

NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Merced County Association of Governments
Conference Room
369 W. 18th Street
Merced, CA 95340
(209) 723-3153

Friday, February 5, 2010– 8:30 A.M.

1. INTRODUCTION

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY ADDRESS ANY ITEM ON THE AGENDA DURING CONSIDERATION OF THAT ITEM.

2. ORAL COMMUNICATION

PERSONS WISHING TO ADDRESS AGENDA ITEMS OR COMMENT ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA MAY DO SO AT THIS TIME. COMMENTS ARE LIMITED TO THREE MINUTES PER PERSON. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD.

FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA, NO ACTION WILL BE TAKEN AT THIS TIME. IF IT REQUIRES ACTION, IT WILL BE REFERRED TO STAFF AND/OR PLACED ON THE NEXT AGENDA.

COPIES OF STAFF REPORTS OR OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION RELATING TO ITEMS OF BUSINESS REFERRED TO ON THE AGENDA ARE ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS. PERSONS WITH QUESTIONS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEMS MAY CALL MCAG TO MAKE INQUIRY REGARDING THE NATURE OF THE ITEM DESCRIBED ON THE AGENDA.

ITEM

STAFF

- 3. **Oral Report - Westside Water Presentation** Kole Upton

- * 4. **Minutes of the January 8, 2010 Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting**

- * 5. **FY 2010/2011 Work Program and Budget** Jesse Brown

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board transmit MCAG's FY 10/11 Work Program and Budget to the member jurisdictions.

- * # 6. **Draft Formal Amendment No. 16 to the 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) – Adds Stimulus 2 Revenue Source Only** Terri Lewis

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt Formal Amendment No. 16 to the 2009 FTIP adding the Stimulus 2 Revenue Source by Resolution No. 2010/02-18-01.

- * # 7. **Term Limit on the Citizens Advisory Committee** Marjie Kirn

Discuss possible changes to the bylaws for the Citizens Advisory Committee.

- 8. **Blueprint Status Report** Jesse Brown

For information and discussion only.

- 9. **Information/Discussion Only**
- # a. CAC Highlights – January 8, 2010
- # b. Sign up sheet for CAC representative to the MCAG Governing Board meeting - 2010
- # c. MCAG Governing Board minutes January 21, 2010
- # d. California Transportation Plan 2035 - flyer
- # e. A New Plan for a New Transportation Era - flyer
- # f. Merced County Abandoned Vehicle Abatement Program Status

- 10. **Oral Report – Air District: Recommend an Air District Citizen Advisory Committee Representative**

- 11. **Oral Report – Property Tax Returns** Richard Jantz

- 12. **Oral Report – CAC Goals: Tighter Bonding for Development** Dennis Cote

* Action

Attachment

+ Enclosure

The next Citizens Advisory Committee meeting will be held on Friday, March 5, 2010 at 8:30 a.m. at MCAG, 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, California

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

January 8, 2010

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the **CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE** held Friday, January 8, 2010, at the Merced County Association of Governments conference room located at 369 W. 18th Street, Merced, California, was called to order by Chairman Tom Grave at 8:32 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Dennis Coté, Engineering
Kyle Ford, Citizen-at-Large
Mary Ford-Azevedo, Small Business
Tom Grave, Education
Aaron Hill for Scott Neal, Goods Movement
Lorrae Iencarelli, Citizen-at-Large
Richard Jantz, Economic Development

MEMBERS ABSENT

Adam Cox, Student
Hicham Eltal, Merced Irrigation District
Dan Hultgren, Real Estate
Diana Westmoreland Pedrozo, Agriculture
Melissa Kelly-Ortega, Citizen at Large
Vacant, Construction
Vacant, Citizen-at-Large
Vacant, Citizen-at-Large
Vacant, Finance

OTHERS PRESENT

Lori Flanders, MCAG
Marjie Kirn, MCAG
Ty Phimmasone, MCAG
Richard Finney
Dean Wilson

1. Introductions

So noted.

2. Oral Communication

Dean Wilson commented that today's report would be his last report as the Valley Air District Citizens Advisory Committee representative.

Marjie Kirn explained that the Air District would not allow outside video conferencing to be used to view the meetings. She further explained that if the CAC did not have an

interested representative, she would direct the appointment of the position back to the Mayors of each jurisdiction.

