analysis of the minimum requirements that are required by metropolitan planning agencies.
- AMBAG should think twice about engaging activities that would be better suited to other, existing agencies.
- Define a clear role for the Agency.

Organization Structure:
- The Board should definitely hold off on hiring a new Executive Director!
- Have a Board retreat and agree upon a mission and goals and structure of the organization.

Duplication:
- Is the Agency duplicating services?

Collaboration:
- When it takes on a multi-agency activity, it needs to be more collaborative: asking for input from other agencies, making changes based on that input, and involving other agencies in deciding and implementing the outcomes. (3)
- don’t add extra levels of approval or requirements
- involve agencies in making and deciding outcomes

Finances/Operating Expenses:
- Engage in activities that can be funded and live within its means (2)
- Define long term need and financial viability of the Agency.
- The future financial viability of AMBAG.
- The possibility of AMBAG contracting for administrative overhead with another agency. For example could AMBAG contract with a County, City, non-profit organization or a Special District (Air District, TAMC, SCRTC) for management and administrative overhead.

6. Do you feel you have a good understanding of the mission, functions, programs, projects and benefits to members of AMBAG? If not, what would you do to improve the overall messaging and public information regarding AMBAG and its direct benefits to member agencies?

Yes:
- Yes, it is critical that AMBAG improve its communication efforts to the public and its member agencies. (3)
- Politically astute and available Executive Director to present at City Council Meetings occasionally,
- good understanding of transportation functions but not RAPS, clearinghouse, energy watch

No:
- Members of the public may not understand the difference between what AMBAG does and what the single county transportation agencies do, especially when there is a certain amount of overlap or AMBAG engages in single county activities. This is one reason why consolidating transportation planning functions within a single county agency would be beneficial. (4)
- Board and public lack understanding of AMBAG's role
- No. I tried to reach out to the previous director, had a long sit down meeting with him 2 years ago, asked to be invited to meetings that I thought our agencies should partner with and never hear back from my multiple emails and phone calls.
- ABSOLUTELY NOT

7. Are there any other key issues or points you would like to add that are germane to the review of the role and functions of AMBAG in the region?

AMBAG Accomplishments:
- Has accessed population estimates of AMBAG over the years, which were of value.
- The Economic Forum was informative, but others may have stepped in to provide that role.
- Doing a good job in planning regional sustainable communities strategy

AMBAG Should Focus on:
- Work on collaboration with RTPA's and transit agencies. (3)
- AMBAG also applies for "regional" grants but doesn't get the support of related agencies ahead of time. The focus appears to be on getting the grant money, rather than determining which projects are best suited to AMBAG—this self-focus is frustrating for other agencies. (2)
- AMBAG needs to offer expertise, funding or other benefits if it wants to be an effective regional organization.
- Work on building confidence in leading and developing programs and projects
- Board needs to seriously address stabilizing the fiscal viability of AMBAG if it is to continue in multi-county MPO role or strong regional presence and capable performance by AMBAG will not occur
- If AMBAG wants to be turned to as a regional leader, then it needs to offer expertise, confidence, funding or other benefits in order to earn that role. Instead, AMBAG asks for these from other agencies, and it is unclear what it offers in exchange.
- In order to be a regional leader, AMBAG needs to develop a reputation for being reliable, professional, efficient, and willing to take on various responsibilities, even small ones.
- Review the role of AMBAG and programs or services compared to the Transportation Agencies and other countywide or regional agencies.
- You hired the Interim Executive Director for a reason, let him do his job and take his suggestions very seriously!
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The Future of AMBAG, Executive Summary
MEMORANDUM

TO: AMBAG Board of Directors
FROM: Les White, Interim Executive Director
SUBJECT: Future of AMBAG Report
MEETING DATE: September 14, 2011

Attached is the report regarding the Future of AMBAG. It is submitted as two separate documents: The first document includes a Table of Contents, Executive Summary, Methodology and the body of the report with recommendations. The second document of appendices includes all the memorandum, articles and studies staff referred to in preparing the report. This second document is lengthy but is a fairly comprehensive and provides a good snapshot of key reference material.

It is proposed that the Board of Directors review this material, receive a PowerPoint presentation at the September 14, 2011 Board of Directors meeting, hear public comments and ask questions of staff. In view of all the material, I would then suggest that additional questions be given to the AMBAG staff in writing a week later (by September 23), so we can prepare a Q and A report and give it to the Board prior to the October 12 Board meeting. I would recommend that the Board take action on the recommendations (or direct alternative courses of action) at the October Board meeting.

We have provided specific recommendations to give a clear focus to what AMBAG staff and I believe are important points to consider in effectively addressing the key issues in the report of duplication of efforts, financial considerations, the Regional Travel Demand Model and AMBAG performance issues.

