

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 Thursday, May 2, 2013 Time: 10:00 a.m.

Meeting Location:
Tulare County Association of Governments
210 N. Church Street, Suite B
Visalia, CA 93277

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Enclosure

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. April 3, 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 | P. Taylor | |
| <i>a. Discussion with Janill L. Richards of the California Attorney General's Office Regarding the RTP Adoption Schedules</i> | | |
| <i>b. Receive Input for May 17, 2013 Meeting Facilitation Training</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. Valley Legislative Affairs Committee (VLAC) | J. Findley | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <i>a. Receive Survey Results from Valley Voice Sacramento</i> | | |
| <i>b. Discuss Topics for the Federal Platform</i> | | |

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. Implementation of the San Joaquin Rail Authority (SB 325) | T. Smalley |
| 11. Proposition 84/Blueprint | R. Terry |
| 12. San Joaquin Valley Greenprint | C. Thompson |
| 13. California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley | R. Audino |
| 14. Regional Energy Planning | M. Sigala |

OTHER ITEMS

15. Director Items
16. 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, June 6, 2013 in Modesto (StanCOG)

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

ITEM 1

Meeting Location:

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

**Meeting Minutes For:
Wednesday, April 3, 2013
Time: 1:00 p.m.**

Members Attending:

Terri King, KCAG (via phone)
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. March 7, 2013 Directors' Meeting

Rob Terry (Fresno COG) proposed some changes concerning Item 3a (RTP topic) in terms of grammatical errors and updated text concerning Kerns EIR mitigation and Georgiena Vivian's comments.

Ahron Hakimi made a motion to approve, seconded by Ted Smalley subject to Rob Terry's changes. 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**

**San Joaquin
Council of
Governments
Andrew Chesley**

**Stanislaus
Council of
Governments
Carlos Yamzon**

**Tulare County
Association of
Governments
Ted Smalley**

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS:

2. FTIP/Air Quality

T. Taylor

Tanisha Taylor stated that six of the eight MPOs released their 8 Hour Ozone Amendment. This amendment extends the deadline to July 20, 2013. The remaining MPOs are scheduled to release this week. She also stated that there should be no issues moving forward beyond that time frame. The second item Tanisha highlighted is that EPA did approve EMPAC 2011 with a six month transition period. This means that after September 6, 2013 each of the MPOs for progress level and regional conformity will be required to use EMPAC 2011.

Ahron Hakimi asked if guidance to do project level conformity is available yet. Tanisha addressed Ahron's question by stating that is true. EPA and ARB are working on guidance to have for the September 6th timeframe in order to be able to use EMPAC 2011.

No further comments or questions.

3. Regional Transportation Plans / Sustainable Communities Strategies

a. Update on the 2014 RTP Schedule/SCS Schedule, Follow Up to Attorney General Discussion

T. Taylor

Diane Nguyen updated the RTP/ SCS efforts that SJ COG is doing. She stated many of the MPOs are working towards an October 2013 schedule to bring RTP/SCS for policy board approval. Speaking for San Joaquin Council of Governments alone, she stated that the technical work behind creating the scenarios is very extensive and they would like to have adequate time for community outreach and feedback. Diane stated that October 2013 is a highly aggressive timeline and are finding it a great challenge to meet.

Diane stated that Andy Chesley touched bases with the CA Attorney General's Office Janill Richards to give her a status update on our progress, and to ascertain their opinion on exceeding the October 2013 schedule timeframe. In Andy's conversation with Janill Richards, she indicated that the Atty. General's Office position for the MPOs is to have high a quality Regional Transportation Plan that each MPO is comfortable with in terms of vetting with the public and in terms of our due diligence. Janill also stated that the quality should not be sacrificed. So what Andy's take away from that conversation was that if MPOs need additional time, a few extra months would be ok.

Andy Chesley added that the point that Ms. Richards made was that they are very open to extending the deadline date and in fact they don't really believe that their agreement with us is to adopt our RTP's by the end of this calendar year and simply ask that by the end of calendar year we have presented an analysis on various scenarios associated with SCS development. Andy stated that we need to be at least close together in terms of adoption because of the air quality conformity effort that we have to go through but thinks February or March of 2014 is very doable for the Atty. General's office.

Ted Smalley commented that from TCAGs perspective, he is very supportive of extra time but is really looking at a realistic schedule of December 2013. Second, he agreed with Andy that whenever we decide, we need to stick together and work together on this.

