

San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies' Directors' Committee

c/o Madera County Transportation Commission – 2001 Howard Road, Suite 201 – Madera, CA 93637
Phone: 559-675-0721 – FAX: 559-675-9328



**Madera County
Transportation
Commission**
Patricia Taylor
Chair

**Kings County
Association of
Governments**
Terri King
Vice Chair

**Fresno
Council of
Governments**
Tony Boren

**Kern
Council of
Governments**
Ahron Hakimi

**Merced County
Association of
Governments**
Marjie Kirn (Interim)

**San Joaquin
Council of
Governments**
Andrew Chesley

**Stanislaus
Council of
Governments**
Carlos Yamzon

**Tulare County
Association of
Governments**
Ted Smalley

Meeting Agenda Thursday, January 3, 2013 Time: 10:00 a.m.

Meeting Location:
Fresno Council of Governments
2035 Tulare Street, Suite 201
Fresno, California 93721

Toll Free Number: 1-800-325-1307
Participant Code: 243245

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. December 4, 2012 Directors' Meeting (*enclosure*)

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

2. Regional Governance for San Joaquin Valley Rail Service (11 AM)
Guest Speaker Kome Ajise, Caltrans Deputy Director for Planning and Modal Programs, will discuss the State Rail Plan and other matters related to passenger rail service.
3. FTIP/Air Quality
2012 PM2.5 Plan Status Report C. Anderson
4. SB 375 GHG Targets for the San Joaquin Valley
Update and Discussion of January 24, 2013 Air Resources Board meeting in Bakersfield T. Taylor
P. Taylor
5. SR 99 Bond Savings Program
Update and Discussion of Project Programming C. Yamzon
6. Valley Legislative Affairs Committee (*enclosure*)
2013 Sacramento Valley Voice Trip
Receive Update J. Findley
7. Interregional Goods Movement Plan
Receive Update. Stakeholder Advisory Meetings January 30, 2013 in Bakersfield and January 31, 2013 in Modesto. M. Sigala

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

The following items are for informational purposes and require no action or vote. A member of the public or Director may request that any informational item be “pulled” for further discussion. Written summaries of Informational Items are included in the agenda packet.

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 8. High Speed Rail | Diana Gomez |
| 9. Caltrans Directors Report | C.Bowen/S.Ehlert |
| 10. Revised 99 Business Plan | R. Ball |
| 11. Implementation of the San Joaquin Rail Authority (SB 325) | T. Smalley |
| 12. Proposition 84/Blueprint | R. Terry |
| 13. San Joaquin Valley Greenprint | C. Thompson |
| 14. California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley | S. Dabbs |
| 15. Regional Energy Planning (<i>enclosure</i>) | M. Sigala |

OTHER ITEMS

16. Director Items
17. Public Presentations for Items Not on Agenda. This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons wishing to address the Committee on items within its jurisdiction but NOT on this agenda. Unscheduled comments may be limited to three minutes.

Note: The general public may comment on listed agenda items as they are considered.

Next Directors Meeting: Thursday, February 7, 2013 (Stockton)

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Accommodations

The Fresno Council of Government's meeting rooms and restrooms are ADA accessible. Representatives or individuals with disabilities should contact Fresno COG at (559) 233-4148, at least three days in advance, to request auxiliary aids and/or translation services necessary to participate in the public meeting.

San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies' Directors' Committee

c/o Madera County Transportation Commission – 2001 Howard Road, Suite 201 – Madera, CA 93637
Phone: 559-675-0721 – FAX: 559-675-9328

ITEM 1

Meeting Location: Kern Council of Governments

**Meeting Minutes for:
Tuesday, December 4, 2012
Time: 10:00 a.m.**

Executive Minutes
Members Attending:

Terri King, KCAG
Carlos Yamzon, Stan COG
Tony Boren, Fresno COG
Ted Smalley, TCAG

Andy Chesley, SJCOG
Patricia Taylor, MCTC
Marjie Kirn, MCAG
Ahron Hakimi, Kern COG

Others:

See Appendix A for List of Others Attending

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. November 2, 2012 Directors' Meeting (*enclosure*)

Motion by Andy Chesley (SJCOG), seconded by Ted Smalley (TCAG) to approve the minutes, motion carried.

Madera County
Transportation
Commission
Patricia Taylor
Chair

Kings County
Association of
Governments
Terri King
Vice Chair

Fresno
Council of
Governments
Tony Boren

Kern
Council of
Governments
Ahron Hakimi

Merced County
Association of
Governments
Marjie Kirn (Interim)

San Joaquin
Council of
Governments
Andrew Chesley

Stanislaus
Council of
Governments
Carlos Yamzon
(interim)

Tulare County
Association of
Governments
Ted Smalley

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

2. FTIP/Air Quality 2012 PM 2.5 Plan Status Report

C. Anderson

Carrie Anderson stated that the Air District officially issued a notice to conduct a public hearing on the proposed PM 2.5 plan on December 20, 2012. The Board will consider adoption on the same day. Then the plan will go to ARB for submittal to EPA. ARB is currently anticipated to consider adoption of the plan at their January meeting. The proposed plan now includes new conformity budgets as well as documentation that has been discussed about the ARB modified methodology for recession adjustments. All of the conformity issues that had been discussed at the last meeting have been resolved. Cari reported working now on delivering updates to the '07 and '08 PM2.5 Plans second year repeat of this effort. Those updates include the same methodology being worked on with the ARB on the 2012 plan for the recession adjustment. It appears that new budgets will be needed to demonstrate conformity for the 2014 RTP assuming they will be using EMFAC 2011. They have a call with ARB the following day and will provide an update at the next meeting.

They continue to provide Congressman McCarthy's office with updates and will have a call with them on Thursday. Everyone received a letter from FHWA dated November 15, 2012 that rescinds the previous letter. With that we will continue using EMFAC 07. The EMFAC 2011 model will be required for use whenever it is approved by EPA and the grace period expires. EPA has indicated it is anticipating issuing a federal register notice approving the new model in February 2013 however the grace period has not been determined at this point in time.

