

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

**San Joaquin
Council of
Governments**
Andrew Chesley

**Stanislaus
Council of
Governments**
Carlos Yamzon

**Tulare County
Association of
Governments**
Ted Smalley

Meeting Agenda Wednesday, April 3, 2013 Time: 1:00 p.m.

Meeting Location:
CALCOG Regional Leadership Forum
Hyatt Regency Monterey, Beach Room
1 Old Golf Course Road
Monterey, CA 93940

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Enclosure

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. March 7, 2013 Directors' Meeting | P. Taylor | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. FTIP/Air Quality | C. Anderson/
T. Taylor | |
| 3. Regional Transportation Plans / Sustainable Communities Strategies | | |
| a. <i>RTP/SCS Schedule, Follow Up to Attorney General Discussion</i> | P. Taylor | |
| b. <i>RTP Valleywide Chapter</i> | T. Smalley | |
| c. <i>SCS Outreach/Facilitator Training Request</i> | B. Veenendaal | |
| 4. San Joaquin JPA for Intercity Passenger Rail Service
<i>Update and Discussion</i> | D. Leavitt | |
| 5. State Route 99
<i>Bond Saving Program - Status of Project Programming</i> | C. Yamzon | |
| 6. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
<i>Reaffirm the Strategic Deployment Plan's Consistency with the
Needs of the San Joaquin Valley</i> | R. Pacheco | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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.

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 7. High Speed Rail | Diana Gomez |
| 8. Caltrans Directors Report | C.Bowen/S.Ehlert |
| 9. Interregional Goods Movement Plan | M. Sigala |
| 10. Valley Legislative Affairs Committee (VLAC) | J. Findley |
| 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 | R. Audino |
| 15. Regional Energy Planning | 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, May 2, 2013 in Visalia (TCAG)

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Accommodations

The meeting room and restrooms are ADA accessible. Representatives or individuals with disabilities should contact the SJV Regional Planning Agencies at (559) 266-6222, 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



**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

**San Joaquin
Council of
Governments**
Andrew Chesley

**Stanislaus
Council of
Governments**
Carlos Yamzon

**Tulare County
Association of
Governments**
Ted Smalley

ITEM 1

Meeting Location:

*Madera County Transportation Commission
2001 Howard Road, Suite 201
Madera, California 93637*

**Meeting Minutes For:
Thursday, March 7, 2013
Time: 10:00 a.m.**

Members Attending:

Terri King, KCAG (Absent)
Carlos Yamzon, Stan COG
Barbara Steck for Tony Boren, Fresno COG
Ted Smalley, TCAG (Via Phone)

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. February 7, 2013 Directors' Meeting *(enclosure)*

Ahron Hakimi made a motion to approve, seconded by Andy Chesley. Motion carried.

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

2. FTIP/Air Quality

T. Taylor

Tanisha Taylor (SJ COG) updated the group on the 2008 Conformity Determination, called the first off cycle amendment, on schedule for adoption in May. All the MPOs have completed their conformity emissions analysis and are in the process of updating their documents with a May board approval and July Federal approval. The air district is also working with ARB on the one-hour ozone standard, which is the ozone standard that has been revoked so there are no conformity implications but does need to be updated to address vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

Andy Chesley (SJ COG) commented about the next deadlines? Tanisha Taylor responded that EPA released the Federal register for approval of 2011 EMFAC that started a six month transition period, so the next deadline is for 2011 RTP. Anything started after that six-month transition which would be August/ mid August will need to use EMFAC 2011.

No further comments or questions.

3. Regional Transportation Plans / Sustainable Communities Strategies

a. Update on the 2014 RTP Schedule

T. Taylor

Tanisha Taylor commented on the 2014 RTP Valleywide workshop. We reviewed the schedule and worked with each of the MPOs to see where they were in their schedule. Each of the MPOs indicated that they believe they would make the October timeframe however it will be a tight timeframe for them. Several of the MPOs are still revalidating and re-calibrating their models, as well as scenario development.

The second piece is the implementation piece related to the 2014 RTP schedule. During the ARB board meeting that took place January 24th there was a commitment to discuss implementation. Tanisha Taylor took the first steps toward discussing implementation. When we left the discussion last it seemed like we were on varying sides of the question, should the Valleywide targets be measured as an all succeed or fail. Meaning that if the valley as a whole does not make the five and ten percent or whatever the target may be in the future, should all MPOs, for example, adopt an alternate planning scenario or should there be a safety clause or something, to provide those MPOs that can meet this target a safe haven.

Andy Chesley shared a conversation with an Amanda Eaken about SCS development. He explained to her an agreement with the attorney general's office that five MPOs would do the SCS as part of the RTP before the end of this calendar year. Ahron Hakimi (Kern COG) also had discussions with Amanda Eaken and stated that that Kern COG's plans are to meet the targets as an individual county and collectively. Carlos Yamzon (Stan COG) commented on the schedule and the actual adoption of the RTP. Andy Chesley responded that the agreement is before the end of the calendar year.

