



# Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) Steering Committee Meeting

Friday, September 4, 2015

**10:00am – 2:00pm**

Merced County Association of Governments  
369 W. 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Merced CA

## AGENDA

---

- |   |                 |
|---|-----------------|
| 1. Welcome/ Identification of voting members present    | Adam Cox, Chair |
| 2. Governing Board update                               | Matt Fell       |
| 3. Land Use Pattern discussion                          | Matt Fell       |
| a. Population and jobs assumptions in RTP scenarios*    |                 |
| b. Visualizing growth assumptions on a map – discussion |                 |
| 4. ACTION: Preferred Scenario                           | Chair Cox       |
| a. Scenario development worksheet*                      |                 |
| b. Committee discussion                                 |                 |
| 5. Review timeline and next steps                       | Matt Fell       |
| 6. Measure update and timeline                          | Marjie Kirn     |
| 7. Comments/Questions from committee or public          | Chair Cox       |
| 8. Adjourn  | Chair Cox       |
| NEXT MEETING?   |                 |

---

\*attachment

## COMMITTEE ROSTER

---

California Rural Legal Assistance	Marisol Aguilar
Leadership Council for Justice and Accountability	Veronica Garibay/Kaylon Hammond
Valley Land Alliance	Jean Okuye
American Farmland Trust	Dan O'Connell
League of Women Voters	Kenra Bragonier
Merced Bicycle Coalition	Lisa Kayser-Grant
Sierra Club	Rod Webster/Craig Breon
Building Healthy Communities	Isai Palma, Vice-Chair
Golden Valley Health Centers	Mary-Michal Rawling
Merced County Department of Public Health	Stephanie Nathan
Construction/Builders Exchange, and Citizens Advisory Committee	Adam Cox, Chair
Small Business, and Citizens Advisory Committee	Dan Caris
At Large, and Citizens Advisory Committee	Pamela Toconis

---

## Comparison of population and jobs assumptions in RTP scenarios 'B' and 'C'

Area	2008		2035		2035		2035	
	Baseline		RTP scenario 'B'		RTP scenario 'C'		Difference 'C' minus 'B'	
	Pop.	Emp.	Pop.	Emp.	Pop.	Emp.	Pop.	Emp.
Atwater	34,146	6,551	37,724	7,776	43,184	8,131	5,460	355
Dos Palos	7,156	1,207	9,361	1,490	11,203	1,623	1,842	133
Gustine	5,416	1,220	6,069	1,551	6,568	1,699	499	148
Livingston	12,540	5,857	14,958	7,268	18,102	7,662	3,144	394
Los Banos	38,887	6,305	51,401	11,135	57,219	11,446	5,818	311
Merced	91,937	28,683	120,423	35,029	123,301	35,799	2,878	770
UC	364	41	11,121	1,727	11,822	2,766	701	1,039
Delhi	11,695	1,289	14,324	1,546	12,399	1,321	-1,925	-225
Franklin	3,535	112	3,777	119	5,515	140	1,738	21
Hilmar	7,040	2,407	9,814	2,853	7,460	2,434	-2,354	-419
Le Grand	1,446	341	1,878	422	1,526	344	-352	-78
Planada	3,899	641	4,658	816	4,112	700	-546	-116
Santa Nella	2,628	497	11,360	853	2,787	609	-8,573	-244
Winton	7,831	572	9,509	658	9,382	601	-127	-57
Remainder of Unincorporated	29,022	10,051	47,385	14,947	39,191	13,026	-8,194	-1,921
<i>Incorporated</i>	190,082	49,823	239,936	64,249	259,577	66,360	19,641	2,111
<i>UC</i>	364	41	11,121	1,727	11,822	2,766	701	1,039
<i>Unincorporated</i>	67,096	15,910	102,705	22,214	82,372	19,175	-20,333	-3,039
<b>Total</b>	<b>257,542</b>	<b>65,774</b>	<b>353,762</b>	<b>88,190</b>	<b>353,771</b>	<b>88,301</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>111</b>

### **Notes:**

**Area:** 'Baseline (2008)' numbers may appear high compared to Census numbers, because the numbers for current and future are summarized using the same boundaries - that is, the *future* boundary of the community.

**Pop.:** Population

**Emp.:** Employment - note this is an estimate of *jobs*, which is different from 'employed residents' (many people work in a different location from where they live)

**Difference 'C' minus 'B':** positive numbers indicate scenario C has more than B, negative and shaded numbers indicate scenario B has more than C. Generally, scenario C assumes more growth in the cities and UC and less in unincorporated areas.