Ahron Hakimi asked a question of Carrie - what's a reasonable assumption on how long the grace period will be? Carrie Anderson replied that the EPA did not discuss it at this time. It is safe to assume that we will be able to use that EMFAC 07 model for the first 6 months of next year to get through the first conformity demonstration. But then assume we will need to use the new model the second half of next year. With the budget updates that are being processed now as part of the 2012 plan, and still working on it with ARB and the District, we should have all the budgets in place that would need to do a positive conformity demonstration for your RTP in the second half of next year if we are required to use EMFAC 2011.

Ted Smalley asks if there is an advantage in our RTP process to using the 2011 EMFAC? Carrie Anderson responded by stating that she didn't know that there is an advantage, with the exception is how the MIP is set up and how the instructions and procedures are set up right now. If we have new budgets that are established with EMFAC 2011 we are going to have to use it anyway to be consistent. We will be talking to EPA about the schedule for when they will actually act on all of the new budgets.

Ted Smalley inquired for all of the planning work, we will be using EMFAC 2011, is that correct? Carrie Anderson replied yes. All the technical work in planning exercises they need to use for 2014. Staff has everything in hand right now to do that analysis with EMFAC 2011. We have provided instructions on how to get the output from the MIP and how to process and how to evaluate scenarios – for example, if there is a modified SB375 scenario the instructions are there on how you demonstrate conformity before you proceed with that scenario. They have all the tools needed to move forward with the 2014 RTP development.

No additional questions on this item.

3. SB 375 GHG Targets for the San Joaquin Valley *Update and discussion of Draft Plan*

T. Taylor

Tanisha Taylor provided a brief update since the last meeting. We did make a recommendation to maintain the five and ten percent targets. To date SJ COG, Madera, and Kings have approved the recommendation as it was written to maintain the five and ten percent targets. Fresno COG has approved the recommendation with a caveat- that they participate in the Valleywide target recommendation but are liable only for Fresno individual targets. For StanCOG, Merced and TCAG, we are anticipating their board action will occur before the December 14, 2012 Policy Council meeting. Kern COG is scheduled for Jan 17, 2013, a week before the ARB board meeting to take action on the recommendation. Next step is going to the Policy Council meeting December 14, 2012 and then on to the ARB Board on January 24th or 25th depending on which dates fall on their schedule.

Carlos Yamzon asked Tony Boren about the caveats, if they were based on a discussion at their board meeting when the item was brought up and maybe share some of that discussion with us. Tony Boren replied by stating that yes it was based on a recommendation that came from their SB 375 committee, on to the TTC, and on to the board. Basically our belief is that we are happy to participate in the Valleywide process, but we believe that we all should be responsible and accountable for our individual numbers.

Carlos Yamzon replies that they had a discussion with their city managers last week about looking at the individual county results. The north counties are doing the heavy lifting and they had some concerns along the effects of what your mentioning (Tony Boren), where the responsibly lies in terms of if you're doing so well that maybe you need higher criteria. And they are looking purely from an economic basis. We are struggling already with bringing businesses and if there is going to be more regulations and requirements there is that concern.

Lezlie Kimura added by stating that she has been attending some of the meetings and has heard the concern of what exactly is ARB going to do when they see these numbers come out. The intention from the January item, and for what they have asked of the valley when they set the targets for the first time, is just come back and tell us what your updated technical view is at this point. We will not be taking an action this January. What they are looking for is information that will help, what is going on, what is the state of the progress that you have made in the past two years.

Andrew Chesley is supportive of the Valleywide target and stated reasons why. 1) When we look at ourselves from an air quality perspective, we manage it on a Valleywide basis. We each have individual responsibilities but when it comes to meeting air quality targets we are all in this together. If San Joaquin would have a hard time to demonstrate conformity I know that I can count on the other seven MPOs for assistance if necessary to reach conformity. 2) The other part is that we are in a larger game than we are normally used to. We talked about the big four and would like to be the big five and this is the chance to get there. When you look at individual MPOs I think it is not reasonable to expect a Merced or Madera to perform in the same way as the larger MPOs in the valley. We all have a certain responsibility to each other in regards to this.

Ted Smalley stated that we have been for a while telling our boards we should precede for months with a Valleywide target. Similar to Tony's stance, we are looking to see what we can do individually to see if we can make the targets individually, but I agree with Andy and support the Valleywide target. I think there are so many reasons and expectations looking at us in the valley and I think it would be a mistake for us that we are going to regret if we do not move forward with the Valleywide target.

Carlos Yamzon stated that he wants to ensure the directors that we all have to individually go through Federal certification. And a part of that is our modeling forecasts, and that scrutiny is

there at the Federal level, those are the basis for the work in the MIP. So I can assure that Stanislaus's work in the MIP is solid. I think as a valley, we go through the same rigorous certification for all our programs and I think we demonstrated that uniformity and collectively we have met the challenges.

Patricia Taylor commented that the directors at the last meeting took the position to support the Valleywide target, and today's item was just for discussion and updates on all board actions. So for the policy council meeting we will have a report from the COG directors' recommendation of the Valleywide target of five and 10, and then we will proceed forward with the ARB presentation providing an update per ARB request on the status of where we are. Mrs. Taylor asked Tanisha and Carrie to get together subsequent to the policy council meeting to prepare a PowerPoint presentation for the ARBs meetings in January.

Ted Smalley had a technical question, as we move forward looking to make sure we have for off-model calculations as standard methodology. In Tulare we have 100,000 trips a year in van pulls in our county and I have 300,000 trips in our college COS transit programs. I assume others may have similar items but I would think that we, and ARB, would want us to have similar methodologies for how we use those for off-model assumptions. Most of us with off model improvements are going to hit the 10% for 2035. Tanisha Taylor responded by stating that we haven't tackled it yet but it is something on our list of things to do because we recognize the similarities that the valley MPOs will do but there will be differences in the methodology depending on what the strategy is. Mike Bitner of Fresno COG developed an off-model methodology that is available to those who need it and we can send it again.

Patricia Taylor had a question for Kern; I know it's not until January, what does it look like in the committee level at Kern COG. Is the Kern board supportive? Ahron Hakimi responded by stating that they will get on board but the only reason that we will abstain (at Policy Council meeting) is because the board will not be able to take action until late January. I believe the reason why our electives are on board is because they completely understand how we are joined for conformity and conformity is the bigger issue around here.

Michael Sigala asks if there is going to be a staff report next week at the policy council meeting and who will be making the presentation. Tanisha Taylor states there will be a staff report and she will be presenting that to the policy council.