Ahron Hakimi asked if everyone is prepared to discuss this next month and agree on a date potentially or is that premature. Patricia Taylor also commented if we are looking at a particular month are we making a range from February to March or are we saying any time from February to March. Ahron Hakimi stated that he would like to vote on that as a group and agree to the date next month if we can. Carlos Yamzon also supported a March 2014 date. Patricia Taylor stated if there is a danger from outside agencies monitoring or watching our process of moving it up or is it just our agreement with the Atty. General's office. Ahron stated that groups such as Amanda Eakins are in favor of getting it right instead of rushing it. Patricia Taylor stated that there was a consensus to bring this back to a vote at next month's meeting.

No further comments or questions.

b. Discuss RTP Valleywide Chapter

T. Smalley

Ted Smalley stated there is a meeting next week. The goal is to reduce the number of pages from 50 to 20 or so pages and make it something that all of us can use when we go to the Washington DC to highlight how we work together as a valley. It's not meant to be a comprehensive detailed reproduction of everything that is in the chapters before.

No comments or questions.

c. SCS Outreach/ Facilitator Training Request

B. Veenendaal

Brenda Veenendaal stated they have money left in the Valleywide SCS Prop84 Grant for workshops support. Support for training, directors, staff, or possibly board chairs to come in and do a face to face on issues that may come up in public meetings, how to talk about the RTP/ SCS process and what it means. Brenda inquired from the directors if they felt this would be a good appropriation of the funds and if so when should the training begin.

Ahron Hakimi asked if this training is based on experience of going through this with one of the other regions. Brenda responded that MIG (consultant) has experience in the bay area. They were scrutinized from certain groups who didn't like the fact that we were putting together an SCS. They went through quite a bit with the MPOs (in that area) and that was one of the reasons that we wanted to hire MIG to be our consultant. They possess the tools to help us should we encounter some negativity about the whole process from the SCS itself. Ahron again asked if it would refer to issues like the UN, Agenda 21 and things like that. Brenda responded with a yes. Both Kern and Merced were receptive. Ahron also suggested including electives to be part of that training.

Patricia Taylor stated that there was a consensus to utilize these funds for this purpose. Patricia also announced that she would get back to Brenda on the exact date per consensus of the directors. Next steps would be for Brenda to e-mail Michael Sigala to circulate opinions amongst the COGs regarding date options.

No further comments or questions.

**4. San Joaquin JPA for Intercity Passenger Rail Service
Update and Discussion**

D. Leavitt

Dan Leavitt stated that the first San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority (JPA) board meeting was held on March 22nd. The meeting was well attended with over 100 people. Their board took a lot the action including voting for a Chair, Supervisor John Pedrozo from Merced along with two Vice-Chairs, Supervisor Henry Perea of Fresno and Councilman Steve Cohn from Sacramento. The board also approved bylaws, conflict of interest code, letter of support, along with comments on the Draft State Rail Plan. They also approved scopes for grant applications for a business plan and for public outreach. Dan stated the next board meeting will be May 24 in Sacramento at the Old City Hall at 1:30pm but will confirm that by the end of the week. There is also an upcoming lobbying event April 10th and 11th. April 10th will be attended by the board members. Dan encouraged RTPA Directors participation for the April 11th meeting from 9:00am-3:00pm in Sacramento. In addition there is a working group meeting coming up in which the RTPA Directors are a part of on April 19th. Margie Kirm directed a question for Dan if he would like executive directors or electives to attend. Dan responded that it would be good to have executive directors there on the April 11th. Andy Chesley directed a question to Dan regarding the subcommittee that is working on the RFP (for management of the JPA) and requested a meeting of the JPA by teleconference prior to May 25, if that would be allowable in the JPA bylaws. Dan responded that they did not include teleconference into the bylaws so an amendment may be required. Andy suggested it would work out better to have the JPA approve the RFP prior to May 25. Andy and Dan we'll discuss this matter further next week.

Terri king gave an update regarding Kings County joining the JPA. They discussed it at their last board meeting and she will be placing it on their agenda to consider joining. Terri also mentioned that they want the western HSR alignment. Patricia Taylor asked Dan what is the process for having Kings County join the JPA. Dan responded they are able to join in at any time and would have to go through the same process to appoint a board member and alternate with approval of the JPA (enacting document). Kern COG stated their continued opposition (to the JPA).

No further comments or questions.

