Meeting Agenda

Friday, June 23, 2017
Time: 11:00 a.m.

Meeting Location:
Stanislaus Council of Governments
1111 “I” Street, Suite 308
Modesto, CA 95354

Teleconference Number: 1-712-432-1212
Participant Code: 432-600-639

A. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Chair Mendoza
   January 27, 2017 Regional Policy Council Meeting

C. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS
   1. Valley Legislative Affairs Committee
      Ben Kimball
      a. Discuss Legislative Platform for Valley Voice
         Washington D.C. 2017 (Sep. 6 & 7)
      b. Review Valley Voice Itinerary and Logistics
   2. Discuss and Consider the Formation of Committees
      Andy Chesley
      a. Executive Committee for the Purposes of Expediting
         Actions on Behalf of the Council
      b. Water Policy Committee
         Chair Mendoza
   3. SB 1 Implementation
      Ted Smalley
      Receive Update and Discuss Implications for
      Valley Projects and Programs
4. Rural Transit Alternatives Study
   *Receive Project Update*
   Michael Sigala

5. San Joaquin Valley Goods Movement Planning Studies
   *Receive Updates*
   Michael Sigala

6. California Transportation Commission Members
   *Discuss Nominees from the San Joaquin Valley*
   Ted Smalley

7. Valleywide Overall Work Program for Fiscal Year 2017-18
   *Accept and Consider Approving*
   Michael Sigala

8. Meeting Calendar for Fiscal Year 2017-18
   *Review and Consider Approving*
   Michael Sigala

D. OTHER ITEMS

1. Executive Directors’ Report
   Ted Smalley

2. Policy Council Member Comments

E. PUBLIC COMMENT

   *This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons wishing to address the Council on items within its jurisdiction but NOT on this agenda. Public Comment will be allowed during the Discussion/Action Items above.*

Phone Conference Meeting on Friday, July 21, 2017 at 10 am to Approve Valley Voice DC Legislative Platform

Phone Conference on Friday, August 25, 2017 at 10 am to Discuss Valley Voice DC

Next Regular Regional Policy Council Meeting: Friday, December 15, 2017

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Accommodations**

The public meeting location and restrooms are ADA accessible. Representatives or individuals with disabilities should contact the SJV Regional Planning Agencies at 559.266.6222, at least 3 days in advance, to request auxiliary aids and/or translation services necessary to participate in the public meeting.
ITEM B

Meeting Minutes

Friday, January 27, 2017
Time: 10:30 a.m.

Meeting Location:
San Joaquin Council of Governments
555 East Weber Avenue
Stockton, CA 95202

Regional Policy Council Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>MPO/COG</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>JURISDICTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amarpreet Dhaliwal – Chair (phone)</td>
<td>Fresno COG</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of San Joaquin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Yep (phone)</td>
<td>Fresno COG</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of Kerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Wegman (phone)</td>
<td>Kern COG</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of Wasco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Verboon</td>
<td>KCAG</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Kings County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Frazier</td>
<td>MCTC</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Madera County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Poythress</td>
<td>MCTC</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>City of Madera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Villalta (phone)</td>
<td>MCAG</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of Los Banos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daron McDaniel (phone)</td>
<td>MCAG</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Merced County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Winn</td>
<td>SJ COG</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>San Joaquin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elbert Holman</td>
<td>SJ COG</td>
<td>Vice Mayor</td>
<td>City of Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Zoslocki</td>
<td>StanCOG</td>
<td>Councilmember</td>
<td>City of Modesto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vito Chiesa</td>
<td>StanCOG</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>Stanislaus County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudy Mendoza – Incoming Chair</td>
<td>TCAG</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>City of Woodlake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuyler Crocker</td>
<td>TCAG</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>County of Tulare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seyed Sadredin (phone)</td>
<td>SJVAPCD</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please see Appendix A for a list of other attendees
A. CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Michael Sigala

B. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Chair Dhaliwal

Chair Dhaliwal announced that he will be stepping down as chairman and opened the nominations for chairman and vice chairman. Supervisor Robert Poythress nominated Mayor Rudy Mendoza for chairman. There were no other nominations.

There was a motion to appoint Mayor Rudy Mendoza as chairman of the policy council.

First Motion: Supervisor Robert Poythress
Second Motion: Supervisor Daron McDaniel
No Nays
Motioned Carried

Newly appointed Chair Mendoza proceeded with facilitating the meeting and moved forward with nominations for vice chairman.

There was a motion to appoint Supervisor Chuck Winn as vice chairman of the policy council.

First Motion: Vice Mayor Elbert Holman
Second Motion: Supervisor Doug Verboon
No Nays
Motioned Carried

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

June 17, 2016 Regional Policy Council Meeting

First Motion: Supervisor Doug Verboon
Second Motion: Supervisor Brett Frazier
No Nays
Motioned Carried

C. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

1. Valley Legislative Affairs Committee

Ben Kimball


Mr. Ben Kimball, Tulare County Association of Governments, briefly touched on the success of the Valley Voice D.C. trip and welcomed any comments and/or feedback to improve on for the next trip. He announced that planning efforts for Valley Voice Sacramento 2017 have already started.

b. Discuss California Legislative Platform and Valley Voice Sacramento 2017 (March 1)

Mr. Ted Smalley, Tulare County Association of Governments, opened discussions on the upcoming legislation as it applies to goods movement. He noted that numerous transportation packages are being discussed, and the importance of the Valley to have one voice while going after national freight funding. A policy council conference call will be held on February 17th at 10 a.m. to discuss the details of each proposal and ensure that everyone is up to speed on all topics.
2. Goods Movement Funding for Major SJV Projects
   a. Receive Update on Current Goods Movement Planning Efforts and FAST Act Funding – Cambridge Systematics

   Mr. Michael Fischer, Cambridge Systematics, presented a PowerPoint and discussed the importance of goods movement in the Valley, background of the FAST Act legislation, and SJV projects that are in progress. He noted that economic activity in the Valley is critically dependent on goods movement, and discussed key issues that need to be addressed for goods movement to be more efficient and cost effective for industries. Mr. Fischer mentioned that the FAST Act creates a national freight program with funding behind it and there are several funding programs now available, however, projects must be a part of the National Highway Freight Network to be eligible to receive funding. He went on to discuss in detail two projects in the Valley that are underway. A final report will be completed in early March 2017, and will be presented to the COG directors in April 2017 for approval to be released to the public. Further discussion regarding the projects ensued.

   b. Discuss and Approve Next Steps for State and Federal Funding Strategies for Major Valley Corridors; Consider Approving Letter of Support Outlining Major Projects – Ted Smalley

   Mr. Ted Smalley presented a letter highlighting national freight projects that are ready for construction, and urging support for critical highway investments in the SJV.

   There was a motion to approve signing the letter of support from the policy council.

   First Motion: Supervisor Brett Frazier
   Second Motion: Supervisor Doug Verboon
   No Nays
   Motioned Carried

3. Air Quality/SCS/RTPs – Andy Chesley
   Receive Update and Discuss Possible Next Steps

   Mr. Ryan Niblock, San Joaquin Council of Governments, led the discussion on air quality efforts and greenhouse gas emissions reduction. He provided an update on the Valley’s interactions with ARB regarding RTP/SCS. Since his last update, the Valley has submitted a letter to ARB establishing a timeline for target setting and highlighting factors beyond the Valley’s control that create challenges for establishing higher greenhouse gas targets. Mr. Niblock reported that the Valley has continued regular coordination with ARB staff and the entire valley has been delivering on the on the promises of the 2014 RTP/SCS. A single report from the entire valley was submitted to ARB by the end of the year deadline, and positive feedback from ARB was received.

4. Rural Transit Alternatives Study – Michael Sigala
   Receive Project Update

   Mr. Michael Sigala, SJV coordinator, provided a brief overview of the Rural Transit Alternatives Study Project. Valley MPOs were awarded a Caltrans planning grant to work with UC Davis Institute of Transportation Studies in looking at alternates for meeting rural transit needs. Various factors are considered to find alternatives that fit the needs of residents, are cost effective, and reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions. The goal is to implement a pilot program in a community in the valley that can be replicated in other communities.
5. Annual Policy Conference – March 8th and 9th in Fresno

Receive Update
Brenda Veenendaal, Fresno Council of Governments, announced that registration for the conference is now open, sponsorship requests were sent out in December, and the committee is continuing to work on confirming guest speakers. Ms. Veenendaal briefly described optional events that are scheduled during the conference. A draft agenda will be shared once items are closer to being finalized.

D. OTHER ITEMS
1. Executive Directors’ Report
   Mr. Andy Chesley gave a congratulation to the two new self-help counties, Stanislaus and Merced.