I believe it is extremely important that a decision be made, in October, with some finality so that disruption to work efforts will be minimized and achieving the best work products can occur. Having an effective, focused AMBAG will ensure employee effectiveness, minimize staff turnover and positively affect staff performance.

I further believe that most of the issues can be resolved by continuing to focus on the issues and concerns mentioned in the surveys of Board members, managers and administrators. The structure doesn’t need to change to resolve most of the substantive issues by Board members, city managers and administrators.

In that regard the Future of AMBAG report sets forth three scenarios. After analyzing those three scenarios, I do not see a compelling argument for significantly changing the
structure of the agency. In many respects it can be concluded that those types of changes proposed by other agencies would be disruptive to current programs, effective relations with state and federal officials and not yield the time and cost savings alluded to in various agency reports.

Certainly, though, there is plenty of room for improving performance as suggested by a number of local government representatives. Thus, there needs to be a number of areas of improvement in communications, collaboration, front-end coordination with RTPAs, as well as other local and regional agencies. AMBAG staff is currently working on all of those and making very good progress.

As it relates to recommendations, those proposed in the report are repeated below:

1. Retain AMBAG in its current form as a regional COG and MPO.

2. Direct staff to identify and address any and all performance related issues going forward.

3. Direct staff to modify the MOU between AMBAG and the RTPAs in order to better fund the Regional Transportation Demand Model and avoid any duplication of transportation planning efforts with a target of retaining half of the current pass through PL funds for specified functions. While the total dollar amount withheld is important, the Board may look at passing through more of the PL in exchange, for other RTPA funds. As non-federal dollars, those RTPA funds could be used to support match requirements for AMBAG grants.

4. Improve coordination and collaboration throughout the region by:
   • conducting regular regional technical committee meetings
   • allowing other agencies ex-officio status on the AMBAG Board of Directors
   • holding periodic joint executive committee meetings
   • identifying specific areas of duplication and strategies for addressing those issues

We look forward to a positive and forthright discussion of this report and the many other reports that have been provided to various boards.

APPROVED-BY:

Les White, Interim Executive Director
Future of AMBAG Report

September 14, 2011

Prepared by
The Staff of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
Executive Summary

Recently there has been a great deal of discussion around the structure of transportation planning agencies in the tri-county metropolitan planning region. Most of this discussion has centered on the dissolution of AMBAG as the federally-designated regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), serving 18 cities and 3 counties, in favor of re-designating TAMC and SCCRTC as single-county MPOs. With the associated loss of federal funding, this would necessarily result in the dissolution of AMBAG as it is structured and operates today. The goals of such a restructuring, as written in TAMC memos, “would be to improve cost effectiveness by removing duplication of efforts across agencies and increasing investment in the regional transportation model.” In subsequent Board and Executive Committee memos at TAMC, SCCRTC, and SBtCOG, many statements have been made regarding AMBAG staff performance and lack of regional coordination, financial concerns regarding cash flow at AMBAG, and the effectiveness of and lack of funding for the Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM).

This discussion must be understood in context of the unique structure of transportation planning in this region.

AMBAG is the only region in California in which the MPO is not also an RTPA. Combined with the MOUs between AMBAG and the region’s RTPAs, under which AMBAG passes through approximately $500,000 of federal funding annually allocated to support AMBAG’s transportation programs and related activities, this arrangement exacerbates revenue issues for AMBAG. Similarly, this large sum of federal dollars passed through by AMBAG siphons away funding that could otherwise be used to make the much needed investment in model improvements recommended by peer review experts which the RTPAs state has resulted in a less than satisfactory model. Furthermore, if the RTPAs are concerned about funding for the model, then providing additional funds would meet their often stated concern about achieving an improved model. In fact, as can be seen in the main report following this summary, the RTPAs have programmed the vast majority of federal funds passed through AMBAG for work elements that AMBAG is *federally mandated* to carry out in areas that then are cast as “duplication of efforts” and cited as a rationale for AMBAG’s dissolution. In other words, the RTPAs are not investing in the model, as they indicate is important; rather, the RTPAs put federal dollars in elements that there are state funds to use which, in part, may duplicate AMBAG’s existing and mandatory efforts.

The scenario proposed by the RTPAs would eliminate AMBAG as the tri-county regional MPO in favor of smaller, single-county MPOs. Financially, the region would experience a net loss of $215,557 (this amount fluctuates based on annual apportionments) in transportation planning funding, based on the differential between federal funding gained and state funding lost. By shifting transportation planning away from a regional model, the tri-county region would also be taking a step in the opposite direction of both federal and state trends. Draft Surface Transportation Reauthorization bills at the federal level have contained provisions to increase the threshold for populations served by an MPO, and on a state level, SB 375, RHNA, and the Regional Travel Demand Model requirements all strongly imply the need for transportation planning to be done at a regional scale. Local commute patterns in our region very clearly form a tri-county commute shed, and transportation projects implemented in each county directly impact transportation system of each adjacent county. When applying for competitive funds, a collective regional body which aggregates multiple counties is in a better position to obtain these funds than single-county agencies, which would be competing against each other for funding. Significantly, the memoranda advocating single-county MPOs (see Appendix items E and F) spend considerable time explaining all the various approaches that may be necessary to achieve regional coordination under single-county MPOs.