Barbara Steck (Fresno COG) directed a question to Georgiena Vivian (VRPA Technology Inc.) concerning the EIR, is there a mitigation measure in the EIR and how does that affect the timing. Georgiena Vivian responded that there is a mitigation measure in Fresno's, Madera's, Tulare's and Kerns EIR that was adopted for an amendment last year. There is a mitigating measure that states the SCS/RTP will be updated and included this year 2013. Georgiena Vivian added that the language in the mitigation measures needs to be presented to the boards for adoption. It does not say that it has to be adopted in 2013, it states that it needs to be presented to the board for adoption, so adoption can occur in 2014 if a legal opinion is warranted.

Tanisha Taylor suggested to poll each of the MPOs in terms of the discussion around the table to identify where each of the MPOs schedule is, in order to have a detailed update of each MPO schedule, and to provide a better understanding of where they are on that schedule, how much work needs to happen, and if we should consider those type of things.

Elizabeth Jonasson (California for Clean Air) added by encouraging nonprofit groups and other organizations to be part of the conversation if additional discussions about extending the timelines occur.

Rob Ball (Kern COG) commented that if they do see a delay, we still need to plan on processing an amendment for October and that amendment should be using EMFAC 2011. Tanisha Taylor responded that they will try to figure out how all those pieces fit together and if they will have any delays.

Tanisha Taylor put forth a question about long term implications of ARB changing targets, and should the MPOs resort to the Alternative Planning Strategy option. Marjie Kirn (MCAG) indicated it was too early and premature to discuss that topic at this time. Patricia Taylor summarized that the MPOs stand committed to individually and collectively meeting the targets.

Elizabeth Jonasson commented on a concern shared by several nonprofits groups that if there are counties that are not planning on meeting them (targets) and others are planning on helping other counties out. Patricia Taylor responded that the valley MPOs are planning on reaching the five and ten percent targets. Andy Chesley added that the bottom line is the strategies we put into our RTP to reducing VMT and GHG emissions. Carlos Yamzon also replied that the accountability is in the process we are going through now. Elizabeth Jonasson added by saying that it has been a unified platform by the community advocates that they would prefer to see each county meet the five and ten percent (target).

Michelle Garcia (Fresno Madera Medical Society) questioned the group by stating if one county helps out another county, how is that going to reduce the emissions in the original county and improve the public health in that county. Patricia Taylor addressed the question by stating that the county who is addressing it would do what they can and it will be addressed in each one of their RTP's. Andy Chesley added that it is not helpful in GHG emission discussions to talk about counties as if we had walls around us. The big issue about air quality has been that we don't want to look at air quality as a county by county effort; we look at it as a Valleywide effort. Carlos Yamzon added the importance of needing and having public support in the process. Carlos suggested the walls that are perceived at the county level are going to disappear because the public is going to be on board with what collectively we are trying to do. The performance measures and the numbers become irrelevant and really the process of getting there and believing it is the right thing to do becomes more relevant.

Ahron Hakimi added that if Andy (SJ County) is exceeding his targets and people are driving much less in San Joaquin, it is the same air basin so any county that can exceed their targets will help someone who breaths in another county. Elizabeth Jonasson added that the ability for people in those counties to walk, pay less in transportation and housing choices are health co-benefits. Andy Chesley added that Elizabeth Jonasson comments were right on. That is a thing we all need to be aiming for. The strategy component of this has to be pushed and we have to be demonstrably making a difference. Bruce Abanathie added by stating that this is a Valleywide Air basin that is affected by other air basins particularly the bay area and we also need the bay area to meet or exceed their targets to help us because of the geography and weather patterns we end up with a lot of pollutants created on the other side of that mountain range. So we hope that the advocacy reaches across the mountain as well.

No further comments or questions.

b. Discuss RTP Valleywide Chapter

B. Kimball

Ben Kimball (TCAG) stated that one of their goals this year is to rewrite it in a way that is more to the point. A handout was provided showing an outline for the chapter. Ted Smalley (TCAG) also added that a separate appendix be created for the SCS technical documentation.

Bruce Abanathie (KCAG) commented on the list that was passed out, he does not see a segment on the Collaboration Issues to which Ted Smalley replied that it should be under Advocacy and other Collaborative Planning Efforts.

No further comments or questions.

c. Receive Update on Valleywide SCS Outreach

K. Anderson

Kim Anderson (SJ COG) commented on round one of the Proposition 84 Grant from the Strategic Growth Council for Valleywide SCS outreach of which \$190,000 was dedicated. Each of the MPOs has representation on the project committee. In the fourth quarter of 2012, the COG staff and consultant team produced several items (passed out and included in the meeting packet). The items that were accomplished in the fourth quarter of 2012 were the development of the overall Public Outreach Strategies. There was an identification of some potential meeting and outreach tools, media lists were finalized, those print materials that you have as part of the packet were finalized which included the Valley Visions logo. There is a set of fact sheets and frequently asked questions, which were done in Spanish, English, and Hmong. There is the key messages sheet for use by the MPOs in their outreach and interaction with the public. There was also the template done, an SCS workshop template and there were four choices of Valley Visions letterhead for use in your outreach and communication connectivity. Earlier this quarter we received the Valley Visions video for each MPO to utilize. We have the project team meeting on Monday to discuss the items in the grant that have not been started yet including the actual development of the media spots, the media by themselves, and then we will be discussing the form that the workshop assistance for each of the MPOs, which we will be discussing with the consultant team. (Video of Valley Visions preceded this update.)