# APS Scenario - GHG reductions worksheet

August, 2015 - APS Steering Committee

Yellow = inputs

1 2 3 4

Q#	Measure or assumption	Pts	2035 GHG reduction
----	-----------------------	-----	--------------------

Survey "50%+"	1	2	3	4	All
---------------	---	---	---	---	-----

## BASELINE (Adopted RTP/SCS) =

Transportation Measures	1	2	3	4	Survey "50%+"
1 "Aggressive" urban transit	2	0.9%			0.9%
2 "Maximum" transit fare reduction	1	0.4%			0.4%
3 Express transit	1	0.3%			0.3%
4 Rideshare / Vanpools	4	1.5%			1.5%
5 "Aggressive" bicycle (and retrofits)	2	0.7%			0.7%
6 "Aggressive" pedestrian (and retrofits)	2	0.8%			0.8%
7 Additional alt. fuel / EV subsidies	1	0.5%			0.5%
8 Fee on gas cars ("feebates")	1	0.5%			0.5%
9 Passenger rail commutes (Amtrak & ACE)	2	0.7%			0.7%
<i>sum of all transportation measures</i>		6.3%			

## Land Use Measures and assumptions

10 "Aggressive" parking restrictions & pricing	3	1.1%			1.1%
11 Smaller lots (RTP scen. C)	2	0.8%			0.8%
12 Denser, plus infill (about 1/3)	6	2.6%			2.6%
<i>sum of all land use measures</i>		4.5%			

## ADDITIONAL REDUCTIONS =

6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%
------	------	------	-------

## TOTAL (minimum 10%)=

12.5%	5.9%	5.9%	16.7%
-------	------	------	-------

---

## 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

# **APS Steering Committee Policy Recommendations**

---

Adopted 8.7.15

## **1) Prioritize infill and growth in existing communities**

Direct growth through infill strategies that promote increased investment in existing communities – prioritizing disadvantaged neighborhoods and communities - that provide a range of housing choices (affordable small, medium, large lot single family and multifamily housing) for existing and new residents.

Direct housing and employment growth to existing cities and unincorporated communities rather than directing growth to new town development and sprawl.

## **2) Prioritize funding for complete street projects on existing corridors**

Prioritize investment in active travel, including investments in necessary infrastructure (sidewalks, streetlights, curb and gutter, bike lanes, and other pedestrian safety measures) to promote increased walking and biking.

Establish and implement a complete streets policy as aggressively as possible that requires its member jurisdictions to accommodate all transportation users through the incorporation of sidewalks, streetlights, curb and gutter and bicycle infrastructure in all projects, prioritizing existing streets and roads.

## **3) Explore funding sources to incentivize jurisdictions (including a grant program)**

Develop a sustainable planning and infrastructure grant program to help jurisdictions implement the region's SCS. Utilize existing and new revenue sources to fund this program.

Provide funding as available for the implementation of complete streets and/or active transportation-type plans and related capital improvement programs. Funding may include but is not limited to: Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds (including various safety, safe routes to schools, and transportation enhancement funds), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, Cap and Trade funds, and others.

Encourage transit agencies to make use of all available federal, state, and local funding to sustain, expand and improve local transit services, prioritizing the transit needs of disadvantaged neighborhoods and residents, including low income and transit dependent residents, and ensure the timely and best use of those funds.

## **4) Conduct a needs assessment and link it to the countywide health assessment**

Conduct a needs and opportunities assessment, coordinating with other assessment efforts, that catalogues health indicators, infrastructure deficiencies, housing needs, water and wastewater capacity, resource areas and farmland, employment opportunities, and access to basic services necessary to ensure the health and safety of the residents throughout the jurisdictions.



## **5) Re-evaluate project selection criteria**

Update project selection policy and criteria to emphasize:

- positive effects on health outcomes,
- reducing environmental impacts,
- improving air quality,
- reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and
- avoiding disproportionately high and adverse effects, including social and economic impacts, on traditionally disadvantaged communities, especially communities of color and low-income communities

## **6) Prioritize vanpools and ridesharing**

Prioritize funding for vanpool and ridesharing programs to expand them and encourage their use. Investigate creative transit options for rural communities such as informal ridesharing and subsidized ridesharing to supplement paratransit. Increase efforts to encourage employers to give or increase incentives for employees to rideshare. Investigate the feasibility of dedicating high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes on highways and multi-lane roadways.

## **7) Emphasize “co-benefits” of implementing SB 375 in addition to meeting GHG reduction targets**

Emphasize and explain co-benefits of implementing SB 375 in addition to meeting GHG reduction targets. Benefits include:

- better health,
- less traffic,
- preserving farmland,
- less water use,
- less energy use,
- better air quality, and
- positive economic impact.

## **8) Public participation improvements**

Develop and implement a strong public participation process that meaningfully responds to and incorporates community priorities. Jurisdictions will make reasonable accommodations to ensure all materials are readily accessible and available in languages reflective of the community’s need. All workshops and hearings should be held at a time and location that is accessible to all Merced County residents. Demonstrate effectiveness in responding to comments, questions, and concerns raised during public workshops and hearings.

## **9) Transit**

Improve access to public transit in rural and urban areas. Re-Evaluate and update the definitions of “unmet transit needs” and “reasonable to meet” to broaden and expand service to rural areas. While continuing to invest in existing urban service, identify new funding sources for improvements to service in rural areas.