Tom Grave inquired to the follow-up items listed in the CAC Highlights from their December meeting. He asked if Richard was prepared to provide a report regarding property tax returns. Richard requested the item be moved to February.

3. Minutes of the December 4, 2009 Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting

Mary Ford-Azevedo made a motion to approve the minutes as amended of the December 4, 2009 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting.

Seconded by Kyle Ford.

Dennis Coté and Ron Price abstained due to their absence at the December 4, 2009 meeting.

MOTION CARRIED.

4. California High-Speed Rail Authority Working Group Between Merced and Sacramento

Jesse Brown provided a brief history of the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission, which has convened a group of local and regional agencies from the Counties of Merced, Stanislaus, San Joaquin, and Sacramento to study the feasibility of commuter rail service between the regions.

Jesse Brown explained that after the passage of the High Speed Rail Bond, the California High Speed Rail Authority entered into an MOU to partner on the development of the Altamont Regional Corridor and the Merced to Sacramento Corridor. He also commented that the Rail Commission recommended that the Merced to Sacramento working group become a partner in the development of the Merced to Sacramento Corridor, which could be shared to include both High Speed Rail and commuter services. He asked for the CAC's recommendation to the Governing Board to show a unified voice and active involvement through an MOU.

Dennis Cote suggested that the first item of business for this partnership include a fiscal impact study to determine if the High Speed Rail is worthwhile.

Tom Grave commented that no mass transit program operates without some sort of subsidy and that the proposed ticket costs have already doubled since discussions first began.

Jesse Brown asked if the CAC would be interested in having a representative from the High Speed Rail speak at a future meeting. He also directed the committee to an Open House for the High Speed Rail taking place on January 21, 2010 at the Merced Senior Center from 3 –7 p.m.

Richard Jantz made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the MOU between the listed parties as stated in the MOU.

Seconded by Dennis Coté.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Support for the California High-Speed Rail Heavy Maintenance Facility Site at Castle and Authority to Submit Proposal

Jesse Brown explained that the California High Speed Rail Authority requested communities interested in “housing” a maintenance facility for the High Speed Rail, submit an expression of interest by January 15, 2010.

Jesse Brown commented that the Cities of Atwater, Merced, and the County have each adopted (or will be soon) resolutions of support for the development of a rail maintenance facility at either Castle or privately held land southwest of the State Route 99 Mission Interchange. Also included in the resolutions, was development of a Downtown Merced high-speed rail station. Jesse Brown explained that the High Speed Rail Authority has estimated 1200-1500 jobs will generate from the maintenance facility.

Aaron Hill inquired as to whom the 1500 employees will work for.

Jesse Brown commented that he believes the private sector, not the government.

Aaron Hill commented that the County should not lose site of private businesses already operating at the Castle site.

Jesse Brown commented that the County has discussed the impact and will do everything within its power to minimize any effects.

Dennis Coté made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt Resolution No. 2010/01-21-01 to support the High Speed Rail Maintenance Facility for Merced County and the High-Speed Rail Station in the City of Merced.

Seconded by Ron Price.

Ayes: Dennis Coté, Kyle Ford, Mary Ford-Azevedo, Tom Grave, Lorrae Iencarelli, Richard Jantz.

Noes: Aaron Hill.

MOTION CARRIED.

6. 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Draft

Marjie Kirn explained that every two years Regional Transportation Planning Agencies are required to create a local planning document which programs Regional Improvement Program (RIP) dollars. She further explained that the last several years have been dismal, with no new money to program and that the state has requested regions to postpone projects by 30% to outer years.

Marjie Kirn explained that staff's recommendation is to leave the funding as is (not move to an outer year) for the two projects on the books. Projects include:

- Bradley Overhead Replacement Project – bridge replacement and widening
- Highway 59 – Widening to 4 lanes

She informed the group that a meeting is being held on January 14, 2010 with the City of Merced and Caltrans to determine if the Highway 59 project can be phased to utilize the funding in a more productive way.

Dennis Coté made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) programming priorities as detailed in the 2010 RTIP Programming – Merced County spreadsheet by Resolution No. 2010/01-21-02 for submittal to the California Transportation Commission in the 2010 TRIP no later than February 12, 2010.