4. SR 99 Bond Saving Program (enclosure)
Discuss and Approve Current Valleywide Strategy

P. Taylor

Patricia Taylor stated that some of the COG directors met with Darius a couple of weeks ago to discuss the 99 Bond Savings Program, and that there was a follow up phone call with some of the Directors, CTC, and Caltrans to review our discussions.

Carlos Yamzon mentioned that the bottom line was in reference to our letter highlighting the inconsistency (re calculating the reserves). It looked like they changed the rules and decided that the \$69 million is for the region. That is the impression he has, that the rules have changed because of the situations and when they set the guidelines 2 or 3 years ago it was a different landscape. There wasn't really a straight answer why the number was chosen. They will allocate monies in December for some projects but they made no commitment above and beyond any savings to tap into for monies needed for shortfalls.

Carrie Bowen from Caltrans mentioned that Commissioner, Darius Assemi asked both Caltrans and CTC staff to work on a methodology to determine what a reasonable amount to allocate is and

a reasonable amount to keep as savings. They did agree to work on establishing that methodology and agreed to include the COG directors and the district directors.

Carlos Yamzon mentioned that Caltrans will not know for another 6 months to a year - they will hold on to that money – until they can nail down what they can release.

Marjie Kern mentioned she will move forward and she will request the money in March. \$36 million is available and will take 12 million from the reserves. All they can say is no. Ted Smalley stated that they will also move forward with a letter of no prejudice. They will also request the money.

Commissioner, Darius Assemi joined the conversation via phone call to provide an update on the conference call with CTC staff and Cal Trans. He asked how many projects have been programmed and delivered to which Carrie Bowen replied 12 and that was an estimate.

Commissioner Assemi asked about other funding sources. Carrie Bowen stated it depends on what county we are in. In Merced they do not have a measure so they have additional challenges. In Stanislaus the county may have or the city may have additional money to put forward. We have partnerships in San Joaquin County thanks to the measure and Andy. But in Merced, they have to rely solely on that Bond money.

Carlos Yamzon stated that he has asked the City of Modesto to send him a letter that they are committed to covering any costs over its Pelandale project. Ted Smalley mentioned they plan to proceed in March with a letter of no prejudice for the Cartmill project and they can wait for 6 months to a year for the cost savings to be realized.

Carrie Bowen talked about Arboleda – the ground breaking is coming up. Manteca and South Stockton have huge projects that have just started. They feel they have the appropriate contingencies in place. They are working to find ways to save money. There have been challenges on I 5– they saw large cost increases and have learned from that. They included coverage for what they needed for the 99 projects, but there are a lot of structures on the 99.

Darius – he encouraged everyone to work closely with CTC and Cal Trans to identify risk for existing projects. The faster these can be identified and come up with actual numbers as opposed to hypothetical number that we have, the faster we can get to a number that all are comfortable with.

Carlos Yamzon talked about the 12 million shortfall for AME as a glass ceiling. He can coordinate and work directly with Cal Trans to get that analysis and that number less hypothetical. Margie Kirn stated they didn't have local funds to support the project.

Carrie Bowen was asked to work with District 6 to put together an analysis around current existing projects. Carrie mentioned yes, and that the key is to work with Headquarters. Andy Chesley reiterated the need to assess risks, the potential for savings, and the need for more projects.

Ted Smalley made a motion to support programming of all three, immediate allocation of funding for AME, support acceptance of letter of no prejudice for project 7 (Tulare – Cartmill), and upon three months conduct a review of the prudent reserve. This motion was in reference to the staff report recommendations for a valley wide strategy.

Motion seconded by Marjie Kirn and passed unanimously.

No further questions.

5. Valley Legislative Affairs Committee (VLAC)
2013 Sacramento Valley Voice Trip
Discuss and Approve Revised Legislative Platform Items

J. Findley

Patricia Taylor conveyed comments from her board that the original platform that was presented was too much information and we need to be more concise and focused on what we are requesting and asking for.

Jeff Findley began by stating that they consolidated a little bit more therefore it's a little shorter and it still has some of the same items. The one major addition is the platform that is in front you today which is the 55% threshold that was requested at the last directors meeting. The VLAC is seeking your guidance and approval of the draft platform so that it may be presented to the policy council on December 14, 2012. Patricia Taylor asked if any of the other agencies took a position (55 threshold) or have any feedback related to the platform.

Terri King states the only comment was on cap and trade funding. They are concerned that cap and trade is used to fund high speed rail. There is still concern about the 55% threshold. Comment as we move forward – have the lobbyist/whoever schedules meetings with legislators contact the freshman legislators to tell them who we are to maybe get their vote. To contact those who don't know who they are.

Ted Smalley on cap and trade - thought that we had a discussion about the coalition and our COG is formally going to act on that and we would recommend making it a little more direct in supporting the coalition. Ted Smalley states that on the Goods Movement funding we would need to clarify cap and trade funding as he didn't see cap and trade funds being used for expansion projects on SR 99.

Andy Chesley commented on the 55% threshold, that we have to be supportive on lowering the threshold and without it some agencies will not be able to pass sales tax here in California. Patricia Taylor states that their board also recognizes that as well. Self help counties have taken the position to support it. Carlos Yamzon also stated that his board is also supportive of looking at it, after the election, they did talk about that maybe it's time to start preparing for this. But if you can recall upon a year ago this came before the policy council and it had a split vote. Tony Boren stated that next Friday when we have this discussion before our policy board we need to flush it out and make sure everyone understands because we don't want a repeat of what happened last year thinking everyone is on board.

Andrew Chesley commented about MAP 21 and the provision that was added over representation on the MPO boards. He stated the general manager from the transit district had visited him and indicated that one of their board members asked him to bring to the board a change in the joint powers agreement to add a voting member to the MPO from the transit district/agency. I have read the language in map 21 and it talks about representation and doesn't describe what the representation is, it also talks about representation from major transportation providers and I don't know if that means. Are they major transportation providers and does this language even require us to modify our MPO board structure. We have ex-officio members from the port and from the district. My position that I have seen so far has been that we are going to wait for some Federal guidance on this because as it stands now we have representation in our board of directors from the transit district and from Caltrans even though they are advisory ex-officio. Several directors noted that they do not have transit districts and didn't think this would be a problem.