Removing AMBAG as the regional MPO will also not yield the promised savings to taxpayers. Rather, it would result in a net loss in transportation funding for the region while redistributing $681,000 of flexible state RPA dollars to other regions in California according to Caltrans. In discussions at both TAMC and SCCRTC, this
has been framed as “taxpayer savings”, however it must be understood that if these dollars are not spent in this region, then according to Caltrans officials, they will be spent in other regions, as the total funding allocated at the state level does not change based on the number of recipients. Thus, taxpayers in this region would actually see their tax dollars spent in every California region except their own. In fact, if the goals are to improve cost effectiveness by removing duplication of efforts across agencies and increasing investment in the regional transportation model, the most efficient way to do this would be to consolidate the region’s transportation planning into one single agency that is both the regional MPO and RTPA (as is the case in nearly every other region in California). This would consolidate not one, but three executive directors and administrative staff, thereby removing the potential for duplication of efforts, and increasing funding for the RTDM while maximizing cost savings to taxpayers.

While there has been some discussion around the savings to individual jurisdictions from no longer paying AMBAG dues, it should be noted that the annual cost savings to member jurisdictions, their residents, school districts, and hospitality industries resulting from energy efficiency projects funded by AMBAG’s Energy Watch program alone are greater than five years of member dues. When added to the $20 million in energy efficiency funding which AMBAG has brought to the region since 2006, one could conclude that just this single program offsets member dues many times over. In addition, other projects, such as, aerial photography, regional housing needs allocations, population and employment forecasting and GIS information have provided measurable benefits to member agencies.

AMBAG is clearly not without room for performance improvement. There have been a number of issues in recent years regarding coordination with regional partners and communication with affected agencies as well as with the AMBAG Board of Directors. While the dissolution of AMBAG as the regional MPO does not actually achieve the goals set out by other regional agencies, it is clear that moving forward in a “business as usual” manner is not acceptable. Through both staff and the Board of Directors, AMBAG will need to redefine and improve its relationships with other transportation agencies and regional stakeholders in order to improve coordination, cooperation, and performance. Through a survey of AMBAG board members as well as managers/administrators (see Appendix B) the agency is identifying areas of improvement and exploring and implementing solutions. It should be the new AMBAG Executive Director’s first and highest priority to reform and reestablish positive working relationships with the RTPAs, other regional agencies and local government jurisdictions in the region to alleviate any duplication of efforts and ensure increased sustainable funding for a robust and greatly improved regional traffic model.

AMBAG has existed for 43 years as a forum for regional collaboration and cooperation. Locally elected representatives have identified AMBAG as the best agency to address regional concerns through programs such as transportation planning, Blueprint Planning, Sustainable Communities Strategy, Regional Housing Needs Allocation, population and economic forecasting, providing support to the Pajaro River Watershed Flood Prevention Authority, facilitating discussion of Monterey Bay Sanctuary programs and issues, the Central Coast Joint Data Committee, Energy Watch, Commute Alternatives, Environmental Clearinghouse, and others. There were and are very good reasons for these programs to be carried out by AMBAG as a regional body. To disband the organization and lose some, if not all, of these programs when there are more effective ways of achieving the goals set out by TAMC and SCCRTC would be contrary to trends towards more, not less, regional coordination and collaboration.
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Letter from TAMC to AMBAG regarding The Future of AMBAG recommendation

September 14, 2011

Stephany Aguilar, Chair
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
445 Reservation Road, Suite G
P.O. Box 809
Marina, CA 93933

Re: Future of AMBAG Report

Dear Chair Aguilar:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Future of AMBAG Report by your Interim Executive Director Les White. It is a most difficult issue for an agency to reevaluate its future and its ultimate existence, and I appreciate the effort that Mr. White and the AMBAG staff have made in this report. I would like to make four primary observations on its conclusions:

- The report underestimates the benefits of the single-county MPO structure. Such a structure would both be more cost-effective and increase local control as compared to the recommended "strengthen AMBAG" option. The single-county scenario would reduce spending of taxpayer funds (regardless of who enjoys the savings, it requires less money), increase the investment in the travel forecast model, remove a middleman in the federal approval process and reduce duplication of efforts on planning and programming documents—these changes are the very definition of improved cost-effectiveness.