The Valley Visions video received positive feedback and would be a great addition to what has been established already.

No further comments or questions.

**4. Regional Governance for San Joaquin Valley Rail Service
*Update and Discussion: March 22 JPA Meeting***

M. Sigala

Michael Sigala (Valleywide Coordinator) updated the group on Dan Leavitt's behalf. They have a nine-members now with Alameda County joining on February 26th and Fresno COG on February 28th (there is a list of representatives from each county that was passed out). He wanted to remind everyone about the meeting on March 22 at 1:30 PM in the City of Merced Civic Center Board Room. Dan Leavitt will be sending out board book items to the members on March 15th. Dan has a conference call with the RTPA directors tomorrow at 10:00 AM to prepare for the 22nd meeting. Dan will be representing the San Joaquin corridor in support of the San Joaquin Valley Intercity Passenger Rail Service and California Passenger Rail Program in Washington DC this weekend. Comments on the Draft State Rail Plan are due March 11th.

No further comments or questions.

5. State Route 99

a. Bond Saving Program - Status of Project Programming & Update from March 5 CTC Meeting

C. Yamzon

Carlos Yamzon congratulated Margie Kirn and MCAG for the AME (project) allocations (from CTC). Carlos also expressed appreciation to CTC and Caltrans staff for the lowering of the prudent reserve. Carlos added that they are moving towards getting Pelandale an allocation in May. There is 35 million dollars available for allocation. Carlos also spoke to Ted and they are similarly strategizing for the next project as well. Carlos believed in May they would be able to get an allocation for Pelandale but are still looking for support from COG directors in a letter signed by the chair, which Carlos would be willing to draft, and a separate letter to commend Commissioner Darius Assemi's involvement.

The conversation ensued regarding the letter of support and appreciation at the Regional Policy Council level to Commissioner Darius Assemi. Ted Smalley proposed a letter as an action item with support of allocation of the two projects with the primary caveat being a repayment clause needed for other projects. Carrie Bowen had concerns regarding the two projects that were going to be listed in the letter because there isn't enough money. Ted Smalley suggested they are willing to take the risk (sign a similar payback agreement and willing to delay invoicing) in return for the possibility to go out and bid and being allowed to move forward. Ted Smalley asked the group (Valley Directors) for support in concept subject to caveat approval by Caltrans. There was the consensus amongst the directors.

No further comments or questions.

b. Approve Revised 99 Business Plan

R. Ball

Rob Ball thanked Joe Stramaglia, Joanne Striebich, Caltrans District 10, and Caltrans Districts 6 staff for all the work they did putting this together (the revised plan). Rob indicated the biggest change is an inclusion of operational improvements. The majority of those operational improvements are focused on diamond ramps and ramp-metering type of opportunity's to provide transportation system management. Rob ball stated that the action is for a request for approval. (copies of the plan were provided at the meeting).

Bruce Abanathie (for Terri King) motioned for approval, seconded by Carlos Yamzon. Motion carried.

No further comments or questions.

6. Valley Legislative Affairs Committee

J. Findley

Sacramento Valley Voice Trip, March 13-14, 2013

a. Receive Legislative Materials and Proposed Meetings Update

Jeff Finley passed out binder materials for the Valley Voice Trip to Sacramento next week. Jeff Finley thanked the VLAC Committee for all of their work, pointing out Laurel Fawcett for putting this document together. The draft materials have been send out to the participants and they had two conference calls so far with the participants, the elected officials, COG directors, and VLAC members that are going to Sacramento. We also had a second call with just the presenters. Jeff Finley concluded that things are going well and progressing and most everyone is familiar with their speaking topics. We are hoping sometime tomorrow afternoon we should have a 99 percent final document ready to go and we will start putting those into binders, copying them to flash drives and e-mailing it to everyone to cut down on material costs.

No further comments or questions.

b. Discuss Speaker Assignments and Preparation

Patricia Taylor commented from past experiences that if you have a member that is assigned to speak, to be clear on talking points and talk about things related to the topic.

Jeff Finley confirmed that all speakers did agree to speak on these items although there is one topic that we don't have a primary speaker on and that his MAP 21. In talking with some of the VLAC members it was suggested that perhaps it would be a good idea to have one or more of the COG directors speak to MAP 21 because there are technical issues and funding formulas that are very complicated.

A discussion ensued about MAP 21 the complexity of the issue and who would be a good candidate on speaking about MAP 21. Mayor Amarpreet Dhaliwal had volunteered as an alternate speaker with the group agreeing to make him the primary speaker.