No further comments.

6. Interregional Passenger Rail Act of 2012 (enclosure)
Status of SJV Rail Governance JPA

D. Leavitt

Dan Leavitt began by updating and stating that things are moving along well and the next key step is forming the JPA. By early next year we should have the six needed to form the JPA. In the meantime, they are two other areas we want to report on, areas that we think we can utilize this effort to help make more partners before the JPA can get started. One is to providing input on key documents relating to the corridor and I appreciate all your help and putting coordinated comments together on input for the draft state rail plan which was submitted to Bill Bronte and others at the division of rail. We did actually meet with Bill Bronte last Friday. The other thing I would like to make you aware of is that Caltrans Division Rail recently had scoping meetings last Thursday night. This was on a different process from the state rail plan that is a program EIR document for the San Joaquin corridor and they put out an official notice of preparation and did scoping meetings in total of five locations starting in Sacramento on the 19th and the last one taking place in Los Angeles December 4, 2012. They did send out disks to some and we received one but it was two weeks after the meeting in Sacramento. Scoping comments are due the 13th but you have 30 days to comment from the receipt of the letter. I can get contact information to Michael and this group so that you have contact information to get CDs. I do think it's important that we participate in the process and actually this is quite different from the state rail plan that is being done.

Tony Boren questions if there is a difference between the state rail plan and the scoping plan. Dan Leavitt responds by saying not 100% but both are vision documents that serve different requirements but the program document is a legal environmental document and is done to get them a certain level of clearance that can help be able to be to get funding sources.

The last area that I would like to talk about is the area of advocacy for the corridor. There was a change in the agenda based on work that we have been doing with the Surfliner corridor and capital corridor. The big change here is a 20 million shortfall of Federal funds from the Surfliner corridor and it actually could be up to 25 million and our understanding is a request from Caltrans Division of Rail is to increase the funding next year by 25 million dollars. We are in support of this. A 25 million dollar hit would be a substantial hit for the program. We are certain that this type of hit would cut off all three services. We put together some sample letters that we're trying get entities to send it to the governor before his January budget comes out.

Our next sub-committee meeting is on December 11 at San Joaquin COG and we will provide a call in and agenda from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM. Then on January 11, 2013 this next full working group meeting and it will be held at our office in the rail commission in Stockton from 10:00 AM to 2:00 PM. At our next sub-committee meeting we will be discussing the future of both of these groups. We believe that the subcommittee needs to continue until we get the transfer and once we get the JPA established, we will no longer need the full working group making this January our last meeting.

Andrew Chesley asked about the development of both the state rail plan and the development of scoping around the corridor plan, can you fill me in on what the coordination has been between the

division up rail and the district offices, and I ask this because I have my staff looking around to see if we received any communication whatsoever about the state rail plan or the scoping meeting?

Caltrans staff replies that it was mentioned at our state wide planning meeting several months ago. We were asked to look at it and provide additional comments, we were given a PowerPoint, and we were told that they were going after the locals and to each district. They did come to our district and expanded on that and gave us some dates that I passed on.

Dan Leavitt announces the five scoping plan meetings:

- o November 19th in Sacramento
- o November 20th in Stockton
- o November 26th in Richmond
- o November 27th in Fresno
- o November 29th in Kern
- o December 4th in Los Angeles

Dan Leavitt commented on working with Caltrans division of rail- part of the key for us is getting support from agencies and others to help this process and over time the division of rail. Caltrans has not looked at this in a negative way historically. At the district level we have gotten a lot of support and it really has been between the division of rail and part of the issue that we have of getting this passed and signed there was some concern with the timing of this. We are out there trying to get support for the program as a whole and also helping to coordinate comments getting the region and corridor involved. They will see that this effort has created a great value for the corridor as a whole and the state. Initially on the rail side they see it as an attack on them even though there told by the administration to do it.

Tony Boren suggests and that we have a conversation with Malcolm (regarding coordination with the division of rail) to which Dan Leavitt agrees.

Patricia Taylor did take the JPA to her board just for informational purposes. She had her legal counsel take a look at the JPA to see if there are any concerns with it. Her legal counsel comment was what happens when the funding goes away and another comment was that if you don't join you won't have a voice. I let them know that and I used Dan's staff report to talk about the timing and if we do want to join, but because of the timeline, we would have to change our JPA in order to allow us to join this JPA.

No further comments.

(Moving up Item 8)

8. San Joaquin Valley Blueprint (*enclosure*)

B. Steck

a. Planners Toolkit Administration – Transition to CA Partnership

Barbara Steck stated that she has a couple of items under the blueprint; one has to do with the blueprint toolkit that has been administered by Mr. Harnish for the first year and has proven to be a useful tool for local agencies. One of our tasks was to find a permanent home for it and California partnership has agreed to take it on, on a one year basis with the hopes it would be the

permanent home for the toolkit. I want to thank Mr. Harnish as well as the partnership for the support on this item and I have brought this back to you for a more formal approval for this transfer. The item will not cost the valley COGs any more additional contributions. A motion would be in order to approve this transfer.

Ted Smalley motioned to approve, seconded by Marjie Kim, motion carried.

No further comments.

b. *Grant Balance Proposal*

The second item is the blueprint grant balances. Barbara Steck sent out some spreadsheets demonstrating a potential to have balances that at the end of our current extension through December 31, it might be \$70,000 but it is likely to be less than that. In that event there is money left over, I would like to ask for another extension from Caltrans through the end of the fiscal year June 30, 2013, and to pull those balances to do a project she described in the memo and it would be for providing training for each of the RPAs on the Impacts tool SACOG uses. This tool is a fiscal analysis tool that would be helpful to the RPAs as well as local agencies. We did make a commitment in blueprint activities to come up with a fiscal analysis tool for local agencies. This tool would help determine the type amount of infrastructure services needed, cost to build and maintain and provide services, and revenues generated from land use plan. The idea would be to take any balances, pull them and use them for all our benefit in getting training.

Ahron Hakimi motioned to approve, seconded by Carlos Yamzon, motion carried.