2. Policy Council Member Comments.
   Chair Mendoza thanked policy council members for their support and confidence, and stated that he looks forward to successful year in 2017 and promoting the good work done in central valley.

E. PUBLIC COMMENT
   There were no public comments presented.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 11:45 a.m.

Next Regional Policy Council Meeting: Friday, June 19, 2017 (later changed to June 23)

Appendix A: list of other meeting attendees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual(s)</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ted Smalley</td>
<td>TCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Sigala</td>
<td>SJV Coordinator/Sigala Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Boren</td>
<td>Fresno COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Niblock</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Park</td>
<td>StanCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Chesley</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Taylor</td>
<td>MCTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Leavitt</td>
<td>ACE Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Fischer</td>
<td>Cambridge Systematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Kimball</td>
<td>TCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Zepeda</td>
<td>MCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Dumas</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rippera</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Cunningham</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington D.C.
Regional Priorities Summary
September 6-9, 2016

2016 legislative platform provided for discussion purposes only.
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Request Summary:
1. The Federal Highway and Federal Transit administrations should consider a community’s “economically disadvantaged” status as a major criterion for grant funding. The definition of “economically disadvantaged” should be determined by factors similar to those used in the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroscreen), including:
   a. Areas disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative public health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation, and
   b. Areas with concentrations of people that are of low income, high unemployment, low levels of home ownership, high rent burden, sensitive populations, or low levels of educational attainment.
2. Congress should consider amending the FAST Act to provide for “mid-range” applicants under the FASTLANE and TIGER programs specifically for those municipalities or counties between 200,000 and 1 million in population.

CONTACT:
Ted Smalley
Executive Director
Tulare County Association of Governments
210 N. Church Street, Suite B
Visalia, CA 93291
Email: tsmalley@tulare cog.org
Phone: 559-623-0450

Despite a collective population of more than 4 million people today, which is expected to grow to more than 5.4 million, or 26 percent of state population by 2050, jurisdictions in the San Joaquin Valley routinely have their projects overlooked during the competitive grant process for the TIGER and FASTLANE programs, both by Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration.

Situated between the Bay Area and Southern California – neither entirely urban nor rural – and with economic and environmental conditions similar to the Appalachian region, the SJV should be provided greater opportunities to compete for available federal grant funding with larger metropolitan areas.

Owing to its status as the premiere agricultural provider in the nation, the SJV routinely faces 15 percent unemployment with 19 percent of the population classified as living under the federal poverty line. At the same time, however, the Valley’s housing affordability continues to attract new residents and road miles, which now number 31,400 or 18 percent of California’s total.

Logistics comprises one Valley economy’s fastest-growing segments and is quickly becoming the lifeblood of farmers, manufacturers, oil providers and others who depend on infrastructure to move their goods to market. For the SJV to accommodate its anticipated growth, it will need to compete effectively for all available federal funding on a level playing field that considers its unique location and circumstances.
Request Summary:

1. Support FAST Act discretionary freight programming (FASTLANE) for regionally significant projects in the San Joaquin Valley. These priority projects are highlighted in attached letter from the congressional delegation of the San Joaquin Valley.

2. Support FAST Act formula programming that includes a fair and equitable distribution and consultation process between the Valley MPOs and state and federal apportionment agencies.

3. Support policy and funding for priority projects identified in the ongoing San Joaquin Valley Interregional Goods Movement planning processes.

Contact:
Ted Smalley
Executive Director
Tulare County Association of Governments
210 N. Church Street, Suite B
Visalia, CA 93291
Email: tsmalley@tularecog.org
Phone: 559-623-0450

The San Joaquin Valley is California’s fastest growing region and the nation’s number one agricultural producer, generating more than $35 billion in the gross value of agricultural commodities such as milk, nuts, lettuce, tomatoes, wine, grains and other products. The Valley plays a major role in processed foods and energy products nationally and internationally. As a growing and diversified region, the Valley depends on an efficient goods movement system for its long-term economic success and to safely move Valley resources for transport throughout the rest of the nation.

The eight San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies continue to work in partnership with federal and state agencies, and key private stakeholders to promote freight movement, and the economy, for our region. The San Joaquin Valley Interregional Goods Movement Plan, finalized in 2013, highlighted how freight movement is a vital component of the San Joaquin Valley’s diverse economy that significantly plays a major role in the distribution of agricultural materials throughout California, the United States, and the world. The Plan is being updated in 2016-17 with additional analysis for priority rural corridors and first-and-last mile connectors. It is anticipated that many of the priority projects identified through our planning efforts will also be eligible for federal Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act freight funding.

- 25 percent of all food in the United States comes from the San Joaquin Valley.
- Over 500 million tons of commodities are transported in the San Joaquin Valley annually; projected to increase to 800 million tons by 2040.
- Trucks are the dominant mode and account for 90 percent of all freight movement.
- State Route (SR) 99 and Interstate 5 (I-5) serve as the backbone to our goods movement system and have higher than average truck percentage volumes. SR 99 and I-5 are on the National Primary Freight Network.
- Lack of capacity for both State Route 99 and Interstate 5 results in congestion and poor air quality for the region.
- Over 44 percent of all employment in the San Joaquin Valley is associated with goods movement-de-
SR 99 and I-5 are critical arteries for goods movement in the State of California and the San Joaquin Valley. Deferred maintenance and the lack of capacity are major issues for SR 99 and I-5. Capacity upgrades for SR 99 to a minimum of six lanes throughout the Valley total approximately 110 miles are estimated to cost $1.6 billion. Additionally, east-west connectors and first-and-last-mile connectors play a critical role in supporting the Valley’s goods movement network.

The San Joaquin Valley goods movement interregional infrastructure system includes:

- 31,420 roadway miles
- Two major Class 1 railroads (BNSF Railway & Union Pacific)
- Short line and regional railroads
- The Port of Stockton
- Seven air cargo airports
- Several existing and planned multimodal transfer facilities

### Priority Goods Movement Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>SR 120 - Widen freeway from I-5 to SR 99. Construct connector ramps and bridges.</td>
<td>$116M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>SR 99 - Widen freeway to 6 lanes from Stanislaus/Merced County line to Hammatt Ave.</td>
<td>$29.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera</td>
<td>SR 99 - Widen freeway to 6 lanes from Ave 12 to Ave 17.</td>
<td>$62.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>SR 180 - Extend expressway to 4 lanes east of Frankwood Ave towards Kings Canyon/Sequoia National Parks.</td>
<td>$100.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>SR 41 - Widen freeway to 4 lanes from Kings/Fresno County line to Elkhorn Ave.</td>
<td>$40.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare</td>
<td>SR 99 - Widen freeway to 6 lanes from Caldwell to Prosperity.</td>
<td>$80M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern</td>
<td>SR 58/SR 99 - Construct connector ramps and bridges.</td>
<td>$150M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the many attainment plans that have already been developed and implemented, the San Joaquin Valley is mandated under the Clean Air Act to develop and adopt a number of new ozone and particulate matter plans in the coming years. The degree of difficulty faced by the Valley in meeting the new federal ambient air quality standards are unmatched by any other region in the nation. Attainment of the latest standards will require transformative changes and development of innovative control strategies to significantly reduce emissions from mobile sources, which now make up over 85% of the Valley’s NOx emissions.

Over the next few years, the Valley must adopt a number of attainment plans to address the following standards:

- 2006 PM2.5 Standard (35 μg/m³ 24-hr and 15 μg/m³ annual)
- 2012 PM2.5 Standard (12 μg/m³ annual)
- 2008 Ozone standard (75 ppb 8-hr)
- 2015 Ozone Standard (70 ppb 8-hr)

Despite achieving significant emissions reductions through decades of implementing the most stringent stationary and mobile regulatory control program in the nation, NOx emissions (primary precursor for both ozone and PM2.5) in the San Joaquin Valley must be reduced by an additional 90% in order to attain the latest federal ozone and PM2.5 standards that now encroach on natural background levels. This air quality challenge is unmatched by any other region in the nation.

The District has jurisdiction over stationary and area sources, which make up less than 15% of the total NOx emissions inventory (Figure 1). The remainder of emissions are associated with mobile sources, the majority of which fall under federal control. The Valley will leave no stone unturned in seeking additional reductions from stationary sources of emissions.
Clean Air Act Modernization

Request Summary:

The Clean Air Act was last amended in 1990. Over the last 25 years, local, state, and federal agencies and affected stakeholders have learned important lessons from implementing the law and it is clear now that a number of well-intentioned provisions in the Act are leading to unintended consequences. This experience can inform efforts to enhance the Clean Air Act with much needed modernization.

The Clean Air Act needs to be strategically amended to address the following five issues. We urge action on this matter as we believe that inaction will set many regions up for failure and economic devastation as the new federal standards encroach on background pollution concentrations.