**5. State Route 99
Bond Saving Program - Status of Project Programming**

C. Yamzon

Carlos reported a lot has happened but there is not much to report. Carrie Bowen reported that Pelandale is their next project for bond savings. She met with Norma and Rachel (Caltrans HQ) to discuss moving forward with Pelandale for the May CTC meeting, however, the comfort level is not there in terms of the risk of no additional funding for the project. She stated Caltrans has about \$500 million in construction right now. Caltrans looked at their risk, needs about \$16 million to move forward. The concern is with some change orders that weren't in the identified risk that were a huge amount and involve structures, right of way, and railroads. Until we get through this rail issue, Caltrans is nervous because the other project structures become very complex and costly.

Ahron Hakimi asked when would you be ready. Carrie stated that she don't know because they just started construction on big jobs (Manteca phase III and South Stockton for example). Caltrans is also fighting the railroad and asking the PUC to help. The railroad is asking Caltrans to maintain their right of way and maintain their structure to a level that

Caltrans is not comfortable with and don't have the funds to do. Therefore, Caltrans doesn't have an answer but will keep looking and asking for the information.

Carlos Yamzon stated that at every CTC meeting, we (Valley RTPAs) have been very visible and our correspondence on behalf of COG Directors and Regional Policy Council has been consistent. Based on information provided at the CTC meeting, the last report basically said that the prudent reserve has been reduced to 25 million (16.9 million for south valley). These are the numbers that we work with our locals, gauging what we need and what is available according to the SR 99 bond.

Andy Chesley directed a question to Caltrans about committing to give regular updates as we proceed forward. Sharri Ehlert responded that so many of these projects are in infancy. The Tulare job is well underway, which is one of eight and because these two projects account for all the monies in savings, Sharri sees it as a waste for Carlos and Ted if you go and allocate these projects and Caltrans has come back to you and ask for your local funds to complete the projects.

Ted Smalley appreciates Caltrans work. Ted mentioned that they are waiting for June to give it more time and his counter was to find caveats that we can agree upon. In our case, TCAG offered to hold invoices for a year. So in other words, you can't pay back what you haven't been given. Ted reiterated that there should be a way to move projects forward with minimal risk. This is what is frustrating to Ted. Ted stated he would be willing to wait a year or a year and a half to get paid back and if we don't get paid back at all then that is the risk. Sharri stated they have assessed their risk at 16 million. What if it increased to 20 million, where would the additional monies come from? You made commitments to pay back. Ted challenges the group to come up with caveats by June, what the caveats will be and figure out what we can do because Tulare wants to go to bid.

Carlos Yamzon spoke of precedents in place from Elk Grove and the need for caveats to be fair. Sharri stated to give us a couple of months to reassess our risks. Carlos Yamzon stated moving toward a Cooperative Agreement arrangement instead of the Letter of No Prejudice. Ted commented that they (CTC) wouldn't entertain a Letter of No Prejudice.

Sharri Ehlert asked to hear from Andy about the initial eight projects. The commitment from those COGs supporting funding the projects. Andy Chesley responded that there was a provision stating that those projects were going to be fully funded.

Patricia questioned the term "fully funding" meaning the projects are in construction phase with Andy affirming the comment with a yes. Patricia stated that fully funded wasn't an accurate statement for Madera because CTC changed guidelines and would not allow for some of the funds to be used on Madera's projects. Sharri mentioned the 5+ million dollar reserve she has for her project (Madera).

Carrie Bowen is committed to moving projects forward but can't commit to reassess until June. Ahron Hakimi implied that just doing the math that August sounds more realistic based upon when the bids come in. The CTC meets in May and June skipping July and back in August.

No further comments or questions.

6. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
Reaffirm the Strategic Deployment Plan's Consistency with the Needs of the San Joaquin Valley

R. Pacheco

Raquel Pacheco reported that ITS Maintenance Team with the representatives of the eight counties met to discuss the need of a comprehensive San Joaquin Valley Intelligent Transportation System Strategic Deployment Plan update. The plan states a comprehensive architectural update will be completed every three years concurrent with the update of the Regional Transportation Plan as needed. The three options discussed were:

1. To reaffirm that the existing ITS architecture is still consistent with San Joaquin Valley's needs.
2. Update that ITS architecture with the assistance of a consultant.
3. Do nothing.