7. Upcoming Meetings Discussion

P. Taylor

**a. *Receive Input for Agenda Items for the December 14, 2012
Regional Policy Council Meeting in Madera***

Michael Sigala states he put together a draft agenda that was not included in the packet and is passing it out now. He also passed around the new roster of the policy council members. The topics are the same that we have been discussing. We will have Dan Leavitt there, Tanisha and Patricia will handle the 375, and cap and trade would be discussed at a CALCOG meeting on Monday and we should have something new to report from that (CALCOG meeting).

Ted Smalley comments on asking the Policy Council to approve joining the cap and trade coalition.

Patricia Taylor comments on SR 99 and the only thing moving forward are the letters that are going to be developed. The consensus is that priorities and strategies have not changed. A letter written from today's conversation can be use as the content and basis of the letter.

Carlos Yamzon will get an update on what happened at the CTC meeting. And also wants to bring to their attention that his chair has sent letters to Merced and San Joaquin talking about some consolidation efforts and he has told me that he (his chair) would like to bring up at the next policy council meeting the idea of an eight valley COG.

No further comments.

b. Discuss Rescheduling the April 2013 Directors' Meeting

Patricia Taylor states we have a conflict with the April's meeting due to CALCOGs Regional Issues Forum in Monterey. April 2013 Directors Meeting was changed to Wednesday April 3, 2013 in Fresno.

No further comments.

9. Regional Policy Council Bylaws (enclosure) M. Sigala
Approve Revisions Related to Brown Act Provisions for the
Directors' Committee

Michael Sigala stated that the legal opinion is that the Directors take themselves out of the Brown Act and into other reasonable meeting procedures. Those were outlined in the staff report and memo and if you choose to take this action, your bylaws are part of the policy council bylaws, so the policy council has to amend the bylaws but they can't amend them unless they have a 14 day mail notice that would be finalized in March. So it's the will of the directors whether or not you want to amend your bylaws.

Andy Chesley motioned to amend the bylaws, seconded by Ted Smalley, motion carried.

No further comments.

10. 2013 Fall Policy Conference A. Hakimi
Discuss

Ahron Hakimi stated that his chairman does not support Kern COG hosting a conference at all. He doesn't think its well time spent. He has directed me not to take the lead and to limit staff attendance in future conferences. There is consensus among the group to keep going on this effort. Andy Chesley was identified as the next vice chair and stated he would look into SJ COG hosting the next fall policy conference.

No further comments.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

11. High Speed Rail Diana Gomez

Diana Gomez provided the update. The Fresno-Bakersfield EIR comment period is over. We will be setting up meetings with our stakeholders in the city of Bakersfield, Shafter, and Wasco follow by the cities of Hanford, and Kings County to go over some of the comments received. We are continuing to move forward in getting a final EIR document. Sometime in January or February there will be a staff recommendation on the preferred alternatives and alternative routes as we leave Fresno. And that will go to the board maybe in January or February. Our chief engineer Frank Vacca who used to work for Amtrak started yesterday and we are continuing to put the team in place. One other thing my section now includes Stockton, so my area is from Stockton to Bakersfield. For informational purposes we finally move into our office located across Fresno city hall. We will be holding two public meetings December 12 and 13, the first one being in Madera at the community college on Avenue 12. Tom Richard and Jeff Morales and I will be speaking to provide an update on the project.

We will start purchasing right of ways sometime in January and will start making offers to parcel owners. The next date will be in Merced to again give an update on the project. We did have one

RFP right-of-way go out, a contractor was selected and we are waiting to finalize that. The other RFP was the project construction management contract and we are in negotiations with that. January 18 is when the bids are due and it will take two to three months to evaluate those bids.

Andy Chesley made a comment about the belief that they will not see locals workers on these jobs. Dianne Gomez stated that both contractors in the selection process do have offices in Fresno. Andy Chesley suggests that they advertise that.

Terri King commented about the process on final approval on the preferred route. Diana Gomez explained that the process is different from the previous time and that sometime in June the board will officially vote on the preferred route.

No further comments.

12. Caltrans Directors Report

C. Bowen

Gail Miller commented that there are issues with the state rail plan website. She believes the website should be providing information for those who are interested and she will be looking into that.

13. Revised 99 Business Plan

R. Ball

No comments.

14. Interregional Goods Movement Plan

M. Sigala

No comments.

15. Implementation of the San Joaquin Rail Authority (SB 325)

T. Smalley

No comments.

16. Proposition 84/Blueprint

R. Terry

No comments.

17. San Joaquin Valley Greenprint

C. Thompson

No comments.

18. California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley

S. Dabbs

No comments.

19. Regional Energy Planning

M. Sigala

No comments.

OTHER ITEMS

20. Director Items

No comments.

21. Public Presentations for Items Not on Agenda.

No comments.

Meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Next Directors Meeting: Thursday, January 3, 2013 (Fresno)

Appendix A: List of Others Attending

Lezlie Kimura, ARB
Diana Gomez, High Speed Rail
Rosa Parks, Stan COG
Dan Leavitt, Regional Rail Working Group
Michael Sigala, Valleywide Coordinator, Sigala Inc.
Gail Miller, Caltrans

On the phone:

CTC Commissioner Darius Assemi
Carrie Bowen, Caltrans Director, District 10
Jeff Findley, MCTC
Mike Bitner, Fresno COG
Kristen Cai, Fresno COG
Cathy Chung, Fresno COG
Tanisha Taylor, SJ COG
Cari Anderson, Anderson Consulting

San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council 2013 Legislative Platform

INTRODUCTION

The San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies include the San Joaquin Council of Governments, Stanislaus Council of Governments, Merced County Association of Governments, Madera County Transportation Commission, Fresno Council of Governments, Kings County Association of Governments, Tulare County Association of Governments, and Kern Council of Governments. In 2006, the San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies expanded their Memorandum of Understanding to form a Regional Policy Council, comprised of two elected officials from each of the eight Valley counties, to discuss and build consensus on issues of Valleywide importance.

The Regional Policy Council, in coordination with the San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, has established a San Joaquin Valley Legislative Platform that reflects the Regional Policy Council's priorities in state and federal legislative matters. The Legislative Platform provides guidance to the eight Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and their lobbying partners when taking action on specific legislative proposals. The platform is intended to provide a unified voice when communicating legislative issues of regional importance to the Valley's state and federal legislative delegation as well as relevant state and federal agencies.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- Protect and enhance current state and federal funding levels for transportation related programs.
- Continue to advocate as a region to advance common goals for improvements in state and federal legislation and policies.