Seconded by Ron Price.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. California High-Speed Rail – Project-Level Environmental Work

Ty Phimmasone provided an overview of the recent Technical Working Group meetings for the High Speed Rail. Highlights included several alignments being withdrawn as well as a summary of the 2009 Business Plan Report.

8. Merced County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (MCSAFE) Program

Marjie Kirn provided an overview of the Merced County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (MCSAFE) Program. She explained that usage of this program is very minimal and requested the CAC's recommendation regarding the programs future.

Richard Jantz commented that Stanislaus County discussed installing call boxes in the past, but due to politics, the program was never implemented. He believes that times have changed and that the technology may be unnecessary today.

Dennis Cote commented that the alternative technologies listed in the staff report are a great alternative to discontinuing the program. He recommended a MCSAFE committee be established. He also commented that he would be interested in serving on the committee.

Richard Finney commented that the program seems unnecessary due to everyone owning a cell phone. He further commented that he couldn't see the logic in spending more money to install more boxes.

Kyle Ford commented that cell phone towers typically follow traffic patterns.

Larrae Incarelli thanked Marjie for catching the minimal use of this program for review.

Dean Wilson commented that if the call boxes were linked with smart technology, it might become more of a benefit.

Mary Ford-Azevedo made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board establish a MCSAFE subcommittee to evaluate and recommend possible service enhancements to the Merced County SAFE program and that Dennis Coté represents the CAC on this committee.

Seconded by Kyle Ford.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Status of Regional Road Projects for Merced County

Ty Phimmasonne provided an overview of ongoing regional projects. He also directed the CAC to our website to view the ongoing status of regional projects, which is updated quarterly.

10. TRIP Report

So noted.

11. Legislative Update

Candice provided an overview of current legislative activities. She also invited the CAC to attend the One Voice Sacramento trip taking place on February 17-18, 2010. She asked the committee to let her know if they are interested in participating as soon as possible.

Due to time constraints, Tom Grave skipped to Item 14.

14. Oral Report – Air District – CAC Report

Dean Wilson asked that the committee continue to receive updates regarding the Air District via their website.

Highlights from his report include:

- Trip Reduction Program has passed – 5 years until implementation. Program is designed to help employers teach employees what transportation options may be available to them. Includes encouragement of on site accommodations such as:
 - On site showers for bicycle riders
 - Cafeterias
 - Modifying schedules for car pooling and public transit opportunities
- There may be fines for those employers that ignore the program
- Legislative platform includes ensuring no duplication in AB82
- SB 705 – Air District and State Legislature are bumping heads due to no other alternatives to burning
- Air District hopes to increase incentives from \$100 to \$200 million due to the high demand
- May have an increase in the diesel fuel tax to help businesses pay for diesel engine upgrades

- Wood stove and lawn mower change out program are coming up for 2010. Interested parties apply for a certificate through the Air District
- Curriculum is available for schools on how to keep the air clean

12. Oral Report – ARRA Project Status

Marjie Kirn commented that all the jurisdictions submitted their projects to headquarters on time.

13. Information/Discussion Only

b. CAC Highlights – December 4, 2009

The committee directed staff to update CAC follow up items included with the highlights. Updates include:

- CAC Bylaws, Term limits - February
 - Property tax return percentage – Richard Jantz, February
- c. Sign up sheet for CAC representative for the MCAG Governing Board meeting – 2010

Dennis Cote signed up as the alternate for January. Richard Jantz informed Tom Grave he could not attend the February meeting as listed. Tom Grave agreed to cover the February Governing Board meeting.

d. MCAG Governing Board minutes December 17, 2009

So noted.

14. Oral Report – CAC Goals Report

Upcoming presentations:

- Tighter bonding for development – Dennis Cote, February.
- Market the Blueprint – How do we do it? Richard Jantz recommended the discussion start with how the CAC can promote it. Possibly schedule for March 2010.
- Tom Grave and Marjie Kirn will discuss future agenda topics.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED BY CHAIRMAN TOM GRAVE AT 10:28 A.M.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 29, 2010

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: JESSE B. BROWN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RE: FY 2010/2011 WORK PROGRAM AND BUDGET

BACKGROUND

Enclosed for your review is a draft summary of the MCAG Work Program, Budget, and Membership Dues Schedule for FY 10/11. As provided by the MCAG By-laws, each City Council and the Board of Supervisors will be requested to approve the Work Program and Budget prior to its final adoption by the MCAG Governing Board, scheduled for May.

