

Discussion Summary

Agenda Item #2: Public Outreach – Survey Results

- Main points:
 - Not a lot of variation in housing preferences across age groups
 - Preference for suburban housing across age groups
 - Increased interest in living in smaller lots in the future
 - Reflects some interest today in higher density choices
 - Paying for parking not popular
 - Priorities were not really varied across ages
 - Responses were predominantly from the Merced area
 - Top three transportation investment priorities were:
 - #1 Sidewalks
 - #2 Bus/Transit
 - #3 Bikeways
 - Road maintenance was #4
 - Highway/road expansion #7
- Do we want to include the survey results in the final document?
 - Committee: YES
 - Suggestions on how to include it:
 - As appendices that is referenced in the document
 - Include a table or a few tables with relevant data from the survey in the document
 - Include survey itself and public outreach plan in the appendix
- Suggestions/Concerns from committee members:
 - Need to identify the co-benefits because they are just as important as meeting the targets
 - Governing Board need to see the priorities
 - Governing Board should re-evaluate current priorities in light of this information
 - Concerned about geographic distribution and the Governing Board reaction
 - Suggest separating the survey results from the Merced area from the rest

ACTION ITEMS

- Load the last rounds of surveys into Typeform and provide the committee with an updated general report (SD)
- Separate the survey results from the City of Merced (MF)
- Provide criteria for selecting priority projects and map of priority projects (MF)
- Provide development pattern in SCS and housing/employment allocations for cities/unincorporated areas (MF)
- Send TCAG RTP policy element/principles (VG)
- Look into MCAG and other COGS complete streets policies (MF)
- Subcommittee to meet to develop language for Aug 7th meeting (LCJA)
- Provide numbers on water use by development type (MF)
- Talk with SJCOG about infill catalog (MF)
- Talk with ARB about amended RTP (MF)

Agenda Item #2: Scenario Options (Powerpoint presentation “APS – Creating a Scenario”)

- Main points:

- Ultimate goal is to show how GHG target can be achieved
- Staff doesn't anticipate outlining why the choices are most practicable as being an obstacle
- Meeting the 10% isn't a limit, we can go beyond
- The committee will use the scenario worksheet to develop the preferred scenario (worksheet provides bookend scenarios of the "survey scenario" which would barely make it and the "everything scenario" which would achieve 16.7%)
- Suggestions/questions from committee members
 - (Kayser-Grant) Policies need to support the measures outlined in the scenario
 - (Breon) He would be willing to go to the ARB personally to ask them to accept the numbers in the draft if the MCAG board adopts current commitments/changes to their priorities (not wait to 2018). If MCAG is willing to amend RTP, amend budget and shift priorities....he would personally go to the ARB to ask them to approve the numbers in the draft.
 - (Webster) Why weren't the transportation measures included in the RTP?
 - (Fell) None of the transportation measures could have been claimed feasible to include in the RTP because of costs and available funding
 - (Fell) Future programming of CMAQ could fund some of the proposed transportation measures (ex: Vanpool subsidy)
 - (Webster) The committee has shared ideas on how to increase funding, which could fund some of the transportation measures
 - (Keyser-Grant) Many of the measures are consistent with local general plans; Funding is the major obstacle
 - (Bragonier) We are shooting for targets in 2020 and 2035 so funding opportunities will change (already have since the SCS was being developed, such as the SJVAPCD grants for charging stations)
- APS document structure: Part one will be the scenario, Part two will be a narrative from the committee with recommended measures

Agenda Item #4: Presentation of Proposals

Representatives identified below presented the linked proposals to the committee.

- Kaylon Hammond and Veronica Garibay: [Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability](#)
- Craig Breon: [Sierra Club](#)

Agenda Item #5: Develop a committee recommendation

- Discussion on preferred scenario
 - Recommend adopting C if the board is willing to adopt it as the preferred scenario by amending the RTP; it follows the general plans but it might be the most reasonable so as long as they amend the RTP prior to 2018 (Can be incorporated as part of the narrative)
 - The City of Merced's higher density town hall meeting this week was contentious and unpopular; if we are going to present a higher density recommendation, we need to be prepared and strategic on how we present it