CONTACT:
Tom Jordan, Senior Policy Advisor
San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
1990 E. Gettysburg Avenue, Fresno, CA 93726
Email: tom.jordan@valleyair.org
Phone: 559-230-6000

Problem 1: Every five years the Clean Air Act requires that EPA review and update air quality standards. The transition between standards is chaotic and leads to a number of overlapping plans with different milestones and attainment dates. In the Valley, there are six active air plans (one for a revoked standard). Over the next two years, four new plans must be developed. Solution 1: When a new standard is published, the old standard for that pollutant should be subsumed. States should be allowed to develop a single attainment plan that harmonizes increments of progress and other milestones without allowing for any rollback or backsliding.

Problem 2: Mobile and stationary sources throughout the nation have now been subject to multiple generations of technology forcing regulations that have achieved significant air quality benefits. Meeting the new standards that approach background concentrations call for transformative measures that require time to develop and implement. These transformative measures require new technologies that in many cases are not yet commercially available or even conceived. The formula-based deadlines and milestones that were prescribed in the Act 25 years ago now lead to mandates that are impossible to meet. Solution 2: In establishing deadlines and milestones, the Act should be amended to require control measures that lead to the most expeditious attainment of health based standards while taking into account technological and economic feasibility.

Problem 3: The Act as it relates to the demonstration of Reasonable Further Progress or Rate of Progress treats all precursors the same, regardless of their potency in harming public health or achieving attainment. Solution 3: The Act should be amended to allow states to focus efforts on meeting new standards in the most expeditious fashion through deployment of scarce resources in a manner that provides the utmost benefit to public health.

Problem 4: Requiring contingency measures in extreme nonattainment areas is irrational and unnecessary. These areas, by definition, have already implemented all available and foreseeable measures and still need a “black box” of future measures to define and employ. Solution 4: We recommend that the Act be amended to eliminate the requirement for contingency measures in areas classified as “extreme” non-attainment by EPA.

Problem 5: The Act requirements for severe and extreme ozone nonattainment areas to address vehicle-related emissions growth must be clarified. Solution 5: The Act should be amended to allow states to take credit for all transportation control measures and strategies and not punish areas that have implemented transportation control measures and strategies that have achieved early reductions in emissions.
Regional Transportation Plans
Change Adoption From 4- to 8-Year Cycles

Request Summary:
Allow Regional Transportation Plans to be updated every 8 years instead of every 4 years.

CONTACT:
Ted Smalley
Executive Director
Tulare County Association of Governments
210 N. Church Street, Suite B
Visalia, CA 93291
Email: tsmalley@tularecog.org
Phone: 559-623-0450

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a 25-year blueprint for transportation projects and funding in a region. They are prepared by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in order to develop our regional goal and priority list of projects and to qualify these projects for Federal and State Programming and Funding. They involve years of modeling, planning, public outreach extensive environmental review and are required to be updated every four (4) years at considerable cost.

By the time the RTP is completed, there is little or no time to implement it or to access performance before it is time to start developing the next one. The RTP would be more useful if it was not required to be updated so often, which would also save significant time and expense, make the process of planning and programming much more efficient.
Request Summary:
Provide Special Funding for Rural Roads that are used by dairies for daily farm to market shipping through a set aside in the next Transportation or Farm Bill.

CONTACT:
Ted Smalley
Executive Director
Tulare County Association of Governments
210 N. Church Street, Suite B
Visalia, CA 93291
Email: tsmalley@tularecog.org
Phone: 559-623-0450

The dairy industry is California’s leading commodity in cash receipts, generating a record $9.4 billion for milk production in 2014, up 23% from 2013 and 22% above the record year of 2011. The dairy industry represents a significant industry in the economy of the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) Counties. According to a survey of the recent county crop reports, milk is ranked in the top 3 commodities for 7 of the 8 SJV counties with an estimated value at $7.7 billion or 82% of California’s total market. There are at least 775 dairies in the Valley transporting millions of pounds of milk and milk products per day, which travel on local county and city roads in order to connect to the State Highway system.

Unlike other agricultural goods with a short, defined harvest season, dairies must transport their products off site every day, causing significant strain on frequently traveled roadways and accelerating the pavement’s lifespan. According to Caltrans, a fully loaded dairy truck can weigh up to 80,000 pounds. A roadway carrying 500 trucks per day is comparable to 5 million vehicle passenger cars trips per day. Also for consideration, the SJV is home to many milk processing facilities. California Dairies, Inc. with headquarters located in Visalia, CA is the second largest dairy processing cooperative in the United States shipping 17 billion pounds of milk annually. Many of the San Joaquin Valley counties are concerned about the localized impacts to our roads while the milk products, along with many other Valley produced commodities, are transported for global consumption.
Regional planning and programming is the cornerstone of an innovative and successful national transportation system and a critical in succeeding in project delivery. A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is a federal designation for a policy-making body made up of local and transportation agencies. The MPO’s are uniquely situated to deliver transportation projects in an efficient and effective manner and have a strong track record of success in getting projects constructed and saving time and money.

Part of the reason that they are so successful is that they have the ability to raise local and regional sales tax and other revenues that they can leverage with other funding to bring more funding to state and federal highways beyond what is normally available. To be successful at this, there needs to be a high level of cooperation among agencies, a willingness to partner together on projects and a lot of creativity. The Valley has been especially successful at getting projects delivered along Highway 99 and in the arenas of transit and air quality. However, there is much yet to be done.

The federal government needs to support regions in their role to deliver transportation projects and continue to work together with them as partners. Any legislation that would transfer decision-making authority over to the state or federal government should be avoided. Conversely, any legislation that strengthens the role of MPO’s in the process and creates added flexibility for MPO’s to be able to find innovative solutions to complex project implementation issues.

Recently the Merced County Association of Governments prepared a letter to the Federal Highway Administration strongly opposing the MPO Coordination and Planning Area Reform proposed rulemaking (Docket No. FHWA-2016-0016). This effort seeks to have regional governments coordinate their efforts, but in practice, will significantly change the relationship between neighboring regional governments, but does not take into consideration the highly successful existing efforts in the Central Valley. This type of one-size-fits-all approach eliminates creative solutions that have been proven to be effective over a long period of time.

In addition, the federal government should offer financial incentives to MPO’s that contribute local revenues (sales tax) to help pay for federal or state highway systems. This would bring more money into the federal system as well as help generate more funding for MPO’s to use on projects.
Request Summary:
We urge bipartisan cooperation between Congress and the Administration to resolve our water crisis.

We encourage support for new storage capacity projects including Temperance Flat Dam and Sites Reservoir in California.

CONTACT:
Tony Boren, Executive Director
Fresno Council of Governments
2035 Tulare Street, Fresno, CA 93722
Email: tboren@fresnocog.org
Phone: 559-233-4148

The SJV’s growing population and expanding economy require an adequate, quality water supply that is reliable for all sectors and the environment. Our supply is inadequate for the future: The San Joaquin, Merced, Kings, Kaweah, Tulare and Kern Rivers are valuable natural resources that need to be restored and protected while additional water supplies are developed. Water and energy are interdependent resources, with one-fifth of the state’s energy being used to pump, transport and treat water. Strategies must be addressed to maximize both resources.

Water is a pressing issue for all Californians, but as one of the fastest-growing regions in the state, water quality, supply and reliability concerns increase for Valley residents. Through 2030, the Valley’s growth rate is projected to be 65 percent higher than the state average. How effectively the region accommodates growth will be an important determination of California’s future. It is imperative that the region -- from San Joaquin County in the north to Kern County in the south -- work together with state and federal agencies to ensure adequate water needed to:

• Support regional economic growth
• Retain a world-class agricultural economy
• Maintain a reliable, high-quality urban water supply
• Protect and enhance our local environment.

The San Joaquin Valley has been severely impacted by reductions to its water supplies used for both municipal and agricultural farming operations. As a result, there is less work for county residents, resulting in double-digit unemployment in some areas exceeding 20 percent. Water is the lifeblood of the San Joaquin Valley and water supplies are vulnerable to sudden disruption and reoccurring droughts. Groundwater supplies have been drawn down faster than they have been replenished; and today’s infrastructures are insufficient to address water storage and conveyance needs anticipated under current and future.

We urge Federal legislators and the Administration to immediately take action to improve California’s water supplies, while also respecting California’s long-standing principles of water rights priorities. We also call on Administration officials to work with their legislative colleagues to develop and implement comprehensive plans that address water supply, reliability and affordability today and for future generations. A successful water plan must include additional storage such as the Temperance Flat Dam and the Sites Reservoir projects. Failure to increase water supplies in California will jeopardize America’s breadbasket and our state’s trillion-dollar economy.
DATE: June 23, 2017

TO: San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council

RE: Formation of Committees

It has been requested that the Regional Policy Council consider the formation of two committees; an Executive Committee and a Water Policy Committee.