At the February 2013 Maintenance Team meeting, the staff level consensus was to recommend that the executive directors of the eight MPOs reaffirm the Strategic Appointment Plan's Consistency with the needs of the San Joaquin Valley. A comprehensive update is not needed this time because there have been no significant changes. Raquel Pacheco requests that the San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies Committee reaffirmed that the Strategic Deployment Plan's Consistency with the needs of the San Joaquin Valley.

Andy Chesley motioned for approval, seconded by Marjie Kim. Motion approved.

No further comments or questions.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

7. High Speed Rail

Diana Gomez

Patricia Taylor stated that there is a High Speed Rail board meeting tomorrow in Fresno. She also stated that they are making a recommendation on the “Y” in Madera along with stating that Madera County withdrew their lawsuit.

No further comments or questions.

8. Caltrans Directors Report

C.Bowen/S.Ehlert

No comments or questions.

9. Interregional Goods Movement Plan

M. Sigala

Michael Sigala stated there is good progress and proceeding to finalize by May or June. A Draft Final Report should be complete by May for the COG directors and June for the Policy Council. Michael directs a question concerning the budgets; he informed the consultants that they were not included in the Fiscal Year 2013-14 MPO budgets because that was what was agreed upon earlier. Michael wanted to clarify this matter.

No comments or questions.

10. Valley Legislative Affairs Committee

J. Findley

Jeff Finley (MCTC) thanked everyone for attending the valley voice trip to Sacramento which was represented well by the valley. VLAC will be meeting next week in planning the Washington DC trip and also developing the draft Federal legislative platform. If you have any specific topics that you would like to add to the list please let your staff representative know and we will compile the list. Our goal is to have the final draft Federal legislative platform to the policy council by July 21. VLAC will probably meet 2 to 3 times between now and then.

Margie Kirn gave an update on Buy America that she received a call from Congressman Jim Costa. FHWA Congressional Affairs notified him that they had made a decision to process partial Buy America requests. FHWA says they will post a request for comments by April 12th allowing for a 15 day comment period soon after the comment period FHWA will either deny or grants waivers.

No further comments or questions.

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

T. Smalley

No comments or questions.

12. Proposition 84/Blueprint

R. Terry

No comments or questions.

13. San Joaquin Valley Greenprint

C. Thompson

Clark Thompson stated they are in Phase One of the San Joaquin Valley Greenprint. At the conclusion of Phase One we will have a State of the Valley Report that includes a table of contents indicating what the valley report will look at. The report is projected to be ready by the end of this calendar year. We are in the process of thinking of Phase Two. In our recent meeting we talked about pulling together a subcommittee to help better defined Phase Two; the tasks, deliverables, etc. with allocation of funds appropriated for Phase Two.

No comments or questions.

14. California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley

R. Audino

No comments or questions.

15. Regional Energy Planning

M. Sigala

Michael Sigala stated that there is a meeting on Wednesday, April 10 at 10:00 am at the Tulare Energy Center, a Southern California Edison building.

No comments or questions.

OTHER ITEMS

16. Director Items

No comments or questions.

17. Public Presentations for Items Not on Agenda.

No comments or questions.

Meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Next Directors Meeting: Thursday, May 2, 2013 (Visalia)

Appendix A: List of Others Attending

Rosa Parks, StanCOG
Diane Nyguen, SJ COG
Ben Kimball, TCAG
Robert Phipps, Kern COG
Carrie Bowen, Caltrans District 10
Sharri Ehlert, Caltrans District 6

On the phone:

Georgiena Vivian, VRPA Technology Inc.
Ken Baxter, Caltrans, District 10
Dan Leavitt, Regional Rail Commission
Raquel Pacheco, Kern COG
Tanisha Taylor, SJ COG
Lezlie Kimura, Air Resources Board
Jeff Findley, MCTC
Aaron Hoyt, SJ COG
Kim Anderson, SJ COG
Gail Miller, Caltrans, District 6
Rob Terry, Fresno COG
Jose Ramirez, Sigala Inc.