No further comments or questions.

7. FY 2013-14 Valleywide Overall Work Program
Approve, Including Valleywide Coordinator Contract

M. Sigala

Michael Sigala provided a brief update stating that he worked with staff during last month along with updating the budget and population numbers as requested.

Patricia Taylor stated that the approval would be for the Valleywide Overall Work Program and for the Valleywide Coordinator Contract.

Andy Chesley motioned for approval and was seconded by Barbara Steck. Motion carried.

No further comments or questions.

8. MAP-21 Subcommittee
Receive Update

B. Abanathie

Bruce Abanathie commented that MAP 21 is a whole new paradigm. It's a new direction in a lot of ways and has some focuses that will really benefit the valley particularly on freight movement. A couple of the changes have really created problems and those are the ones that we wanted to address. The letter (handed out) isn't exactly what was planned when this was initially started. We had discussions on the format of this letter and my intent was to actually take the USC sections and modify them. So what I ended up doing is putting together something that would basically tell the Congressman these are some of the changes that were made and these are some of the problems they created. Bruce went over CMAQ and PM 2.5 as examples.

On the Transportation Alternatives Program as far as the Federal law goes, the only concern is the idea that only TMAs will receive direct subvention of TA funds. What we are recommending is that all MPOs receive direct subvention of TA funds. Bruce commented that he thinks the entire state would like to see a direct subventions of TA funds, like transportation enhancements was before 2004 when it went into the CTC. That is the Federal issue and is the only issue we are addressing with the congressman. The other thing is as I mentioned, the state program eliminated one significant area of eligible projects, for years we have worked to pull ADA out of those unfunded mandates list of programs and with TA, we finally got it and now the state has taken it back out. We have a concern over the fact that the state is limiting eligible projects as stated in Federal legislation.

The last issue to address was the Buy America issue. We want to work with the larger community in addressing not only Buy American but any of these problems that they see to get more influence in resolving the issues. Bruce specifically recommend to the group and all seem to agree that the language in Section 313, that it already exists needs to be modified and leave out this additional paragraph that MAP 21 puts in. Bruce has been watching the Federal register for the waiver notifications and has seen one waived modification since MAP 21 came out which was for bridge parts back east somewhere. So we have vehicles projects that are 14 to 15 months into their efforts to get a waiver and we got no word, FHWA cannot give us updates. What we are asking is that we put a time frame on the waiver requests. And we are also going to request a CE on the waivers for projects that the Federal government has already started, there are no materials that meet Buy America in those projects.

Patricia Taylor commented on the letter whether you are requesting that we sign this letter. Bruce responded no. Bruce stated we still have work to do on this. The public transportation pages are still blank and that is because we're still waiting for some promised information from FTA and are also still waiting for some promised information from Caltrans Division of Mass Transportation. If you look at the public transit transportation portions, our biggest problem here is some confusion of recipients and some recipients. What we would like to see is that our public transportation providers are the recipients and they can have some say in who else in the area received this public transportation money, like they did under SAFETEA LU, TEA 21 and under ICE-TEA. Bruce is still waiting on more information on that. Then is format, the letter itself right now is five pages and we could keep it probably to about seven pages. It was suggested a bulleted list of issues be developed to address and then allow that bulleted list to be flushed out in further

conversation depending on the congressman's legislative staff wants to see. What Bruce is looking for now is feedback from the different MPOs, if anyone has any significant problems with what is here, or additions with what is here, if the format of the letter is what the directors and Policy Council would like to see and where should this letter come from. Patricia Taylor responded and directed Bruce to send the directors and e-mail with his questions. Andy also agreed on the letter with bullet points, and the technical appendix as an attachment.

No further comments or questions.

9. Next Regional Policy Council Meeting – March 22, 2013
Receive Input on Agenda Topics and Action Items

M. Sigala

Patricia Taylor stated they were looking for input or suggestions for agenda topics and you can email those to Michael Sigala.

No further comments or questions.

10. Community and Regional Planning Center at CSU Fresno
Update and Discussion

R. Audino

Rachel Audino stated that during the last COG directors meeting she mentioned their office has taken over the CRPC on campus with the College of Social Sciences. She introduced her colleague Phillip Siegrist who will also be working on CRPC. She discussed what role they can have to help the COGs, receiving statements from COG staff about the status of the Certificate of Community and Regional Planning and we are also exploring opportunities for contract services for local agencies doing general plan assessments. Rachel also stated that they would also like to get on all of your TAC (Technical Advisory Committee) meetings to do more outreach with planning directors and if you have any feedback on potential roles that the CRPC can have to let them know.

Bruce Abanathie invited the CRPC to their next meeting on the 20th. Ben Kimbal also displayed interest in collaborating with CRPC.