- Include some of the quantifiable elements in the proposal accounted for in the scenario before the committee takes action; also wants to see the development pattern in the SCS (housing and growth) and look at allocations of housing unit by type and what the employment allocations for the jurisdictions and unincorporated areas (jobs and housing balance)
- We need to do more than just check the APS off as ; We need to show that we want to influence change in the region
- What are the criteria MCAG uses to select transportation priorities/investments?
 - Committee wants to see the map of priorities
 - The public survey show they don't want road/expansion projects as priority
- Why is it important to amend the RTP before 2018?
 - Makes the SCS more meaningful because some see it as a toothless exercise
 - Next RTP is likely going to have higher targets. Amending before 2018 will close the gap to meeting the next higher target in the next round
 - Why would board change their mind on scenario C?
 - If committee is going to take action, consensus will be key to show the support from the non-advocate representatives

COMMITTEE ACTION: Recommend to the board to amend the existing RTP before 2018

- Motion: Dan Caris
 - Second: Craig Breon
 - VOTE: Unanimous (voice vote)
- Will we need to develop/submit an APS if the RTP is amended with an SCS that meets the targets?
 - Staff will get direction from ARB on the committee's options to proceed
 - Staff indicated that procedurally, amending the RTP will take more time and will create delays which may or may not be a problem with ARB
 - Committee should make every effort to make recommendations that are reasonable and minimize unnecessary impacts on staff time and cost
 - Staff clarification: If the committee recommends to not pursue an APS it will need to go to the Governing Board; the board appointed the committee to develop an APS so if the scope changes, board approval will be needed
 - COMMITTEE SUGGESTION: Inform the board of the committee's intent to make a recommendation to amend the RTP and then get the final word from ARB about only submitting an amended RTP
 - Next steps:
 - Staff will make an oral report to governing board to update them on the intent of the committee to recommend the RTP and the communication with the ARB about the process

- Staff will ask ARB if an APS would be necessary if an amended RTP with an SCS that meets the target is pursued (Timeline for completion is unknown)
- Discussion on APS Measures – Developing the Narrative
 - Incentivize infill development and include recommendation in the amended RTP to favor infill over new towns
 - Principles such as prioritizing growth to existing communities by incentivizing infill are in TCAG’s RTP policy element; LCJA will send them to staff for distribution to the committee
 - APS Wish List:
 - Prioritize infill and growth in existing communities
 - Prioritize funding for complete street projects on existing corridors
 - General Plans need to include a complete streets policy
 - Staff will look at MCAG complete streets policies, or if other COGs have adopted complete streets policies
 - Explore funding sources to incentivize jurisdictions (including a possible grant program)
 - FresnoCOG adopted a policy in the RTP to develop a grant program to incentivize local jurisdictions to influence growth/development patterns
 - Conduct a needs assessment study and link it to the countywide health assessment
 - Evaluate project selection criteria
 - Prioritize vanpools and ridesharing
 - Emphasize the “co-benefits” of implementing SB 375 in addition to meeting the GHG reduction targets
 - Committee decided to form a subcommittee to develop language from the wish list that will be reviewed and considered at the August 7th meeting; Subcommittee is comprised of reps from:
 - Sierra Club
 - Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability
 - Merced County Department of Public Health
 - MCAG Staff
 - How can we incorporate water as it relates to future land use development?
 - We should to take into consideration groundwater management and water resources when making future development decisions
 - Staff can provide numbers on water use by development type
 - Staff will beef up the water connection in the document with numbers on use by type and water conservation measures
 - Discussion on parking
 - A committee member expressed the need to address dis-incentivizing driving through parking policies such as charging for parking

- Concerns were expressed about impacts to low income people; concerns about segregating community by making parking in certain areas unaffordable
- The suggestion was made to reduce the amount of parking available rather than charge may be a better approach until the alternative options are widely available
- Concerns expressed about dissuading people from going downtown
- One approach may be to not provide as much parking for future development
- Consensus: Need to address parking but not sure how
- Can MCAG conduct an infill site catalog?
 - Matt will communicate with SJCOG on their program; but it couldn't happen in the near future because of the data needs
 - Having such information would be useful - need to know what infill is available in the cities/region

COMMITTEE ACTION: Adopt the list identified today and authorize appointed subcommittee to put together policy language to bring back to the steering committee for action

- Motion: Mary-Michal Rawling
- Second: Stefanie Nathan
- VOTE: Passed by voice vote
- Opposition: Craig Breon

COMMITTEE ACTION: Eliminate Sierra Club proposal numbers from wish list notes

- Motion: Kenra Bragonier
- Second: Rod Webster
- Vote: Unanimous (voice vote)

Next meeting: August 7th at 10am, MCAG

▪