VALLEY VOICE ADVOCACY EFFORTS

- Continue to pursue state and federal support for the projects and legislative priorities identified through the Regional Policy Council's advocacy program called, "Valley Voice".

2013 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

Funding

- Support funding for state mandates or changes in responsibilities on local and regional governments.
- Support regulatory relief when funding is not available.
- Support legislation that lowers the threshold required to pass transportation initiatives.

Cap-and-Trade Program Funding

- Support the efforts of the Alliance for Jobs, Transportation California, California Transit Association, California State Association of Counties and the League of California Cities to advocate that a portion of any collected revenues be dedicated for transportation purposes. The uniting principle for all of these stakeholders is that auction revenues derived from vehicle fuels should be used to fund transportation system needs, included

projects to meet state greenhouse gas reduction requirements through local and regional transportation projects.

Goods Movement Funding

- Continue to protect and solicit funding for Highway 99, a major trade corridor in the San Joaquin Valley, and other regionally significant corridors.
- Preserve and enhance short-haul rail as a vital tool for goods movement and air quality improvements throughout the state.

Sustainable Communities, Local and Regional Planning, Air Quality Funding, Energy Planning

- Support legislation for sustainable communities funding and other funding sources for comprehensive revitalization strategies, projects, air quality improvements, affordable housing, and job creation that enhance the long term prosperity of San Joaquin Valley cities and communities.
- Advocate for streamlining environmental review of transportation projects utilizing CEQA documents prepared for Regional Transportation Plans and Sustainable Communities Strategies.

MAP-21 Implementation

- Ensure the State works closely with local governments during the preparation of any funding formulas, guidance documents, or policy decisions involving the implementation of the new Federal transportation funding program, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21).

Amtrak (AB 1779)

- Support increased state funding for state-supported Amtrak conventional passenger rail services, including the San Joaquin Line.

California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley

- Support the efforts of the California Partnership to increase the state's investment in programs and services serving the eight county region of the San Joaquin Valley.
- Support the Partnership's Water Quality, Supply, and Reliability Advocacy efforts. Their mission is to ensure a reliable, adequate quality water supply to sustain a high quality of life, and a world class agricultural sector, while protecting and enhancing the environment.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – JANUARY 3, 2013

10. Revised 99 Business Plan

R. Ball/A. Hakimi

The Draft Updated Business Plan (Volume I), Financial Program (Volume II), and Appendices (Volume III) have been completed and are currently under staff circulation and review.

11. Implementation of the San Joaquin Rail Authority (SB 325)

T. Smalley

Mr. Smalley will be present to answer any questions.

12. Proposition 84/Blueprint

R. Terry

No updates/changes have taken place within the projects of Prop 84 or Blueprint activities since the last Director's Meeting of December 14, 2012. For any questions, please contact Rob Terry at Fresno COG by email at rterry@fresnocog.org, or by phone at (559) 233-4148 Ext. 222.

13. SJV Greenprint

C. Thompson

The Greenprint Steering Committee continues to meet on a monthly basis, alternating between in-person and conference call-only meetings in recognition of the Valley-wide extent of the planning area. The next meeting of the Steering Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, January 8, 2013, beginning at 2:00 p.m. The project consultant, the Information Center for the Environment (ICE) at UC Davis, is currently focused on the collection and mapping of spatial data to support the needs of the Greenprint and also to aid regional, county and city planning initiatives. The Steering Committee is particularly interested at this time in providing information and sources of information that may be useful to Valley COGs in the preparation of their Sustainable Community Strategies. Consequently, ICE has prepared the following documents that are "living" in the sense that continuing changes will be made to them. Please advise of any questions, comments, concerns or difficulties in accessing any of these documents, or additional data/data sources you'd like to request.

<http://plone.ice.ucdavis.edu/sjvgreenprint>

<http://plone.ice.ucdavis.edu/sjvgreenprint/data-collections/glossary>

<http://plone.ice.ucdavis.edu/sjvgreenprint/data-collections/data-listing>

14. CA Partnership for the SJV

S. Dabbs/R. Audino

Upcoming Meetings:

Smart Valley Places CEC Meeting

Wednesday, January 23 10am-12pm

1033 Fifth Street, Clovis

San Joaquin Valley Regional Industry Clusters Initiative

The Partnership will launch the San Joaquin Valley Regional Industry Clusters Initiative in January 2013, focused on supporting and bolstering the key industry clusters in the eight county region: water, energy, ag, manufacturing, logistics, public sector infrastructure, and health and wellness. This initiative follows the completion of the SJV Regional Industry Cluster Analysis and Action Plan that can be found here:

www.sjvpartnership.org

The flyer is split into two vertical panels. The left panel has a black background with white and light blue text. The right panel has a blue background with white and light blue text. At the bottom of the right panel is the Fresno State logo and text.

You are invited to a meeting of the San Joaquin Valley Regional Industry Clusters Initiative.

THE AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, MANUFACTURING, AND WATER CLUSTERS WILL MEET ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2013.

THE MEETING LOCATION WILL BE ANNOUNCED AT A LATER TIME.

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

Office of Community & Economic Development at Fresno State

Mike Dozier, Executive Director
559-294-6027, mdozier@csufresno.edu

Stacie Dabbs, Assistant Director
559-347-3918, sdabbs@csufresno.edu

Ismael Herrera, Rural Development Center Director
559-278-0519, isherrera@csufresno.edu

Silas Cha, Project Manager
559-278-6119, scha@csufresno.edu

Save the Date

MEETING
AGRICULTURE CLUSTER
ENERGY CLUSTER
MANUFACTURING CLUSTER
WATER CLUSTER

DATE
WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 2013

LOCATION
CENTRAL
TBD

 California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley

Administered by

FRESNO STATE
Community and Economic Development

15. Regional Energy Planning

M. Sigala

The **Southwest Solar Transformation Initiative (SSTI)** has unveiled its "roadmaps" developed for the cities of Arvin, Atwater, Clovis, Delano, Hanford, Livingston, Madera, Merced, San Joaquin, Visalia, Fresno, Modesto, Mendota and Turlock. The SSTI is part of the U.S. Department of Energy's Rooftop Solar Challenge to help streamline and standardize permitting, zoning, metering and connection processes – and improve finance options for rooftop solar systems, with a particular focus on municipal buildings. The San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council/RTPAs are a partner in this program. A year-end "wrap up" workshop will be held in Fresno on Wednesday, December 12, 2012 from 9am to 3pm at The Grand.