No further comments or questions.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

11. High Speed Rail

Diana Gomez

Diana Gomez (California High Speed Rail) updated the group on CP 1. They received five bids and are currently analyzing the five bids, which is a three-step process. Within the next two weeks they will be opening up the bids and determining who the contractor will be and start negotiating and hopefully by June they will be awarding a contract. The other activity in progress is around the "Y" which is around Chowchilla. HSR Authority will have two public meetings, one set for March 20th in Fairmead and the second on March 27th in Chowchilla to go over the alternatives. Diana stated that they settled on two lawsuits and are making significant progress. Diana also proposed to come out and meet with Patricia Taylor and Marjie Kirn about the "Y" and inform them on what will be proposed.

From Fresno to Bakersfield they plan on going to their board in April or if not May to talk about staff recommendation on the preferred alternatives. We will continue to prepare the final document that they are hoping to get certified by August or September, and then hopefully getting the Federal approval by November. Diana stated that they hired a CFO (Chief Financial Officer), which was the final piece of the executive staff.

Carrie Bowen commented on the Merced to San Jose corridor, which according to Carrie was where they were going to put the "Y" in. Carrie also raised a question of where the heavy maintenance facility will be. Diana stated that this year they won't be selecting a site (for the maintenance yard).

No further comments or questions.

12. Caltrans Directors Report

C.Bowen/S.Ehlert

Carrie Bowen stated she is excited about AME and Pelandale moving forward. Federal Highway Administration is awarding projects to small businesses and minority owned businesses and she has been working with District 6, they have been making a lot of progress in their Protégé Mentor Program for AME. Carrie indicated that consultants and contractors they are interested in meeting with the COG directors (from the Mentor Program).

Carrie also added that the Buy America is also causing some challenges for Caltrans especially with utilities. She also added that she would like to see the jobs for high-speed rail and Caltrans projects to benefit the people that live here and work here.

Gail Miller also reiterated that MAP 21 is causing challenges locally and at the national level.

No further comments or questions.

13. Interregional Goods Movement Plan

M. Sigala

No comments or questions.

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

T. Smalley

No comments or questions.

15. Proposition 84/Blueprint

R. Terry

No comments or questions.

16. San Joaquin Valley Greenprint

C. Thompson

No comments or questions.

17. California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley

R. Audino

No comments or questions.

18. Regional Energy Planning

M. Sigala

No comments or questions.

OTHER ITEMS

19. Director Items

No comments or questions.

20. Public Presentations for Items Not on Agenda.

No comments or questions.

Meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.

Next Directors Meeting: Wednesday, April 3, 2013 (Monterey)

Appendix A: List of Others Attending

Bruce Abanathie, KCAG
Ben Kimball, TCAG
Derek Winning, MCTC
Jeff Findley, MCTC
Rosa Park, Stan COG
Diane Nyguen, SJ COG
Gail Miller, Caltrans, District 6, Deputy Director
Lezlie Kimura, Air Resources Board
Diana Gomez, California High Speed Rail
Rachel Audino, CA Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley
Elizabeth Jonasson, California for Clean Air
Michelle Garcia, Fresno-Madera Medical Society
Georgiena Vivian, VRPA Technology Inc.
Phillip Siegrist, Community Regional Planning Center, Fresno State
Michael Sigala, Valleywide Coordinator, Sigala Inc.
Jose Ramirez, Sigala Inc.

On the phone:

Tanisha Taylor, SJ COG
Aaron Hoyt, SJ COG
Kim Anderson, SJ COG
Robert Ball, Kern COG
Ken Baxter, Caltrans, District 10
Carrie Bowen, Caltrans, District 10, Director
Tom Jordan, SJVAPCD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: San Joaquin Valley Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Status

ITEM 6

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approval.

DISCUSSION:

ITS Maintenance Plan Overview:

The San Joaquin Valley ITS Strategic Deployment Plan requires periodic maintenance to remain relevant. Changes to the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) in the San Joaquin Valley Region, such as newly implemented projects or changes in agency priority, will be documented through updates to the Strategic Deployment Plan using procedures in the Maintenance Plan (federally accepted in July 2005).

ITS Maintenance Plan Purpose:

Released in 2001, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Final Rule and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Policy require regions, which are using funds from the Highway Trust Fund, to establish a Regional ITS Architecture /Strategic Deployment Plan that complies with the National ITS Architecture. In response, the eight counties within the San Joaquin Valley adopted the San Joaquin Valley ITS Strategic Deployment Plan in September 2001. This plan received federal approval in January 2002. The plan fosters the integration of regional ITS systems and defines the system components, key functions, stakeholders, and information sharing. It guides the development and deployment of ITS projects and safeguards against the loss of federal funding.

ITS Maintenance Status

The San Joaquin Valley began the coordination of the RTP update in 2012. During the same time period, the ITS Maintenance Team, with representatives from each of the eight Metropolitan Transportation Organizations (MPO), met to discuss the need for a comprehensive ITS update. Within the Maintenance Plan it states: “a comprehensive architecture update will be completed every three years, concurrent with the update of the RTPs, as needed.” The three options discussed were to 1) reaffirm that the existing ITS architecture is still consistent with the San Joaquin Valley’s needs; 2) update ITS architecture with the assistance of a consultant; or 3) do nothing. At the February 2013 Maintenance Team meeting and with agency staff knowledge of the analysis included in the Strategic Deployment Plan, the staff level consensus was to recommend that the Executive Directors of the eight MPOs reaffirm the Strategic Deployment Plan’s consistency with the needs of the San Joaquin Valley. A comprehensive update is not needed at this time because there are no significant changes. Any minor updates will be addressed individually following the Maintenance Plan procedures.