- The report's recommended option would create a funding structure that is less cost-effective and reduces local control. The proposed option would take $250,000 away from the single county transportation planning agencies to invest in the travel forecast model. However, the report does not indicate who would perform the federally-funded activities that the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the San Benito Council of Governments currently perform: project selection and programming, long-term planning, outreach to the public, elderly and disabled transportation oversight. If AMBAG is to perform these functions, it would mean decision-making would move from the countywide to the tri-county governing body—essentially a loss of local control. If not, then other local or state monies would be required to perform these functions; essentially this proposal would cost more. Furthermore, it is unclear how AMBAG would match these new federal funds in the long-term, since over the past several years the countywide transportation agencies have provided that non-federal match. The proposal that agencies could "buy back" the federal money that they currently receive with existing state or local funds would result in paying more money for the same services that could be provided on a less costly basis under the single-county MPO option.
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- **The survey results point to issues of both performance and agency structure.** The results of the survey are valuable and revealing. It is clear that some of the observations relate to performance issues (coordination, clarity, focus) while other issues are more structural (financial stability, grants vs. mission and duplication of efforts). While performance issues can be addressed within the organization, structural issues require more dramatic changes. The ongoing funding and grant issues likely relate to the fact that this is the smallest multi-county MPO region in California and federal funding is simply inadequate to support the current structure.

- **There appears to be strong support for some kind of regional deliberative body.** As the San Joaquin Valley regional transportation planning agencies’ agreement shows, this regional body can involve policymakers but does not require a separate agency executive director, staff and offices. It will require more cooperation for such a multi-agency body to operate, but if such a body includes appointees from the countywide regional transportation planning agencies, its activities may result in even better coordinated activities than do separate appointees to a separate agency.

Improving transportation planning in our region is a complex issue that will take a while to evaluate and could involve an extensive transition process. The TMC Board of Directors requests that the Executive Committees of AMBAG, Santa Cruz County RTC and San Benito COG join with TMC’s representatives to discuss how to proceed with this issue before making a decision. I would ask that you accept this invitation and direct your Interim Executive Director work with our agencies to arrange such a meeting. In addition, given its pivotal role in the MPO structure, the City of Salinas has requested a presentation on this issue prior to your next Board meeting. I hope that Mr. White can join me in making that presentation, as well as be available to present his report to the TMC Board on September 28.

I appreciate the time that AMBAG has taken to study the options, and would hope that you would continue to delay recruitment of a permanent Executive Director until a resolution can be reached. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Debra L. Hale  
Executive Director

cc: TMC Board of Directors  
    George Dondero, SCCRTC  
    Lisa Rheinheimer, San Benito COG
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Recap from Joint Executive Committee Meeting – October 6th
AMBAG/TAMC/SCCRTC/SBtCOG

· Perspectives regarding AMBAG
  Recap of main issues:
  1. Collaboration
  2. Client oriented
  3. Value added to all
  4. Clear focus
  5. Duplication of work
  6. Consistency of work quality
  7. Efficiency
  8. Pass-thru $$
  9. Weighted vote

· Performance Improvement
  Communication-
  1. Explain value added of work & how AMBAG can be a better resource
  2. Newsletter should continue
  3. Distribute document w/ staff, phone numbers and who does what
  4. AMBAG staff should attend City Council meetings on rotation basis
  5. Look into possible Board member overlap between agencies
  6. Communication needs to be a two way street and there should be more staff to
    staff communication
  Collaboration-
  1. Look into having ex-officio Board members
  2. Facilitate on sharing services, consulting, reports, retreats, training.

· Other topics of Interest or Focus
  Recap of main issues:
  1. Grants (especially w/ smaller cities)
  2. Explore changing role of local government
  3. Volunteer efforts/fundraising
  4. How measure productivity?
  5. TAMC/RTC/COG as clients
  6. Local control, regional cooperation
  7. How sustainable is AMBAG?
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Letter from TAMC to AMBAG regarding Future Coordination of Efforts

October 31, 2011

Les White
Interim Executive Director
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
445 Reservation Road, Suite G
P.O. Box 809
Marina, CA 93933

RE: Future of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)

Dear Mr. White,

On behalf of the staff of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, I am writing to reassure you that we intend to work collaboratively with the Association staff and Board to help you achieve the goals set at your October 12, 2011 Board meeting and at the joint meeting of our Executive Committees, including:

- Reducing duplication of efforts,
- Enhancing the quality and long-term effectiveness of the regional travel forecast model and pursuing funding for improvements, and,
- Improving collaboration and communications among the four transportation planning agencies in the region.

Thank you for meeting with me and George Donders of Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission last week to develop a workplan for carrying out this process. I will be reporting to our Board of Directors on this process at our December 7 meeting and will recommend that they formally direct staff to continue these efforts. Meanwhile, I look forward to working with you and our tri-county partners on this continuous improvement effort.

Sincerely,

Debra L. Hale
Executive Director

cc: Transportation Agency for Monterey County Board of Directors and staff