2013 Valley Voice Trip to Sacramento Survey



1. Overall, do you feel that the trip was worthwhile?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		100.0%	14
No		0.0%	0
Additional Comments			2
answered question			14
skipped question			0

2. Would you be interested in participating in a similar effort next year?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		100.0%	14
No		0.0%	0
Additional Comments			0
answered question			14
skipped question			0

3. Would you be willing to take part in a larger effort in Washington D.C. on September 10-13, 2013?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		100.0%	14
No		0.0%	0

Additional Comments 2

answered question	14
-------------------	----

skipped question	0
------------------	---

4. Were one day and a half of meetings in Sacramento adequate?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		85.7%	12
No		14.3%	2

Additional Comments 3

answered question	14
-------------------	----

skipped question	0
------------------	---

5. Did you find the meetings with the Assembly and Senate members and State agencies productive?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		92.9%	13
No		7.1%	1
	Additional Comments		2
	answered question		14
	skipped question		0

6. Do you prefer to meet with Assembly and Senate members and State agencies individually or would you prefer to have panel presentations/discussions instead?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Individual meetings with members		42.9%	6
Panel discussion with several members at a time		57.1%	8
	Additional Comments		4
	answered question		14
	skipped question		0

7. Are there additional elected officials or state agencies that we should be meeting with? If so, please provide suggestions.

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		72.7%	8
No		27.3%	3

Additional Comments 7

answered question 11

skipped question 3

8. Was the information provided during the meetings useful to you and your COG?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		100.0%	14
No		0.0%	0

Additional Comments 0

answered question 14

skipped question 0

9. Do you feel that the delegates spoke with one Valley voice during the meetings?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		85.7%	12
No		14.3%	2
	Additional Comments		3
	answered question		14
	skipped question		0

10. Do you feel that the legislative requests were understandable, reasonable and measurable?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		92.9%	13
No		7.1%	1
	Additional Comments		2
	answered question		14
	skipped question		0

11. Do you feel that the commitments received from Legislators and state agency staff adequately addressed the requests made by the SJV delegation?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		78.6%	11
No		21.4%	3
	Additional Information		4
answered question			14
skipped question			0

12. Should more time be dedicated in the morning to debrief, plan and review the daily events?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		21.4%	3
No		78.6%	11
	Other (please specify)		1
answered question			14
skipped question			0

13. Did you prefer the approach of presenting key regional priorities only to certain Members or staff, instead of presenting every priority at every meeting?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		85.7%	12
No		14.3%	2

Additional Comments 2

answered question	14
skipped question	0

14. Were your Valley Voice binders adequate? If not, what should have been included or excluded?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		100.0%	14
No		0.0%	0

Additional Comments 2

answered question	14
skipped question	0

15. Did you find the hotel accommodations to be adequate?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		92.9%	13
No		0.0%	0
N/A		7.1%	1
Additional Comments			2
answered question			14
skipped question			0

16. Did you find the organized group lunch and group dinner accommodations to be adequate?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		100.0%	14
No		0.0%	0
Additional Comments			4
answered question			14
skipped question			0

17. Do you have any suggestions on how San Joaquin Valley Legislators, Elected Officials and COGs can work together to meet common goals in a manner that benefits the region?

	Response Count
	6
answered question	6
skipped question	8

18. Any suggestions on how we could improve the trip:

	Response Count
	3
answered question	3
skipped question	11

Q1. Overall, do you feel that the trip was worthwhile?

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| 1 | Good group of elected. We need to include Assembly women Shanon Groves next year. | Apr 9, 2013 10:05 AM |
| 2 | Somewhat. We are getting better each year in the overall approach. Unlikely to see direct benefits. | Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM |

Q3. Would you be willing to take part in a larger effort in Washington D.C. on September 10-13, 2013?

- | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|
| 1 | If work allows | Apr 9, 2013 10:05 AM |
| 2 | Different issues expected. More program funding opportunities vs. State. | Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM |

Q4. Were one day and a half of meetings in Sacramento adequate?

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| 1 | In addition to meeting with our own representatives, most of whom we already know, it would be worthwhile to also meet with representatives in key positions to help us or the leaders of the different chambers. | Apr 9, 2013 1:57 PM |
| 2 | Although the second half day was a waste. | Apr 9, 2013 1:06 PM |
| 3 | Two full days. | Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM |

Q5. Did you find the meetings with the Assembly and Senate members and State agencies productive?

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| 1 | They were productive, but it seemed like we were preaching to the choir in a lot of cases. It would be interesting to bring in a few legislators from other parts of the State to hear from us, although it would probably be difficult to get them to join us. | Apr 9, 2013 8:05 PM |
| 2 | We may have found out what their priorities are, but in the end statewide priorities will take over and may not be beneficial to the SJV. | Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM |

Q6. Do you prefer to meet with Assembly and Senate members and State agencies individually or would you prefer to have panel presentations/discussions instead?