The formation of committees, or subcommittees, is allowed under the San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies Policy Council By-Laws as originally adopted on December 4, 2009 and revised on February 6, 2015:

_The Policy Council shall have the ability to form additional committees and/or subcommittees, either formally or ad hoc, as deemed necessary._

Andy Chesley, Executive Director of San Joaquin Council of Governments will present the concept for the formation of an Executive Committee.

Chair Mendoza will present the concept for the formation of a Water Policy Committee.

**Requested Action.** Discuss and consider approving formation of committees, and take other actions as necessary regarding the policies, and or authority, of such committees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Annual Statewide Funding (FY 2016–17)</th>
<th>Expected Bay Area Funding (FY 2016–17)</th>
<th>Distribution Basis (or &quot;Competitive&quot;)</th>
<th>Re却ource Source</th>
<th>Indexed to CPI</th>
<th>Effective Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA)</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>LSR formula (SHC Section 2101(a)(3)(C))</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1-Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets and Roads (LSR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual LSR</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Not specified, but funds will be used by Caltrans for maintenance of the state highway system or for purposes of the state highway operation and protection program.</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Infusion</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>SHOOP</td>
<td>GF loan repayment</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Maintenance and Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual State Highway Maintenance and SHOPP</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Not specified, but funds will be used by Caltrans for state highway bridge and culvert maintenance.</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Infusion</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>General Fund (GF) loan repayment</td>
<td></td>
<td>See &quot;Effective Dates.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Bridge and Culvert</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Caltrans set aside</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>FY 2017–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Mitigation</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>FY 2017–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Formula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA Population-Based</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$94</td>
<td>Transit Agencies/RTPAs</td>
<td>STAPopulation- and revenue-based formulas (PUC Section 99313 and 99314)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1-Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA Revenue-Based</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 percent diesel sales tax increase</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA Capital</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>prior to receiving an apportionment, a recipient transit agency must submit a detailed list of proposed projects to Caltrans, after which the department shall certify the transit agency's eligibility to the Controller</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>FY 2017–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA Population-Based</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and Intercity Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual TIRP</td>
<td>$245</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>CalSTA</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Infusion</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity and Commuter Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Supported Intercity Rail</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>CalSTA</td>
<td>Each of the state's three intercity rail corridors will receive a minimum of 25 percent of these funds. CalSTA will adopt guidelines to govern the administration of the funds.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1-Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Rail</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$17.3</td>
<td>CalSTA</td>
<td>Each of the state's five commuter rail corridors shall receive 20 percent of the funds through FY 2019–20. Commencing on July 1, 2020, the funds will be allocated based on guidelines and a distribution formula adopted by CalSTA.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1-Nov-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Corridors</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>Competitive (unmarked)</td>
<td>20-cent/gallon diesel revenue tax increase</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions for Congested Corridors</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>Competitive. CTC, in consultation with AB, shall adopt program guidelines. The commission shall allocate no more than one-half of the funds available each year to projects nominated exclusively by the department. Preference shall be given to corridor plans that demonstrate collaboration between the department and local or regional partners.</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/L Partnership for Self-Help</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>CTC, in consultation with Caltrans, transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, and other local agencies, shall develop guidelines on the allocation of funds no later than January 1, 2018.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>FY 2017–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program (ATP)</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>ATP distribution (SHC Section 2381)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>See RARRA &quot;Effective Dates.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$5.7</td>
<td>SAFE agencies/CHP/Caltrans</td>
<td>Not specified. Funding will potentially flow through existing FSP formula, which was used to estimate the &quot;Expected Bay Area Annual Amous.&quot;</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>See RARRA &quot;Effective Dates.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Grants</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Competitive. Caltrans to develop guidelines in consultation with AB, OPR, and KCD.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>See RARRA &quot;Effective Dates.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resiliency Planning Grant (One-Time)</td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>GF</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Development Local Assistance</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>California Workforce Development Board</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>See RARRA &quot;Effective Dates.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Research</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>UC and CSU with legislative oversight</td>
<td>$100/year to the University of California and $2 million/year to the California State University</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>See RARRA &quot;Effective Dates.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The San Joaquin Valley MPOs in partnership with the UC Davis Institute of Transportation Studies (ITS) are working on a Caltrans funded study to examine if shared access services (ride-sourcing and ride-sharing arrangements such as uber/lyft, or car sharing), and other options, can provide alternatives for meeting transportation needs in rural areas of the Valley.

To date, the following recommended pilot concepts for further analysis have been approved by the MPO Directors:

- Microtransit in San Joaquin and Stanislaus counties (Escalon, Manteca, Lathrop and Riverbank)
- Ridesourcing/Ridesplitting in Tulare county (Cutler/Orosi/Dinuba)
- Carsharing in Kern county (Lamont)

In the coming months, ITS will develop a pilot project concept to test innovative transit solutions in one of these disadvantaged communities. A primary outcome of the study will be to establish a replicable transit model that can be used throughout the Valley, thereby decreasing the amount of passenger vehicle trips that occur in rural areas and across county lines.

Concurrent to these activities, the California Air Resources Board and California Energy Commission have released Request for Funding Proposals to implement pilot projects, such as those noted above, throughout California.

The Valley MPOs and UC Davis ITS have further partnered on these funding opportunities and have applied to ARB (IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOLLOWING THIS PAGE) for implementation of shared mobility and technology pilots in Kern, Tulare, Stanislaus and San Joaquin Counties.

**Requested Action.** None, informational only.
A. Funding: Larger projects in disadvantaged communities

B. Executive Description of Project

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (Valley Air) is the lead applicant for the proposed project entitled Ecosystem of Shared Mobility Services. Valley Air and our project partners request $2.25 million from the California Air Resources Board (ARB) (0.0008 MTCO₂e reduced per dollar) and will contribute an additional $1,561,426 in matching funds ($381,000 cash and $1,180,426 in-kind). The project will support a suite of shared mobility services in five disadvantaged, rural communities in the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) where provision of transit is very costly and services are extremely limited. The pilot concepts and locations were identified as part of a year-long planning project led by UC Davis in partnership with the eight SJV Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), SJV transit agencies, and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). These concepts and locations were selected by the eight MPOs for implementation because they have significant potential to reduce operating costs, improve mobility and access in rural disadvantaged communities (DACs), and provide models that can be exported throughout the Valley and the State.

1. Battery electric vehicle (BEV) carsharing and ridesourcing programs will be established at seven affordable housing complexes in Tulare and Kern communities. A total of at least 24 BEVs will be installed, along with at least 17 level 2 dual port chargers. The development density of selected locations will support walk access to carsharing for residents in the complexes and surrounding neighborhoods. Use of the BEV vehicles for ridesourcing at each complex will be fostered to expand the reach of existing transit and the new carsharing service. The focus will be first and last mile access to transit and direct access to the end destination, when it is not possible to complete an essential trip with transit or carsharing. Ridesourcing provides a new income opportunity for those who decide to become drivers. Carsharing and ridesourcing will be subsidized to ensure that the services are affordable. It is anticipated that this program will produce significant savings from reduced dial-a-ride (DAR) service costs (e.g., by retiring one vehicle in a DAC) that can be used for sustained operations.

2. A technology platform will be implemented to improve the efficiency and service of the multiple independently operated demand-responsive transportation services in Stanislaus and San Joaquin jurisdictions (e.g., DAR, volunteer transportation organizations, carsharing, and ridesourcing). The platform will aggregate the demand and supply of available services: (a) participating transit providers will communicate the demand for travel (departure/arrival times and locations), and (b) suppliers will communicate vehicle availability, capacity, and fares. The platform will use this data to match travelers and drivers to minimize service costs, travel times, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by filling available seats and reducing empty travel miles. Outreach will be conducted to engage and expand service providers and to increase the pool of volunteer drivers. At least one Stanislaus County diesel DAR van will be replaced with a BEV, and at least one DC fast charger will be installed. This platform will reduce the very high per trip DAR costs in jurisdictions that cannot reduce DAR service and still meet Americans with Disabilities Act service requirements.

In sum, the total number of people (or participants) served by the pilot will be 130,648 across 24 rural DAC census tracts.