The **Regional Energy Planning for Economic Development Roadmap**. At the CEC meeting in Sacramento in November 2012, we discussed the funding available under a regional planning category related to AB 118 and alternative fuels. A concept paper has been developed subsequent to our CEC meeting and was submitted as a "draft" to CEC staff in December 2012. The Draft concept paper is attached for your information.

Revised Draft Concept Description -- 12/04/12

Guiding Fuel and Vehicle Technology Investments in the San Joaquin Valley

*Expanding AB 118 Resource Use in the Valley through Regional Planning and Road
Mapping of a New Valley Energy Economy*

Concept Overview

A Project Team headed by the San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council is proposing a project to dramatically increase the utilization of available State resources related to AB 118 in the eight county region of the San Joaquin Valley (Valley). Our approach is to achieve this objective by conducting a regional energy and economic planning and road mapping effort focused specifically on the transportation, alternative and renewable fuels and vehicle technology components of the overall energy economy in the region.

Our effort will focus on the market and identifying fuels and technologies that will work given the unique needs and attributes of the Valley. The Project will build upon successful existing Valley planning efforts and proven similar energy planning and road mapping projects undertaken by members of our Project Team in other parts of the country. Our work will also be consistent with the Vision for Clean Air: A Framework for Air Quality and Climate Planning document issued in draft by the California Air Resource Board as well as the San Joaquin Valley and South Coast Air Quality Management Districts earlier this year. This two-phase project will result in: 1) a “map” of proposed investments and opportunities, which will provide options for our transportation fuel and technology-related investments; 2) A roadmap for achieving high value energy-related opportunities; and, 3) Policy recommendations and technical assistance for increasing alternative and renewable fuel and vehicle technology use and utilization of AB 118 - related resources in the Valley.

Substantial resources are currently being invested in all forms of energy in the Valley. For example, a 2010 report from the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley indicated that over \$100 million in federal funding for clean energy investments was brought into the Valley during the 2009-2010 time period. This figure does not include investments from the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District or private sector sources such as utilities, oil companies, businesses and homeowners. What the Valley lacks is a comprehensive understanding of the breadth and depth of these energy-related investments and how they have contributed to the regional economy and a framework and roadmap for new energy-related investment within the region. This project results in a much-improved understanding of these investments across the region with a particular focus on transportation fuels and related sourcing, processing and distribution technologies.

Background

A critical aspect to any regional economy is the energy that it utilizes to create wealth. The efficient use of energy allows residents to live and work comfortably, helps move goods and people, powers industry machinery, and gives life to the infrastructure that underpins the region's communities. These roles make energy a key issue in the future development of the Valley. The choices made today about the role of energy in the future will have a significant impact on the economy, environment, and the quality of life for Valley residents in the future. *No thorough understanding of the Valley's energy economy and activities currently exists*; particularly not a comprehensive understanding of the energy economy in relation to national, regional and statewide investment, and policy and programs in business attraction and development. Areas like innovation, taxation, education and training, workforce development, transportation, housing, land-use, environmental remediation and permitting, or the many other areas can and will influence energy, and therefore should be taken into account in a comprehensive view of the Valley's energy future. The National Association of Regional Councils (NARC), the San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council (RPC), San Joaquin Valley Clean Energy Organization (SJVCEO), and key leadership from the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley have come together to explore the opportunities for developing a comprehensive strategy for understanding the Valley's energy future.

The Valley currently faces many complex and interrelated environmental and economic challenges. A 2005

report from the Congressional Research Service said:

“Socio Economic conditions in the San Joaquin Valley as measured by a range of variables, including per capita income, poverty, unemployment rates, and household income reveal an area that falls significantly below national and California averages. The 2000 poverty rate for the San Joaquin Valley (20.5%) for example was significantly higher than the national rate (12.4%) and the Appalachian Regional Commission area (12.6%)”

These negative conditions still exist and have in fact worsened over the past few years. Some Valley cities are experiencing unemployment rates over 40-percent. As a result of the current economic downturn, Valley jurisdictions are faced with significant budget cuts, service reductions to residents, and staff layoffs.

As it faces these challenges, the Valley is blessed with an abundance of energy resources. For years the Valley has been a significant source of oil and natural gas production for the nation. In addition, the Valley possesses an impressive array of solar/photovoltaic, wind, biomass and other renewable energy sources. The Valley also has immense energy savings potential. The Valley is committed to increasing the use of clean energy (energy efficiency and renewable energy) as a means of addressing these challenges. While increased use of alternative fuels and clean energy would certainly not solve all economic challenges, it acts as a catalyst for more positive steps to improve the quality of life for Valley residents: create jobs, reduce household energy costs to stave off foreclosure, and reduce emissions from vehicle miles traveled, along with electricity and natural gas usage.

Actions to improve air quality through alternative transportation fuels and technologies are essential to the health, environment, and economy of the San Joaquin Valley. While Valley jurisdictions and stakeholders have a keen interest in these issues, they have not adequately accessed available AB118 resources to translate this interest into concrete action and substantive implementation. It is our understanding that to date the Valley has accessed available AB 118 funds to help develop biofuels for transportation as well as strategic plans for electric vehicle charging infrastructure. While this has certainly helped develop alternative fuel and transportation technology capacity in the region, significant additional capacity exists within the Valley to utilize AB 118 resources to support the overall state effort and grow its fuels and transportation slice of the regional energy economy. To help address this critical issue, local San Joaquin Valley agencies need to be much better equipped with tools, data and training to understand and implement alternative transportation-related planning, policies, technologies and infrastructure.

Project Team

The Project Team contains the technical core of the organizations that have been working to develop the overall energy economy plan and roadmap for the Valley. Special expertise will be brought in to address alternative and renewable fuels and transportation options in the Valley. Collectively this Team possesses a substantial breadth and depth of knowledge and experience with regional planning, energy issues, and economic analysis at the national, state, regional and local levels as well as a sound knowledge of conditions on the ground in the San Joaquin Valley. Our Team uniquely brings a technology assessment and workforce development focus with true regional, cross-jurisdictional capabilities for both the ARB and CEC.