1	especially if they are of the same party and we are simply relaying the identical message.	Apr 9, 2013 8:05 PM
2	A combination of both on a seperate day would be good.	Apr 9, 2013 10:05 AM
3	Might be difficult to get legislators at the same time to form a panel. We'd have to be really organized to have panel discussions and have engaging presenters.	Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM
4	If it is for timing purposes, then panel discussions would also be adequate.	Apr 8, 2013 4:13 PM

Q7. Are there additional elected officials or state agencies that we should be meeting with? If so, please provide suggestions.

1	Those from other parts of the State who aren't aware of issues we face and how important we are to the health of their district.	Apr 9, 2013 8:05 PM
2	Senate Pro Tem, Speaker of the Legislature and any key committee chain persons.	Apr 9, 2013 1:57 PM
3	Governors Office	Apr 9, 2013 10:08 AM
4	TBD as we get closer to next year.	Apr 9, 2013 10:05 AM
5	Non-SJV electeds in important positions that should get to know us or be of assistance. Gov. or his main staff.	Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM
6	All local elected officials	Apr 9, 2013 8:02 AM
7	Key Governor's staff	Apr 8, 2013 4:13 PM

Q9. Do you feel that the delegates spoke with one Valley voice during the meetings?

1	Only a couple of diversions	Apr 9, 2013 8:02 AM
2	The more comfortable the speaker was with the subject the better the conversation. Have others ready to add questions or comments in addition to the main speaker to make it more of a conversation.	Apr 8, 2013 5:03 PM
3	I think this year was alot better and speakers/presenters were more prepared and the meetings flowed very well.	Apr 8, 2013 4:13 PM

Q10. Do you feel that the legislative requests were understandable, reasonable and measurable?

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| 1 | We need to have clear request and clear objectives. Vague requests get us no where but I still see value in going and bonding as a group. The more we do this the better we will get. | Apr 8, 2013 5:03 PM |
| 2 | However, some requests could be fine tuned. | Apr 8, 2013 4:13 PM |

Q11. Do you feel that the commitments received from Legislators and state agency staff adequately addressed the requests made by the SJV delegation?

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| 1 | Is there such a thing as a commitment from someone in Sacramento other than the promise to raise taxes? | Apr 9, 2013 8:05 PM |
| 2 | We shall see if the follow through. | Apr 9, 2013 1:57 PM |
| 3 | How and who will conduct follow up with them. | Apr 9, 2013 10:05 AM |
| 4 | If there is a specific action that we request they take then we can get specific commitments whether or not they are willing to take those actions or support a position. | Apr 8, 2013 5:03 PM |

Q12. Should more time be dedicated in the morning to debrief, plan and review the daily events?

- | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|
| 1 | We did a better job of preparing up front. | Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM |
|---|--|---------------------|

Q13. Did you prefer the approach of presenting key regional priorities only to certain Members or staff, instead of presenting every priority at every meeting?

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| 1 | Makes better use of limited time available and is more focused. | Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM |
| 2 | Yes. I really liked this approach. I understand that staff or Members may not hear every issue; however, I feel that directing certain requests to those that may have more influence over the matter, or that are already working on legislation is more productive. | Apr 8, 2013 4:13 PM |

Q14. Were your Valley Voice binders adequate? If not, what should have been included or excluded?

- | | | |
|---|------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | Pages for notes. | Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM |
|---|------------------|---------------------|

Q14. Were your Valley Voice binders adequate? If not, what should have been included or excluded?

2	I used my ipad and that work fine.	Apr 8, 2013 5:03 PM
---	------------------------------------	---------------------

Q15. Did you find the hotel accommodations to be adequate?

1	Appreciate the full breakfast with room rate, unlike the Holiday Inn.	Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM
---	---	---------------------

2	Great Location!	Apr 8, 2013 4:13 PM
---	-----------------	---------------------

Q16. Did you find the organized group lunch and group dinner accommodations to be adequate?

1	All great	Apr 9, 2013 10:05 AM
---	-----------	----------------------

2	Did not care for the lunch location. Too crowded and meal too small and tasteless. Great dinner location and meal choices.	Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM
---	--	---------------------

3	I would have preferred the seating at the dinner to be more interactive versus individual tables. I noticed that each county sat at separate tables versus encouraging interaction between county representatives	Apr 8, 2013 5:03 PM
---	---	---------------------

4	Great Selections	Apr 8, 2013 4:13 PM
---	------------------	---------------------

Q17. Do you have any suggestions on how San Joaquin Valley Legislators, Elected Officials and COGs can work together to meet common goals in a manner that benefits the region?