C. Expanded Project Narrative

In the SJV, like other rural areas, long travel distances and low development densities contribute to transit service that is, all too often, infrequent and hard to access, despite its high-cost. High-poverty levels in the SJV lead to low levels of auto availability, which leaves many residents without access to jobs, health care, education, healthy food, and other basic services. UC Davis, in partnership with eight SJV MPOs and Caltrans, conducted a study to identify shared-use alternatives to traditional transit that would reduce per trip transit costs and increase overall accessibility in rural DACs while reducing GHG emissions. The project included data analysis to quantify the quality of transit service and the relative per trip cost of transit, ridesourcing, and carsharing travel. Extensive stakeholder outreach was also conducted to understand study-related concerns, goals, and analyses. The result was consensus on the most promising shared-use mobility concepts and the best locations for initial pilots. We seek funding to test these pilots:

Carsharing and Ridesourcing in Affordable Housing (Valley GO): The identified pilot communities in Kern and Tulare counties have relatively frequent transit service with stops in town centers. However, residents who live in the sparsely-populated areas surrounding these towns must rely on DAR to get to those transit stops. This type of DAR service is very expensive (upwards of $90 per one-way trips) and limited to advanced reservations (up to seven days in advance). More than one DAR van serves these communities. The proposed pilot seeks to understand whether a carsharing and resourcing service, located at affordable housing complexes, could serve...
Attachment 3: Project Implementation Plan

enough DAR demand to retire one or more DAR vehicle in each county. Another
demand-responsive vehicle would remain in service with the special equipment
needed to transport wheelchairs. Retiring DAR vehicles would provide considerable
cost savings (annually $375,000 in Kern and $176,000 in Tulare) that could be
applied to sustain and expand the carsharing and ridesourcing programs. Moreover,
there are numerous rural DACs (with affordable housing complexes) throughout the
SJV that could benefit from a similar pilot model (Map 1).

The grant will fund at least 24 BEVs installed at seven affordable Self Help
Enterprises Inc. (SHE) housing properties (see letter of support from SHE) in Kern
and Tulare communities (see Table 1) for use in a carsharing and ridesourcing
service. Currently, the DAR vehicles that would be retired travel 40,000 miles
annually in Kern (diesel van) and 119,587 miles in Tulare. A carsharing service will
be selected from a competitive-bid process. The carsharing service will purchase
BEVs; equip vehicles; provide insurance; manage reservations (accessed by phone,
website, and smart phone application), vehicle access, and payment systems; and
maintain and clean vehicles. The carsharing service will be available to those who
live in the pilot affordable housing complexes and the broader community.
Memberships and use will be subsidized (by grant funds) for affordable housing
residents and low-income community members.

Table 1: Self Help Affordable Housing Complexes for Valley GO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Property Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dinuba-Cutler-Orosi (Tulare)</td>
<td>Sand Creek</td>
<td>41020 Road 124, Orosi, CA 93647</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Villa de Guadalupé</td>
<td>1255 Avenue 408, Orosi, CA 93647</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Viscaya Gardens</td>
<td>1000 Rosemary Ave., Dinuba, CA 93618</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont-Arvin (Kern)</td>
<td>Rancho Lindo</td>
<td>9023 Camino La Jolla, Lamont, CA 93241</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caliente Creek</td>
<td>909 Meyer Street, Arvin, CA 93203</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasco (Kern)</td>
<td>Sunrise Villa</td>
<td>1600 Poplar Avenue, Wasco, CA 93280</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almond Court</td>
<td>801 Almond Court, Wasco, CA 93280</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Users can access their local DAR provider by phone (who will forward the request to participating ridesourcing companies) or book a ride on a ridesourcing website or smartphone application. Qualified users will be allowed to use the service at no or reduced cost (subsidized by the grant). Methods will be developed to allow unbanked users to access the carsharing and ridesourcing pilot services.

We have interviewed potential carsharing partners (Enterprise CarShare, Zipcar, Green Commuter, and E-Rive) to confirm the feasibility and cost-estimates of providing the described carsharing and ridesourcing service. Victor Valley Transit Authority in Needles, California started a carsharing program in August of 2016 with a minimum revenue guarantee (about $35,000) to Enterprise CarShare (vvta.org/carshare). The program is largely self-sufficient with a healthy share of the revenue guarantee still available.

UC Davis (Pike and Rodier, 2017) conducted a survey of SHE residents in January of 2017. Preliminary results indicate that the average vehicle year is 2006 (1993 oldest and 2016 newest). They indicated strong demand for carsharing and ridesourcing services (see Figure 1 below). 60% had access to a bank account and 39% a credit card. There was an average of 1.4 driver’s licenses per household.

Figure 1: Potential Use of Carsharing and Ridesourcing, If Service Available (UC Davis Survey of SHE residents, 2017)
Technology Platform (Valley FLEX): Communities in San Joaquin and Stanislaus counties also have high DAR costs. However, here no single transit provider can reduce the number of DAR vans they operate and still meet the needs of those who must transport wheelchair equipment when they travel. Multiple independent transit agencies, volunteer transportation organizations, and ridesourcing services provide transportation in these areas. To reduce DAR costs and expand access in these communities, a technology platform is needed to coordinate existing services and travel demand to better match trips, fill empty seats, and reduce empty vehicle miles traveled. Such a technology platform, FlexDenmark, was implemented in most of rural Denmark and reduced costs of five participating transit agencies by 20% (Tviling-Larsen, The Danish DRT Model FLX Process). The program has run for about 15 years.

The Valley FLEX technology platform will merge the demand for DAR and the supply of vehicles from public DAR vans, deviated buses, volunteer transportation organizations (VTOs), carsharing, and ridesourcing (e.g., Taxi, Uber, and Lyft). Participating transit providers will communicate the demand for travel (departure/arrival times and locations) and suppliers will communicate vehicle availability, capacity, and fares. Valley FLEX will use demand and supply data to match travelers with compatible origin-destination locations and departure-arrival times to minimize service costs, travel times, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and GHG emissions (see Figure 2). Reservations can be made in advance or on-demand. Methods will be developed to address payment barriers of unbanked customers. The platform acts as competitive marketplace that lowers costs by rewarding the cheapest and fastest providers. Two companies that provide the proposed platform, DemandTrans and TransLoc, have confirmed that they are ready and able to provide and operate the pilot technology platform for this project (see letters of support). A vendor will be secured through a competitive-bid process.

Project partners are DAR providers in the pilot areas (see letters of support from San Joaquin Regional Transit, Stanislaus County Transit, and City of Escalon Transit), volunteer transportation organizations (see letter of support from MOVE), and ridesourcing services that operate in the area. Users can request the service by calling the DAR service provider, using a smartphone application, and/or accessing a website. Advanced and real-time travel demand information is provided by the DAR transit agencies and supply information is provided by transportation services (i.e., DAR, VOTs, carsharing, and ridesourcing). The Valley FLEX technology platform vendor will continuously input the demand and supply data from project partners and communicate available rides to users via phone, internet, or smartphone to users and drivers via smartphone or tablet. The project will also support the growth of the existing pool of volunteer transportation drivers though outreach and engagement services provided by MOVE.

The service will be scaled, first, throughout San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties (incorporated and unincorporated areas), and subsequently throughout the valley. Economies of scale are achieved with high trip volumes. Assuming operating cost reduction of 20% and using total operating expenses for DAR in San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties (from the 2016 Federal Transit Database), we estimate a cost savings of $1.2 million annually, which could be applied to fund ongoing operations (see Table 2). If implemented throughout the Valley, annual operating cost could be reduced by almost $6 million.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Agencies</th>
<th>Annual Operating Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Regional Transit District</td>
<td>$406,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus County Public Works – Transit</td>
<td>$278,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Escalon</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto Area Express</td>
<td>$516,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Manteca</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,283,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: June 23, 2017

TO: San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council

SUBJECT: San Joaquin Valley Goods Movement Planning Studies

For the past 18 months, the Valley MPOs have conducted two Caltrans funded valleywide goods movement planning efforts:

- **I-5/SR 99 Goods Movement Corridor Study** – Specifically analyzing the major north-south corridors of the Valley and making recommendations for improving mobility and safety, including a demonstration project.

- **SJV Goods Movement Sustainable Implementation Plan** – Specifically analyzing critical first-and-last-mile connectors, truck parking and routing, priority rural corridors, and freight modeling.

Both studies have been completed and final presentation materials are included in the agenda packet following this page.

