

---

## Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) Steering Committee – Meeting Notes

Friday, August 7, 2015

---

### Discussion Summary

#### Agenda Item #2: Updates from MCAG staff

- Staff will take an item to the Governing Board this month to ask them to direct staff to pursue an RTP amendment; specifics will be determined by the outcome of this meeting
- ARB indicated the approach of amending the existing RTP is acceptable
- Timeline implications:
  - If RTP is amended and is based on scenario C instead of B, then we have to do a air quality conformity analysis; wouldn't have to re-do CEQA as long as the regionally significant project list doesn't change because all three scenarios were covered by the existing EIR
  - Land use scenario D isn't consistent with the general plans so it wouldn't be recommended for inclusion in the RTP/SCS
- Funding Sources presentation (see attached))
  - Staff provided a breakdown of federal and state funding sources and eligible project types
  - RTP assumption is that CMAQ would be spent ½ on transit, ½ on air quality projects (bike and pedestrian projects)
  - Q: What is the prognosis for cap and trade funds?
    - A: That funding source will need to be included in the next RTP by category as it is a new source (some goes to transit, some goes to affordable housing, etc); the only one we could include right now is the transit operations dollars; COGs are currently communicating to the state how this funding source can better serve our region
  - Q: Does it make sense to include the cap and trade source in the amended RTP?
    - A: Yes, it can be included as a potential new funding source
  - Q: Would MCAG only consider transit as a potential recipient for cap and trade funding?
    - A: No – it is based on the state's investment plan and programs. Currently the transportation dollars go to high speed rail, intercity rail, transit, and the affordable housing grant program. The state is in the process of updating their investment plan, so that may change.

#### Agenda Item #3: Narrative Development (See proposed subcommittee language)

Kaylon Hammond (LCJA) reviewed the subcommittee language section by section, providing the opportunity for committee members to comment on each

- Item 1 – Infill and Growth (no changes)
- Item 2 – Complete Streets (discussion / no changes)

- The intention is to create the policy; the goal should be to push the other jurisdictions to have a complete streets policies as well; MCAG policy can set that standard for those member jurisdictions
- How do MCAG policies translate to setting the standard for the local jurisdictions?
  - MCAG has planning dollars that can be used to help member jurisdictions develop these policies
  - Committees can be mechanism to communicate these new policies
- Item 3 – Incentivize through funding/grant program (discussion / no changes)
  - Staff reminded that CMAQ funds are spent at the discretion of MCAG based on its policies; existing policies are similar to the proposed language but there are differences such as focusing on disadvantaged communities; the committee can make recommendations for those changes
- Item 4 – Needs assessment (one change)
  - “infrastructure deficiencies” and “basic services” are relative; need more description
    - New language: “access the basic services necessary to ensure the health and safety of the residents throughout the jurisdiction”
  - Staff has talked with FresnoCOG and would likely model their assessment effort and it would be used to inform the next RTP/SCS
- Item 5 – Selection criteria (one edit)
  - Last line correction - “disadvantages” to “disadvantaged”
- Item 6 – Rideshare (no comments/changes)
- Item 7 – Co-Benefits (one change)
  - Replace “saving communities money” with “positive economic impact”
- Two additional subcommittee suggestions:
  - Item 8 – Public participation (Two changes)
    - Edit – “resident” to “residents”
    - New language: “Jurisdictions will make reasonable accommodations to ensure all materials be readily accessible and available in languages reflective of the communities need”
  - Item 9 – Transit (New language)
    - Staff suggested the proposed language is close to MCAG’s policy but may not be stated as succinctly in the RTP
    - Discussion:
      - Concerns expressed about insulting the board that is already doing it; need to propose language that identify differences in what is being done and what needs to be done
      - Recent trend of focusing on farebox ratio means routes are chosen with highest ridership (rather than look for other local funding sources); unfair because it is leaving out whole populations

- Need to address gaps in service without identifying it as “unmet transit needs” because of flaw in how those needs are identified/determined
- Staff suggested that “reasonable to meet” and “unmet transit needs” are definitions that are defined by the board and can be changed
- Emphasize looking at other funding sources that can be used to meet these needs that aren’t being addressed through the “unmet transit needs” process
- Cap and Trade look to reduce GHGs by increasing ridership – not going to support increased rural transit service with low ridership
- New language: “Improve access to public transit in rural and urban area
  1. Re-Evaluate and update the definitions of “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” to broaden and expand service to rural areas.
  2. While continuing to invest in exiting urban service, identify new funding sources for improvements to service to rural areas”
- **ACTION:** Adopt 9 policy items with language as amended.
  - Motion: Lisa Keyser Grant – Bicycle Coalition
  - Second: Kaylon Hammond – Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability
  - Unanimous

#### **Agenda Item #4: Preferred Scenario**

- Staff explained the GHG reductions worksheet and the menu of options
- Leadership Counsel for Justice and Accountability requested to see the housing/employment data before voting on a preferred scenario because of concerns around growth in rural areas
  - Data will look at growth differences between scenarios
  - Scenarios are examples of how growth could occur, consistent with existing general plans
    - A was trend
    - B was based on blueprint (somewhat more compact, slightly more dense and slightly more mixed)
    - C was slightly more dense and slightly more mixed than B
    - D was not consistent with general plans, therefore not viable for RTP amendment (could be considered in APS)
- The committee did not vote on a preferred scenario, but asked to have the data to review at the September 4<sup>th</sup> meeting that will be extended to allow for discussion and action (10:00am – 2:00pm)

#### **Agenda Item #5: Next Steps**

- Staff will take an item to the Governing Board on August 20<sup>th</sup> to request they direct staff to pursue an RTP amendment
  - Adam Cox, Kaylon Hammond, Mary-Michal Rawling and Kenra Bragonier volunteered to attend the meeting to support the recommendation
- Meeting adjourned: Motion by Rod Webster, Second by Lisa Keyser Grant