1	More time for discussion, understanding, and consensus, prior to the trip.	Apr 9, 2013 10:41 AM
---	--	----------------------

2	Consistent follow through between annual visits to address their commitment.	Apr 9, 2013 10:05 AM
---	--	----------------------

3	Big city problems/solutions proposed by key legislators do not benefit all regions of the SJV. Need flexibility in the use of funds that may become available that are beneficial to each individual MPO and their local agencies.	Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM
---	--	---------------------

4	Coordinate with partnership with gov	Apr 9, 2013 7:50 AM
---	--------------------------------------	---------------------

5	Keep doing this. We will get better each year.	Apr 8, 2013 5:03 PM
---	--	---------------------

6	consider a working framework on water and reduction of 2/3 threshold all counties can agree with.	Apr 8, 2013 4:15 PM
---	---	---------------------

Q18. Any suggestions on how we could improve the trip:

1	One or two presenters did not do the best job on their topics. Although early planning took place, need to get speakers selected earlier to insure we get the best ones. A few members left early the second day. This does not look good. Selected presenters should make the commitment to stay the entire time. Perhaps a full second day would encourage them to stay.	Apr 9, 2013 9:15 AM
2	Make sure that we have more female participation on the speaking panel.	Apr 8, 2013 5:03 PM
3	Free Food	Apr 8, 2013 4:15 PM

San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies' Directors' Committee

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – MAY 2, 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 23 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, May 16, 2013 at 10 am.

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

10. SJV Rail Authority (SB 325)

T. Smalley

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

11. 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. Final drafts of all the products created for/with each city will have been completed by the end of April, with project close-out activities

San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies' Directors' Committee

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – MAY 2, 2013

commencing in May. Templates of all of the tools provided will be housed on the Blueprint Toolkit website for open access and use (toolkit.valleyblueprint.org).

(Blueprint) 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. ***Meeting flyer for the IMPACS training is attached.***

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.

12. 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 Valleywide extent of the planning area. The next meeting of the Steering Committee is Tuesday, May 14 and is an in-person meeting beginning at 2:00 p.m. At this meeting a draft report on the project context/background information, one of the early project deliverables, will be discussed and direction provided. The Committee will also review an outline of Phase 2 tasks and deliverables, for which the Strategic Growth Council has awarded \$400,000, as the Fresno COG begins more detailed preparations for the Phase 2 contract between the COG and the State Department of Conservation. The Committee may also recommend the COG Directors approve an expansion of the Committee to include a representative from the Local Government Commission to assist with discussions and strategies for Valleywide outreach.

For any questions regarding the SJV Greenprint, please contact Clark Thompson at (559) 233-4148 Ext. 203 or via email at clarkt@fresnocog.org.

13. CA Partnership for the SJV

R. Audino

Upcoming Meetings

2013 SJV Regional Economic Forum

Fresno City Hall

Friday, May 3 8:30am to 12pm

*San Joaquin Valley Regional
Planning Agencies' Directors' Committee*

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – MAY 2, 2013

Smart Valley Places CEC Meeting

Clovis City Council Chambers
Tuesday, June 4 10am to 12pm

CA Partnership for the SJV Board Meeting

Hanford Civic Auditorium
Friday, June 14 10am to 12pm

14. Regional Energy Planning

M. Sigala

Regional Energy Planning for Economic Development Roadmap.

A Valleywide Regional Energy Planning meeting was held on April 10, 2013, at the Tulare Energy Education Center, a facility of the Southern California Edison company. Representatives from Kern Energy Watch/Kern COG, Southern California Edison, PG&E, Assemblymember Henry T. Perea's Office, SJV Clean Energy Office, Tulare County Association of Governments, National Association of Regional Councils, Paul Johnson & Associates, GMS Energy, the California Partnership for the SJV, the SJV Air Pollution Control District and the SJV Regional Policy Council attended the meeting.

The meeting offered an opportunity to exchange information about initiatives in the Valley related to energy including AB 118 funding, the Rate Payer Equity Act (AB 327), Carl Moyer program funding, CA Partnership industry analysis, Monterey Shale and other programs and funding opportunities. The next valleywide meeting will occur in August 2013.

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>