Major deliverables and other information for both studies can be found on the sjvcog’s website: [http://sjvcogs.org/valleywide_activities/good-movement/](http://sjvcogs.org/valleywide_activities/good-movement/)

**Requested Action.** None. Informational only.
I-5/SR 99 GM Study Overview

- Task 1: Existing and Future Conditions
- Tasks 2 & 3: Strategic Projects and Programs and Their Feasibility
- Task 4: Assessment of Strategic Projects and Programs
- Task 7: Demonstration Project
Task 1: Existing & Future Truck Generators

- Identified Existing Clusters of Freight and Logistics Activity
- Purchased Truck Data near these clusters
- Documented Plans for Future Logistics Centers

Task 1: Identified Truck Hot Spots

- **Generators**
  - Freight Clusters
  - Truck Support Facilities

- **Congestion**
  - Recurrent
  - Non-Recurrent

- **Crash Data**
  - Truck Involved
  - Crash Typology
I-5/SR 99 Freight Corridors Factsheets

- Data for over 150 segments
- Interactive maps available online during project
- Geographic database to be delivered

Example of Analysis (Kern County)

Legend

- Major Truck Involved Collisions
- Major Non-Truck Involved Collisions
- Worst Peak Period Speed
  - 10 - 20
  - 21 - 25
  - 26 - 30
  - 31 - 35
  - 36 - 40
- Major Industries
- Fuel Site
- Truck Stop
- Critical Interchanges
- Capacity Enhancement Projects
- Critical Congested Segments
- Critical Safety Segments
Tasks 2-4: Planned Improvements

- Identified Projects that Support GM in RTPs and Other Plans
- Married Projects with Issues
- Investigated Strategies for Reducing SR 99 Truck Traffic

Tasks 2-4: Corridor-to-Corridor Connectors

Southern SJV Connectors:
- SR 41
- SR 58
- West Beltway

Northern SJV Connectors:
- SR 132
- SR 140
- SR 165
- SR 152
### Tasks 2-4: Modal Shift Potential

- Current rail intermodal terminals at Stockton and Lathrop
- Active interest at Shafter
- Past proposals in north SJV
- Shipper’s Transport Express staging yards at French Camp & Shafter

### Modal Shift Potential – VMT Reductions

- Potential for VMT reductions in SJV I-5/SR99 corridor
- Greater reductions south and west of the study area
- Additional reductions in empty container miles
Task 7: Demonstration Project

- Explored tolling, inland cargo depots, real-time truck parking and truck platooning
- Truck Platooning selected
- Vendors, routes, and timeframe identified
- Vendors cancelled due to unanticipated scheduling conflicts

Next Steps for the Valley

- Pursue funding:
  » Consider bundling SR 99 and I-5 projects for FASTLANE and TIGER pursuits
  » CARB funding for On-Road Advanced Technology Demonstration Projects to fund truck-related demonstrations, such as truck platooning
- Consider additional evaluation of I-5/SR 99 connectors:
  » Analyze economic development opportunities and community access needs
- Continue to identify technological improvements
  » Real-time truck parking
  » Additional weigh in-motion stations
San Joaquin Valley Goods Movement Sustainable Implementation Program

presented to
San Joaquin Valley Council of Governments
Regional Directors Committee Meeting

6/1/2017

Goods Movement SIP
Key Tasks

Task 1: High Priority First/Last Mile Connectors
- Identify location and conditions of these connectors
- Develop improvement strategy recommendations

Task 2: Develop Truck Route Planning Guidance
- STAA route designation issues
- Develop truck route planning guidance
- Identify truck parking concepts

Task 3: Priority Rural Corridors
- Identify locations and conditions of these corridors
- Designations in key planning documents

Task 4: Performance Measures and Freight Models
- Performance measures
- Truck model improvements
- Modeling Institute
Task 1 Overview

- What is the purpose of identifying important local freight connectors?
  - Increasing focus on connector needs
  - Position for potential future funding opportunities
  - Coordinate with FHWA Intermodal Connector review
  - Identify connections to broader goods movement network
  - Improve the San Joaquin Valley’s competitiveness with more efficient freight system connections

What is a Connector?
Roadway that connects a major truck route to/within a vicinity of freight activity centers in the region.

Connector Findings (Task 1)

- Developed and vetted a list of 100+ connectors, analyzed condition of 60+ connectors representative of Valleywide conditions
  - Improved signage for both passenger and commercial vehicle traffic
  - Safety analysis and improvement
  - Signal coordination
  - Pavement quality improvements
  - Exploring design standards for heavy truck routes and connectors
Task 3 Overview

- Draft list of SJV routes identified based on FAST Act Guidelines.
- Includes corridor segments transmitted to Caltrans for FAST Act requirements
  - Can be used as a resource to provide new corridor nominations as first round of priority rural corridors are rotated off the statewide list.
Objective: Identify local/regionally significant truck routes, truck parking needs, and truck route gaps and continuity issues.

First cut at network, and inventory of truck parking using public and private truck parking facilities.
Truck Route Findings (Task 2)

- Data management
- Routing guidance
- Trucking industry outreach and information
- Safety measures and signage
- Pavement Maintenance

Major Truck Parking Issues in SJV

- Lack of overall supply of long term and short term parking spaces in the valley
- Lack of data about parking demand in different corridors
- Lack of law enforcement to avoid illegal parking on ramps and shoulders
- Difficulty of obtaining required permits to develop or expand parking facilities
- Lack of funding to support public rest stops
- Lack of reliable dynamic parking availability app and affordable reservation option to help drivers plan their trip more efficiently
- Difficult access and challenging truck circulation at some of the truck stops.
- Incompatibility of supply chain:
  - Shippers may demand drivers to leave their facility right after delivery. If driver is not ready for next trip, they have to park somewhere.
- Un-reliable travel time and HOS rules
Truck Parking Recommendations (Task 2)

There are 53.7 truck parking spaces per 100 thousand of Vehicle Miles Traveled (KVMT) or 90.6 spaces per 100 miles of National Highway System (NHS)

- Planning and Funding
- Demand Control
- Technology
- Emission Reduction Policies

Commercial Truck Modeling White Paper (Task 4)

Step One
1. Maintain an inventory of truck routes, truck parking, major freight activity centers
2. Maintain a database of classification counts for major arterials and regional screen lines
3. Prepare a maintenance plan and review/update the database every 5 years
4. Maintain a single set of input database for passenger and freight models

Step Two
1. Maintain the consistency with California Statewide Freight Forecasting Model (CSFFM). Ensure consistency of the model's assumption
2. Develop a sketch freight planning tool for quick inter-regional commodity flow analysis
3. Modify Valleywide truck model to include new modules and user friendly interface for easy and seamless integration with the MIP passenger model and Statewide model
4. Include truck trips by their purpose: freight and non-freight trips
5. Improve model validation on local level and conduct model sensitivity test
Sustainable Community Strategy Integration (Task 5)

- Compares SCS with recommendations, guidelines and deliverables of this project. Highlights RTP policy and projects that:
  - Promotes multi modal goods movement and identify opportunities to increase share of rail in regional freight flows.
  - Develops freight advisory/ freight stakeholder group and have regular meetings to improve coordination between various activates, projects and planning efforts
  - Supports economic growth by improving last mile accessibility to strategic economic centers
  - Develops strategies to improve efficiency of freight movement in the valley
  - Improves maintenance of intermodal freight facilities prior to expansion of new ones
  - Improves traffic safety on routes with high truck volumes and at-grade rail crossings

Funding Availability

Federal FAST Act
- National Highway Freight Network
- National Highway Freight Program
- FASTLANE grants (Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects)
- Technology and Innovation Deployment Program
- Intelligent Transportation Systems Program
- Advanced Transportation and Congestion Management Technologies Deployment Program

State SB 1
- $50 billion in new transportation revenue
- New Trade Corridor Enhancement Account
  - $3 billion for investments in high priority trade corridors
Recommendations for the Valley

- Take steps to secure funding for near-term opportunities
- Conduct additional local analysis to prioritize corridor improvements including truck parking
- Establish a process for regular input on connectors, priority corridors and truck routes
- Work with Caltrans to adapt statewide freight model for Valley
DATE: June 23, 2017
TO: San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council
SUBJECT: Valleywide Overall Work Program for Fiscal Year 2017-18

An Overall Work Program (OWP) is a federal and state mandated planning and budgeting work product that Regional Planning Agencies of the San Joaquin Valley develop on an annual basis. The OWP is a one-year scope of work and budget for transportation planning activities and funding sources to be accomplished between July 1 and June 30 of the fiscal year. The Valley Regional Planning Agencies have stipulated in their memorandum of understanding the need to annually produce an eight county Valleywide OWP.

The Valleywide Overall Work Program for FY 2017-2018 details the coordinated activities that all eight regional planning agencies are actively engaged in. Each Valley RPA will also include a Valleywide Chapter in their respective Overall Work Program that details and proportionally budgets for the shared tasks identified in the attached Valleywide OWP.

The San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies’ Directors’ Committee approved the FY 2017-18 Valleywide Overall Work Program at their April 6, 2017 meeting.
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Overall Work Program
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Introduction

The San Joaquin Valley (SJV) covers over 27,000 square miles and encompasses the eight-county region of Kern, Kings, Tulare, Fresno, Madera, Merced, Stanislaus and San Joaquin counties. Since 1992, the San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies (Valley RPAs) have coordinated planning activities where interregional issues are involved, including air quality conformity, goods movement, funding for regional transportation projects, legislative advocacy, and recently, Sustainable Communities Strategies.