The Project Team will be led by the **San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council**. This organization exemplifies the Regional Transportation Agencies' approach to working on regional issues like the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint planning process, and the eight county Interregional Goods Movement Plan. Another member of the Project Team will be the **National Association of Regional Councils (NARC)**, which serves as the national voice of regionalism and provides its members valuable information and research on key national policy issues, federal policy developments, best practices, and conducts enriching training sessions, conferences, workshops and satellite telecasts. Technical leadership on transportation fuels and vehicle technology-related environmental issues will be provided by the **San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District**, whose mission is to improve the health and quality of life for all Valley residents through efficient, effective and entrepreneurial air quality-management strategies. They are heavily involved with the municipal planning organization and many of the communities throughout the Valley on air quality efforts. **Strategic Energy Innovations**, a California based non-profit committed to improving adoption and use of clean energy for improved communities, brings a sound knowledge of conditions in the Valley through their engagements with local governments, academic institutions and regional planning and development agencies. Consultants will be added as needed to fill technical and

policy needs. Our Project Team will work closely with the **California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley**, an unprecedented public-private partnership sharply focused on improving the region's economic vitality and quality of life.

Approach

We propose to conduct this Project in four tasks spread over two phases:

PHASE I

Task 1: Conduct Background Research and Needed Partnership Building. We will gather information on Valley-based efforts that applied for and received AB 118 and related resources. We will assess these efforts and profile organizations that were successful in receiving resources and the scope of their successful efforts. We will identify and add relevant stakeholders as needed to this regional transportation fuels and technology planning effort. Stakeholders will be brought together via public meetings, workshops, email groups, conference calls and any other methods deemed most appropriate.

Task 2: Map the Current Transportation, Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology and Investments and Opportunities in the Valley. This will feature a review of existing reports, programs, major energy and transportation related initiatives, and data analyses, findings and recommendations made on or about the region to date, as well as a geographic and visual representation of this and additional information impacting current and future transportation and fuel-related investment strategies. The examination will include a thorough inventory of existing state, regional and local energy programs, and be based on identifying a regional profile of energy-related activities that have positioned the region's current industries, sectors, and overall economic and workforce development strategies. We will capture an updated asset inventory for traditional and alternative energy fuel production, generation, operations, research and development facilities, infrastructure, programmatic, and investment activities at a statewide and regional basis. We will also look at penetration and use of advance vehicle technologies in the Valley. It will take into account demographic, population, income, infrastructure, and other similar overlays for analysis and assessment. For instance, Task 2 deliverables will help the partnership and its stakeholders understand where certain assets are located relative to specific populations and end-users.

Task 3: Develop an Alternative Fuels and Vehicle Technology Road Map. This task will include the development of a high-level SWOT ("strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats") matrix that provides a situational assessment of the region's current and emerging capacities alternative and renewable fuels and advanced vehicle technologies for a fuel and technology road map, including a simple benchmarking of where the region stands compared to the rest of the state and other regions across the U.S. Feedback from the partnership and its stakeholders will be incorporated into the final recommendations through a draft and review process, before the analysis is incorporated into a final "Road Map" for the region. The findings and recommendations will be assessed against other regions to suggest those elements which might lead to a faster transition of the energy economy for fuel and vehicle technologies and near-term results for job creation, entrepreneurial and industrial expansion, academic research and development commercialization, and overall general economy building.

Phase II

Task 4: Provide Technical Assistance, Information and Support to Valley Transportation Planning and Oversight Authorities and Jurisdictions as Needed. We will support efforts by San Joaquin Valley agencies to guide and implement the policies, investments and other strategies identified in Task 3. Additional phases and development deliverables may be included upon completion of Task 3. As part of that process our Team will investigate existing local and regional governance, planning, policies, permitting, and funding/financing strategies, mechanisms and activities that promote gas and biogas as a transportation fuel. By focusing on the infrastructure needs of local governments and the very real barriers to San Joaquin Valley implementation of these fuels we will expand the understanding, knowledge and implementation of alternative fuels across the Valley. Our Team will convene San Joaquin Valley leaders over the course of this one-year project, and assemble concrete short-, medium- and long-term options for the Valley. These options will be technology-specific and include detailed cost estimates along with implementation barriers and work-arounds to these important barriers. Our emphasis on increasing market penetration of CEC and ARB supported technologies, programs and policies. All options will be made available to Valley local governments through formal meetings and via the web. Our Team will build and suggest a flexible regional model for AB 118-related technologies and fuels that includes a template plan, policies and ordinances, incentives, permitting procedures, and communications outreach/engagement guidance, coalition building strategies, training, agreements and evaluation systems for use at the city, county and/or regional level in

urban, suburban and rural areas within the Valley.

Outcomes

The project will produce a number of specific outcomes. These include:

- A “map” of proposed investments and opportunities, which will provide economic development and other decision makers with a long term, sustainable and coordinated growth options for our transportation fuel and technology-related investments.
- A roadmap for achieving high value opportunities.
- Policy recommendations for increasing alternative and renewable fuel and vehicle technology enhancements in the Valley. These include: 1) Fuel and technology options for Valley jurisdictions; 2) Ways to increase Valley access and use of AB 118 and other alternative and renewable fuels and technology resources; 3) How to train and develop work force needed to support the new fuel and technology choices; 4) Short, medium, and long term options for the Valley; and 5) A flexible regional planning model with templates for AB-118 related policies and fuels.

Benefits

Much work needs to be done to improve the economic and environmental conditions in the San Joaquin Valley. Expanded use of its tremendous clean energy assets offers a significant potential to help the Valley grow its regional economy and positively address its environmental challenges. This project provides a concrete step in that process by providing an objective and “big picture” look at the fuels and transportation slice of the regional energy economy. Our Team brings a unique approach that combines regional energy planning and economic development perspectives gained from work our Team has done around the country that is paired with relevant local and regional experience in the Valley that has gained us the trust of Valley jurisdictions and stakeholders. Finally, our project should help Valley stakeholders better understand so that they can more intelligently utilize the significant resources available through AB 118.

Budget

The budget for the proposed effort is scalable based on the breadth and depth of the research conducted and the technical support provided. The range of financial support required could be up to \$500,000 for Phase I and up to an additional \$250,000 for Phase II.