Federal Highway Administration has requested that Fresno COG update the Fresno County ITS Strategic Deployment Plan and Kern COG update the Early Deployment Plan for the Kern Region. The Fresno COG and Kern COG efforts’ will be done independent of the San Joaquin Valley ITS Plan and will not be complete prior to the adoption of the 2014 RTP.

Recommendation

- Reaffirm the Strategic Deployment Plan’s consistency with the needs of the San Joaquin Valley

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – APRIL 3, 2013

7. High Speed Rail

D. Gomez

Diana Gomez, Central Valley Regional Director, or her representative may be in attendance to provide an update and answer any questions.

8. Caltrans Directors Report

C. Bowen / S. Ehlert

Carrie Bowen, District 10 Director, and Sharri Ehlert, District 6 Director, or their representatives may be in attendance to provide an update and answer any questions.

9. Interregional Goods Movement Plan

M. Sigala

The San Joaquin Valley Interregional Goods Movement Plan is entering month 22 and is approximately 90 percent complete. To date, Phase One (tasks one thru six) including: *Economic and Demographic Profile, Importance of Goods Movement in the Valley, Commodity Flow Profile, Commodity Growth Profile, Industry Profiles, and The Community, Environmental, and Economic Impacts of Freight Movement* segments of the report have been completed as well as an identification of the final project list and numerous stakeholder engagements.

Phase Two and Three (tasks seven thru nine) of the Plan will be: *Identify and Evaluate Strategies for Improving Freight Mobility* (task 7), *Identify Strategies for Mitigating the Effect of Goods Movement on Local Communities and the Environment* (task 8), and the *Final Report including Institutional/Funding Arrangements Needed to Implement the Plan* (task 9). Tasks 7 and 8 are complete in draft form. It is anticipated that all work products will be completed by the end of May 2013.

The next monthly meeting of the Technical Working Group will be on Thursday, April 18, 2013 at 10 am. The Plan will be presented at the Caltrans Transportation Planning Workshop on April 8, 2013 in Visalia.

All relevant information for this planning effort can be found at:
<http://www.sjvcogs.org/goods.html>

10. Valley Legislative Affairs Committee (VLAC)

J. Findley

Jeff Findley, Chair of VLAC, will be available to provide any updates and answer any questions.

11. SJV Rail Authority (SB 325)

T. Smalley

Ted Smalley (TCAG) will be available to answer any questions.

12. Proposition 84/Blueprint

R. Terry

(Prop 84 Round 1) Blueprint Integration (BPI) outreach and circuit planning activities to the 46 valley cities with populations under 50,000 continues has recently been expanded to provide Blueprint Principle integration assistance to these cities through April 2013. 41 of the 46 cities are coordinating assistance efforts with their respective circuit planning team, with the five electing not to participate doing so based upon their lack of

staffing and/or project needs. As of March 8, 2013, all of the participating cities have signed their agreement letters and are engaged in coordination efforts.

(Blueprint) Transition of Toolkit management, from the Fresno COG to that of the Community and Regional Planning Center (CRPC) (overseen by the Office of Community and Economic Development (OCED) at Fresno State), has completed, with both Fresno COG and CRPC staff continually working together on training, management protocol and future needs assessments. The Valley Planner's Network, which is comprised of various planning agency staff from around the Valley, will house a standing item for Toolkit reporting and discussion on their quarterly agenda.

In conjunction with representatives from SACOG and the Local Government Commission, remaining Blueprint balances at all of the eight Valley COGs/RTPAs are being combined to provide for training on the fiscal impact analysis tool IMPACS (created by SACOG as part of their Urban Footprint Model). It is anticipated that this training will provide each COG the knowledge and tools to assist their local member agencies in fiscal analysis, where requested. It has always been the goal of the Blueprint and Toolkit to provide assistance to local agencies in their planning processes. With the addition of IMPACS to the knowledge base, each COG/RTPA will have one more tool, free of charge, to assist their local partners in analyzing planning decisions and their potential fiscal impacts. Training is currently scheduled to take place April through June of 2013, and will include COG/RTPA staff working one-on-one with local agency representatives. Attached is the information sheet used by the COGs to outreach to their local agencies for participation; which includes training dates and details.

In late February, Fresno COG officially submitted a letter to the Council of Infill Builders regarding the Dr. Arthur C. Nelson report "A Home for Everyone: San Joaquin Valley Housing Preferences and Opportunities to 2050" (<http://www.councilofinfillbuilders.org/resources/valley-housing.html>), which was released on January 22, 2013 through the Council on behalf of the Natural Resource Defense Council (NRDC). The letter states the position that some of the critical data/findings within Dr. Nelson's research did not seem to accurately portray the valley, or its markets, and gives methodology for such findings. A copy of the letter was provided to the Director of each Regional Agency; additional copies are available upon request.