Planning efforts of Valleywide importance are conducted among the eight RPAs through the San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies’ Directors’ Committee (Directors’ Committee) and the San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies’ Policy Council (Regional Policy Council), a governing board including elected officials from each Valley RPA and the Executive Director of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

The FY 2017-2018 Valleywide Overall Work Program is a summary document and details major coordinated activities that all eight regional planning agencies are actively engaged in. The Valleywide OWP does not replace the need or requirements of each RPA to conduct their own OWP, rather it is a planning and budgeting tool for shared Valleywide activities.

(Note – the terms Regional Planning Agency (RPA), Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), Metropolitan Planning Agency (MPO) and Council of Governments (COG) are used interchangeably in this document.)

Current Valleywide Major Activities

1. MAJOR HIGHWAYS AND INTERSTATES

Objective: To develop and foster regional coordination and prioritization for SR 99, I-5, and other regionally significant corridor improvements.

Lead: Kern COG and MCAG

The Valley RPAs work in close consultation with Caltrans and other stakeholders to prioritize funding for SR 99 and other major highways and interstates. The 99 Business Plan helped the Valley achieve dedicated funding for SR 99 through Proposition 1B, the only transportation earmark in the bond placed before the voters. Caltrans Districts 6 and 10 have completed the necessary Corridor System Management Plans required by the State, updated the 99 Business Plan and Master Plan, and coordinated continued project selection and funding alternatives. The Directors, working in close consultation with Caltrans District 6 and 10 staff, routinely meet and discuss Prop. 1B bond savings, State funding priorities, FAST Act, and other funding strategies to enhance and improve SR 99, I-5, and other critical projects.

Activities for FY 2017-18:

• Continue to advocate for critical widening projects for SR 99 for six lanes of travel throughout the SJV.
• Explore SHOPP funding for the updated Business Plan and auxiliary lane concepts, as projects are eligible. Develop Master Strategy for the SHOPP. Kern COG to coordinate with Caltrans D6, SJ COG to coordinate with D10 on opportunities for additional programming.
• Continue to seek federal FAST Act funding and state funding for major SR 99 projects and coordinate pre-construction activities, when feasible, to ensure project readiness.

2. JOINT FUNDING STRATEGIES – STIP, IIP AND OTHER FUNDING

Objective: To develop and foster greater coordination across various funding programs to enhance and increase transportation funding to the Valley.

Lead: TCAG and San Joaquin COG

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year capital improvement program to assist the State and local entities to plan and implement transportation improvements, and to utilize resources in a cost-effective manner. STIP funded improvements include state highways, local roads, public transit, intercity rail, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, grade separations, intermodal facilities, etc. Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) funds are programmed by Caltrans on a statewide priority basis, for use primarily on the State highway system (outside urbanized areas) and projects that generate economic development.

In 2015, the Valley RPAs through the newly formed “Valley Swap Meet” working group, reached consensus on a coordinated Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and shifted programming to the outer years of the 2016 STIP in response to a request by the California Transportation Commission.

Activities for FY 2017-18:
• Establish a coordinated eight county effort to advocate for continued project funding considering the budgetary actions to reduce STIP funding
• Explore valley interest in developing a coordinated Valley STIP as part of the 2018 STIP cycle
• Develop a milestone timeline for IIP programming – establish a goal of 20 percent
• Discuss whether there is valley interest to pursue a regional set aside position
• Develop an optimized strategy for STIP/IIP funding for the next 20 years with the goal of all eight counties getting priority projects and therefore supporting the full 20-year plan
• Continue coordinated planning efforts through the “Valley Swap Meet”, including opportunities to partner on federal funding programs such as Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) so no funds lapse in the valley.
• Share information about any developments in federal funding opportunities that may come out of the new Administration.

3. SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY INTERREGIONAL GOODS MOVEMENT

Objective: To prioritize, coordinate and implement goods movement planning and capital projects to improve the Valley’s economic competitiveness.

Lead: Fresno COG and TCAG
The San Joaquin Valley (SJV) has always been California’s geographic and agricultural production center generating more than $35 billion every year in nuts, lettuce, tomatoes, wine, and other grains and agricultural products. It also plays a major role in the national and international distribution of processed foods and energy products, and has a burgeoning logistics and distribution industry. The region has relatively inexpensive land and low cost labor, good access to the national rail and interstate highway networks, connections to major deep-water ports in Oakland, Los Angeles, and Long Beach, and proximity to major consumer markets in Southern California and the San Francisco Bay Area.

Recognizing the importance of goods movement to the region, the eight San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies and Caltrans commissioned the San Joaquin Valley Interregional Goods Movement Plan completed in 2013. In FY 2014-15, the Valley RPAs were awarded two additional goods movement related planning grants from Caltrans to continue to identify strategies and recommendations for improving freight movement in the Valley, the San Joaquin Valley I-5/SR 99 Goods Movement Corridor Plan and the San Joaquin Valley Goods Movement Sustainable Implementation Plan. Both studies are anticipated to be completed by June 30, 2017.

Activities for FY 2017-18:

- Continue to coordinate project prioritization for FASTLANCE goods movement funding under the federal FAST Act transportation authorization
- Continue to participate in the California Freight Advisory Committee, and statewide committees determining eligibility for FAST Act funding
- Provide input to the California's Freight Mobility Plan
- Provide input to the California Freight Investment Plan
- Continue to work with regional partners conducting logistics, economic development and other analysis related to goods movement
- Advocate and support efforts to maintain short line rail corridors
- Continue to explore alternative fuels and strategies for meeting the California’s Sustainable Freight mandates

4. AIR QUALITY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND COORDINATION

Objective: To continue successful coordination of Valleywide air quality planning minimizing potential impacts to project delivery.

Lead: San Joaquin COG and StanCOG

Transportation conformity is required by the federal Clean Air Act and ensures that federal funding is given to transportation activities that are consistent with air quality goals. The Clean Air Act strengthened conformity requirements for transportation projects, necessitating a more enhanced level of technical analysis of plans, programs, and projects than in the past. Conformity determinations must be conducted at least every four years, or as amendments are made to plans or projects. The federal transportation conformity rule requires interagency consultation on issues that would affect the conformity analysis, such as the underlying assumptions and methodologies used to prepare the analysis. Consultation is generally conducted through the San Joaquin Valley Interagency Coordinating Committee (IAC). The IAC has been established to provide a coordinated approach to Valley air quality, conformity and transportation modeling issues. Each of the eight Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) and the Air Pollution Control District are represented. In addition, the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, the California Air Resources Board and Caltrans have members on the committee.
Coordination among the Valley RPAs, the Air District and other air quality and transportation agencies is proving to be a very effective process. The Valley RPA Directors have budgeted to continue joint funding for a valleywide Air Quality Coordinator, responsible to the Directors, to ensure that air quality conformity and related modeling within the Valley is accomplished on a consistent and timely basis.

Activities for FY 2017-18:

- Monitor state and federal guidance related to air quality transportation planning requirements
- Conduct conformity determinations to ensure that the Regional Transportation Plan, FTIP, and subsequent amendments conform to the State Implementation Plans (SIPs), as required by federal laws and regulations
- Submit future-year travel forecasts to the SJVAPCD and the California Air Resources Board as requested
- Continue to utilize the Interagency Coordinating Committee (IAC) for routine communication and coordination
- Assistance with the development of second round SB 375 targets, including ongoing coordination with California Air Resources Board staff related to SB 32 and its effect on SB 375 targets.

5. SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGIES / REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANS

Objective: To develop and coordinate SB 375 compliant Sustainable Communities Strategies for the Valley

Lead: Fresno COG and San Joaquin COG

California’s Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375) requires each MPO to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of their Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). A SCS outlines the plan for reducing per capita greenhouse gas emission by integrating the transportation network and related strategies with an overall land use pattern that accounts for projected growth, housing needs, changing demographics, and forecasted transportation needs among all modes of travel.

Under the Sustainable Communities Act, the California Air Resources Board (ARB) sets regional targets for GHG emissions reductions from passenger vehicle use. The ARB established these targets in the San Joaquin Valley as per capita GHG reductions of five percent by 2020 and 10 percent by 2035. The Valley Regional Planning Agencies have worked independently and collectively to meet these targets and have invested considerable resources towards technical staff, modeling, and scenario development.

The Valley’s Regional Planning Agencies are currently working with ARB to establish timelines and protocol for the next round of RTPs and associated targets.

Activities for FY 2017-18:

- Continue to implement the 2014 RTP/SCS
- Initiate 2018 RTP/SCS development efforts
- Continue to work with ARB staff on the second round of greenhouse gas reduction target recommendation and establish a “Valley” position for the 2018 RTP/SCS and associated targets
- Continue to advocate for increasing the RTP timeline from four years to up to ten years
- Assist with the implementation of performance measure targets in the 2018 RTP/SCS, including strategies for data collection and application.
6. RELATIONSHIP DEVELOPMENT WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES AND ENTITIES

Objective: To develop and foster greater communication and coordination within Valley Regional Planning Agencies and with other related agencies and stakeholders.