For any questions regarding the above notated items, please contact Rob Terry at (559) 233-4148 Ext. 222 or via email at rterry@fresnocog.org.

13. SJV Greenprint

C. Thompson

The most recent meeting of the Greenprint Steering Committee was held March 26. Major agenda items included an update on project timelines, a tour of currently available data, and the establishment of a subcommittee to assist with a detailed scope of work for Phase 2 of the project. The Steering Committee, project consultants, and others are very mindful of the terminology and data layers (maps) to be used in the "State of the Valley" report. While the best available data will be utilized, its importance, source, accuracy, and limitations will be made transparent throughout the document. Enclosed is a draft outline of the TABLE OF CONTENTS for the "State of the Valley" report to provide you with a sense of what the report will include. Phase 1 of the project is estimated to be completed by the end of this calendar year.

14. CA Partnership for the SJV

R. Audino

Future Meetings

Smart Valley Places CEC Meeting

April 23, 2013

Clovis City Council Chambers

2013 SJV Regional Economic Forum

April 26, 2013

Location: Radisson Hotel, Fresno

15. Regional Energy Planning

M. Sigala

The **Southwest Solar Transformation Initiative (SSTI)** has developed "roadmaps" 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. The program ended in February 2013

The Regional Energy Planning for Economic Development Roadmap.

Correspondence with the California Energy Commission is ongoing with our valley partners. A comment letter to the CEC from the Regional Policy Council was submitted for the 2013-14 Investment Plan for the Alternative and Renewable Fuel Vehicle Technology Plan. Our comments, if incorporated into the Plan, would allow for greater flexibility for funding an alternative fuel component of our Regional Energy Planning Roadmap.

The last Valleywide Regional Energy Planning meeting was held in August 2012 with Congressman Costa. The next meeting is scheduled for 10am, April 10, 2013, at the Tulare Energy Education Center, a facility of the Southern California Edison company.

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Your Council of Governments (COG) invites you to participate in IMPACS training

Please Join Us!

Your local COG would like to invite you to join them in participating in training on the fiscal impact analysis tool IMPACS, provided by the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint (additional details can be found on page 2). The training will be conducted by representatives from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), who created the tool, and will provide the foundation for your agency to utilize this free tool within your own jurisdiction. Your local COG representative and you will attend the training together, establishing a strong network for technical support, where needed. Training will include the following five Tasks, with relevant training dates indicated in **green (please save these dates)**:

Task 1. Model Data Documentation

-SACOG will prepare a detailed report on the required data inputs, how they are used in the model, and an explanation of the reports. This information will be provided prior to the first web-based training session.

Task 2. Model Distribution

- SACOG will prepare IMPACS for distribution to MPOs. This includes, but is not limited to: highlighting appropriate data input points, calling out defaults versus specific inputs, creating tool/function specific notes, generalizing inputs to make as few as possible Sacramento specific defaults, etc.
- SACOG will work with representatives from each MPO to sign tool user consent forms, and receive the latest version of the IMPACS tool.

Task 3. Pre-Training Webinar

April 10, 2013 – 10 a.m. - Noon

-SACOG will host a webinar to take place 2 weeks prior to the in person training session. The webinar will be to go over the data requirements and address any issues on loading the tool locally.

Task 4. In Person Training (at Fresno COG)

April 24, 2013 – 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.

- SACOG staff will travel to Fresno COG to conduct a full day, hands-on, IMPACS training. The session includes, but is not limited to: data inputs, calculations, and outputs.
-SACOG will provide 15 laptops for use during the training. Multiple users can group up on a laptop. Participants are also welcome to bring their own laptops; we ask that you have the model loaded before the training begins (see Task 2).

Task 5. Follow-Up Webinars

May 8, 2013 & June 5, 2013 – 8 a.m. - Noon

- SACOG will host two follow-up webinars to answer any questions, provide assistance on setting up IMPACS with local data, and to help with scenario development.

FISCAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Answers to Commonly Asked Questions

What is IMPACS?

The Integrated Model for Planning and Cost Scenarios (IMPACS) is a model that provides local governments a means of evaluating the fiscal challenges and opportunities of providing infrastructure and services in their communities. This model was created by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments as part of their Rural-Urban Connection Strategy (RUCS) tool.

How much will the model cost my community?

Nothing! The model (which was developed by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments - SACOG), and training, is being provided through the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint.

How much data is required to use the model?

To estimate the infrastructure demand and cost of a project, it is necessary to analyze a large amount of data regarding site conditions, the proposed land use program, development parameters, infrastructure unit costs, and potential development revenues. While the IMPACS model performs the majority of these analyses automatically, the model requires the user to provide key data inputs.



How can it be used to help my community?

The IMPACS model allows communities to analyze the infrastructure, parks, and certain public service requirements and understand the fiscal impacts of different development scenarios. The model can help jurisdictions perform the following tasks:

- Determine infrastructure demand from proposed development.
- Estimate the capacity of existing infrastructure.
- Determine whether new infrastructure is required for a proposed development project.
- Estimate capital costs and operational costs needed for the new infrastructure.
- Determine law enforcement, emergency service, library, and park and recreation needs.
- Evaluate expected revenues from development and compares with cost and expenditures.
- Identify thresholds in land use patterns that trigger the need for new, larger, or smaller infrastructure.

Who can help me learn how to use the model? Who can provide on-going technical support?

Each area's regional transportation planning agency (COG/RTPA) is receiving training on the model to ensure agencies have a local contact for assistance and technical support, when needed. Each regional agency will be looking for one local agency staff person to join them for the training, to jump-start the use and knowledge of the model. After training has concluded, the IMPACS Tool will be housed on the Blueprint Toolkit (toolkit.valleyblueprint.org) for open use.

Who can help me learn how to use the model? Who can provide on-going technical support?

Each area's regional transportation planning agency (COG/RTPA) is receiving training on the model to ensure agencies have a local contact for assistance and technical support, when needed. Each regional agency will be looking for one local agency staff person to join them for the training, to jump-start the use and knowledge of the model. After training has concluded, the IMPACS Tool will be housed on the Blueprint Toolkit (toolkit.valleyblueprint.org) for open use.

Where can I get additional information on the model? Additional info on RUCS, including info on IMPACS, can be found at:
<http://www.sacog.org/rucs/pdf/RUCS%20Tools.pdf>

GREEN PRINT - State of the Valley Report Outline

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Abstract or Statement of Purpose (1 page)
2. Executive Summary (2-5 pages)
3. Table of Contents
4. Introduction
 - a. Landscapes of the San Joaquin Valley
 - b. Overview of the SJV's Open Space and projected demands on this space from human population growth
 - c. Agricultural Economy
 - d. Competition for Resources and Space
 - i. Water
 - ii. Air Quality
 - iii. Natural Habitats
 - e. Pressures on the Region's Open Space, agricultural, mineral, and recreational landscapes.
 - i. Urban Growth
 - ii. Urban-Rural Boundary Conflicts
 - iii. Land Fragmentation
 - iv. Air Quality
 - v. Climate Change
 - f. Environmental Justice and Social Equity
 - i. Exposure
 - ii. Vulnerability
 - g. Compatible Uses
5. Water Issues
 - a. Resource Description
 - i. Current Status
 - ii. Trends
 - iii. Future Challenges
 - b. Available Datasets
 - i. Surface Water
 - ii. Ground Water
 - c. Data Gaps
 - d. Regulatory Environment
 - e. Implications for the region
6. Agriculture and Rangelands
 - a. Resource Description
 - i. Current Status
 - ii. Trends
 - iii. Future Challenges
 - b. Available Datasets
 - i. Soils
 - ii. Crops
 - iii. Dairy
 - iv. Confined Animal Facilities
 - v. Ranching and Rangeland
 - c. Timber
 - d. Regulatory Environment
 - e. Linkages to other resources
 - f. Data Gaps
7. Mineral Resources
 - a. Resource Description
 - i. Current Status
 - ii. Trends
 - iii. Future Challenges

- b. Available Datasets
 - i. Aggregate (Gravel) Sources
 - ii. Petroleum (oil and gas)
 - c. Regulatory Environment
 - d. Linkages to other resources
 - e. Data Gaps
- 8. Air Quality
 - a. Resource Description
 - i. Current Status
 - ii. Trends
 - iii. Future Challenges
 - b. Available Datasets
 - c. Regulatory Environment
 - d. Linkages to other resources
 - e. Data Gaps
- 9. Energy
 - a. Resource Description
 - i. Current Status
 - ii. Trends
 - iii. Future Challenges
 - b. Available Datasets
 - i. Solar
 - ii. Wind
 - iii. Biomass
 - c. Regulatory Environment
 - d. Linkages to other resources
 - e. Data Gaps
- 10. Natural Habitats and Ecosystems
 - a. Resource Description
 - i. Current Status
 - ii. Trends
 - iii. Future Challenges
 - b. Available Datasets
 - c. Regulatory Environment
 - d. Linkages to other Resources
- 11. Recreational Opportunities
 - a. Resource Description
 - i. Current Status
 - ii. Trends
 - iii. Future Challenges
 - iv. Linkages to other resources
 - b. Regulatory Environment
 - c. Available Datasets
 - i. California State Parks
- 12. Other Regional Data
 - a. Available datasets
 - i. Land Use Planning
 - ii. Transportation
 - iii. Administrative Boundaries
- 13. Integration (lead-in to Phase 2)
 - a. Compatible Uses
 - b. Conflicting Uses
- 14. Conclusion
- 15. Appendices
 - a. Glossary
 - b. Data List