Lead: TCAG and StanCOG

To maintain ongoing communication and cooperation with other external agencies, the Valley RPAs have included a relationship development component to foster routine “two way” communication with our related state and federal transportation agencies.

Federal entities include the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Federal Rail Administration (FRA), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). State entities include the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA), California Transportation Commission (CTC), Caltrans Districts 6 and 10, Caltrans Headquarters, California Association of Council of Governments (CALCOG), Strategic Growth Council (SGC), and the California Air Resources Board (ARB). Regional entities include the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Sacramento Council of Governments (SACOG), and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). Other stakeholders include the California Trucking Association, agricultural associations, the California Partnership for the San Joaquin Valley, colleges and universities, environmental groups, and the public.

Activities for FY 2017-18:

- Directors to coordinate and attend one-third of CTC meetings
- Directors to meet with at least two CTC Board Members they don’t currently know
- Directors to continue to advocate for a CTC representative to be appointed from the Valley
- Directors to meet annually with CalSTA Director
- CTC staff to be invited to Directors’ Committee meeting once a year
- RPA staff to be encouraged to take more leadership positions on Valleywide matters
- Valley Directors to develop and maintain relationships with Caltrans Director and Deputy for Planning
- Caltrans staff to be invited to attend “Valley Voice” advocacy trips
- All Valley Directors should attend and speak at each CALCOG meeting
- Valley Directors’ Committee meetings should be moved to a time of the month where Valley Directors can review and discuss CALCOG agenda prior to CALCOG meeting to develop joint strategy on issues
- Request MTC or SCAG staff come to a Valley Directors’ Committee meeting
- Valley Directors to meet annually with management of ARB
- Create Valley Brochure to highlight the various activities the Valley RPAs are engaged in

7. VALLEY LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Objective: To engage in a unified process that allows the eight county region to discuss and comment on legislative affairs and build consensus on issues of Valleywide importance.

Lead: TCAG and MCAG
The Valley Legislative Affairs Committee (VLAC) has been established at the staff level to track relevant legislation with a potential Valleywide impact to Regional Planning Agencies. VLAC also develops support/oppose/amend positions for each of the agencies and makes recommendations as warranted. When legislative positions appear to have a consensus within the Valley, the Regional Policy Council may make a unified statement to inform the state and federal governments that the Valley is actively engaged in the legislative process.

VLAC coordinates the annual “Valley Voice” advocacy visits to Washington D.C. in the fall and Sacramento in the spring.

Activities for FY 2017-18:
- Plan “Valley Voice” Washington D.C. visit for September 2017
- Plan “Valley Voice” Sacramento visit for early 2018
- Track legislation, communication with legislative offices, letter campaigns and other activities to develop a unified, Valleywide position.
- Develop the Valleywide Legislative Platform (state and federal)
- Facilitate discussions around controversial topics such as water and high speed rail among Regional Policy Council members
- Continue to meet monthly and make recommendations as warranted

8. VALLEYWIDE MODEL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Objective: To maintain a continuing, cooperative, and coordinated regional transportation modeling process which is responsive to local needs as well as state and federal requirements.

Lead: Fresno COG

Fresno COG is the lead agency in the San Joaquin Valley Model Improvement Plan, which has updated all eight San Joaquin Valley transportation demand models. These improvements were required to respond to the requirements Assembly Bill 32 the Global Solutions Warming Act of 2006 and Senate Bill 375, which requires the development of a Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) in Regional Transportation Plans (RTP).

Traffic model runs are made as necessary to support transportation planning, conformity analysis and greenhouse gas emissions analysis. The COG staff also runs the latest EMFAC emissions model for air quality in support of transportation conformity. This activity supports both highway planning activities and the air quality conformity process. Some MPO staff used the Envision Tomorrow visioning tool to help test various land use scenarios for SB 375 target setting and Sustainable Communities Strategies.

A related action is participation in activities related to coordination of valleywide modeling analysis and participation in the San Joaquin Valley model users group. These activities are critically important to an understanding of the role of the transportation sector in resolving serious air quality problems in the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin.

Activities for FY 2017-18:
- Continue long-term model improvements
- Participate and monitor EMFAC 2017 development
- Continue to research off-model GHG reduction quantification methodology for technology strategies
• Continue development of advanced four step models, tour base models or activity based models in select counties
• Improve coordination and participation of the Valley model users group
• Coordinate with SJV Goods Movement planning efforts to develop a framework for a regional freight movement modeling tool

9. OTHER VALLEYWIDE ACTIVIES

The Valley RPAs are also engaged in the following activities for FY 2017-18:

• SCS Implementation Alternatives for Meeting Transit Needs in the Rural San Joaquin Valley, a Caltrans planning grant administered by MCAG and conducted by the UC Davis Institute for Transportation Studies
• Technical Assistance providers for the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) program – pending
• Support for Intercity Passenger Rail (SJ JPA)
• Blueprint and Greenprint post project web maintenance
• Regional Policy Council meetings and Directors’ Committee meetings
• Producing the annual San Joaquin Valley Policy Conference (held in the Spring of 2017 in Fresno)

Directors’ Chair Rotation Schedule
Fresno Council of Governments, 2017-18
Merced County Association of Governments, 2018-19
Stanislaus Council of Governments, 2019-20
Madera County Transportation Commission, 2020-21
Kings County Association of Governments, 2021-22
Kern Council of Government, 2022-23
San Joaquin Council of Governments, 2023-24
Tulare County Association of Governments, 2024-25

Annual Policy Conference Rotation Schedule (with past years shown in italics)
Modesto (StanCOG), Fall 2010
Bass Lake (MCTC), Fall 2011
Lemoore (KCAG), Fall 2012
Stockton (SJ COG), Fall 2013
Visalia (TCAG), Fall 2014
Tenaya (MCAG), Fall 2015
Fresno (Fresno COG), Spring 2017
StanCOG, 2018
MCTC, 2019
KCAG, 2020
San Joaquin COG, 2021
TCAG, 2022
MCAG, 2023
Fresno COG, 2024
Kern COG – subject to further discussion, may be available to host at some time
### Fiscal Year 2017-18 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valleywide Activities</th>
<th>Air Quality Planning&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Valley Voice&lt;sup&gt;(3)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Valleywide Coordinator&lt;sup&gt;(4)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total FY 2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPO Share By Population&lt;sup&gt;(1)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno 984,541</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>$46,342</td>
<td>$5,877</td>
<td>$27,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kern 886,507</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>$41,727</td>
<td>$5,292</td>
<td>$24,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings 150,373</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>$7,078</td>
<td>$898</td>
<td>$4,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madera 155,349</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>$7,312</td>
<td>$927</td>
<td>$4,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced 271,579</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>$12,783</td>
<td>$1,621</td>
<td>$7,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin 733,383</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>$34,520</td>
<td>$4,378</td>
<td>$20,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus 540,214</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>$25,428</td>
<td>$3,225</td>
<td>$14,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulare 466,339</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>$21,950</td>
<td>$2,784</td>
<td>$12,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FY 2017-18 4,188,285</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>$197,140</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>(1)</sup> DOF, January 2016 estimates

<sup>(2)</sup> SJ COG Staff ($47,322) & Consultant ($149,818)

<sup>(3)</sup> No PL Funds

<sup>(4)</sup> Sigala Inc

Budget amounts shown represent the total direct Valley RPA cost for this activity. SJ COG is the fiscal agent for Air Quality Planning. Fresno COG is the fiscal agent for Valley Voice and the Valleywide Coordinator contract.

In addition to the shared activities outlined above, the following grant programs represent additional Valleywide activities. These programs require no direct or shared RPA cost and are budgeted in the OWP of the respective lead agency.

- **SCS Implementation Alternatives for Meeting Transit Needs in the Rural San Joaquin Valley ($500,000) administered by MCAG**
- **Both Goods Movement Studies were completed in FY 2016-17**
### Meeting Calendar FY 2017-2018

**San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council (\& RPA Directors' Comm.)**

#### Executive Directors’ Committee Meetings
- San Joaquin Valley Regional Policy Council Meetings (Dec 15, 2017 & June 22, 2018)
- Pre Valley Voice Phone Conference (July 25, Aug 25, 2017 & Feb 23, 2018)
- Annual Policy Conference (March or April 2018, Modesto)
- Sacramento Valley Voice (March 2018, dates TBD)

### 2017

#### July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### August

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2018

#### January

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### February

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### March

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### May

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### June

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sun</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tue</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thu</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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