The work program identifies each element's objective, personnel and funding requirements, and funding source. The major emphasis areas of this year's work program are described below.

DISCUSSION

Transportation

SR 99 Merced Project Study Report

Caltrans will lead the preparation of a project study report that will scope out options for the future improvement of SR 99 from the Mission Interchange north through Merced to the southern SR 99 project boundary of the Atwater/Merced Expressway. MCAG, City of Merced, and County of Merced staff will participate on a project development team that will review and provide direction on this project during its 18-24 month development.

SB 375 Model Development

SB 375 tasks MCAG as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) with the responsibility of preparing "Sustainable Community Strategy-SCS" (future land use scenario) that integrates land use and transportation to achieve green house gas goals set by the California Air Research Board (CARB). The first such SCS is scheduled to be included in MCAG's 2014 Regional Transportation Plan. Each of the other seven MPO's in the San Joaquin Valley have the same requirement and are on the same schedule. A coordinated and, for the most part, state funded effort will continue to develop and upgrade computer models that will be used to prepare and evaluate the Sustainable Community Strategy options for their ability to meet CARB emission reduction targets.

San Joaquin Valley Blueprint The Blueprint program will be entering its 5th year. Fresno COG has assumed the administrative lead coordination the efforts of the eight-valley councils-of-government through this process. The goal is a unified vision and strategy for achieving a valley-wide plan for regional land use, transportation, economic development, and other key components important to valley residents through the year 2050. A major product of the coming year will be a “tool box” of policies and programs for local agencies to choose from should they choose to achieve San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Principles.

Alternate Modes Plan Pedestrian, bicycle, and park-and-ride facilities will be evaluated on a community and countywide basis to identify critical linkages and missing links between home-work, home-school, home-shopping/medical. Safe routes to school options will also be identified.

Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System (YARTS) Merced County, Mariposa County, and Mono County formed YARTS as a three-county transit service Joint Powers Authority in 1999. YARTS has contracted with MCAG for transit management, marketing, and administrative support. MCAG is fully reimbursed for its personnel and support costs.

Geographic Information System (GIS)

Since 1991, MCAG’s not-for-profit corporation, Merced Data Special Services, Inc. (MDSS) has maintained a countywide Geographic Information System that includes parcel, general plan, and zoning maps. This system is as an element of the work program funded with federal and state transportation funds. This data system is free to MCAG jurisdictions. There will be no separate maintenance cost for MCAG member jurisdictions for these maps or thematic layers. MCAG staff provides training and hosts a users group for member agencies. This program also maintains an interactive website that is accessible to the member agencies and the general public.

Each jurisdiction may contract with MCAG to provide additional services as they may require.

Grant Administration

The grant writing and administration program provides these services to member agencies. The program has a staff of 2.5 regular positions, a program manager, and 1.5 grant writer/administrators. Past policy has been to fund the equivalent of the program manager position with member contributions, LTF planning, and Regional Solid Waste Management Agency funds. The remaining positions are funded through contracts with member jurisdictions. These contracts include CDBG (housing rehabilitation) and other program administration. The remaining positions are funded through contracts with member jurisdictions. These contracts include administering grants such as CDBG and HOME for housing rehabilitation, First Time Homebuyers and other program administration.

One Voice Legislative Strategy

Our State and Federal legislative program will be entering its 7th year. Workshops will be held in the fall with the Governing Board, Technical Review Board, and our private sector partners to revise and update the strategies. Our One Voice delegation will present the state and federal legislative programs to our respective delegations in Sacramento and Washington D.C.

Transit Joint Powers Authority for Merced County

The Amended and Restated Joint Powers Agreement of the Transit Joint Powers Authority is scheduled to become effective July 1, 2010. The Executive Director and the Transit Manager are in the process of evaluating alternative staffing arrangements that will maximize the use of existing staff resources from both the Transit Agency and MCAG for the most effective and efficient use of available capabilities and funds.

Regional Waste Management Authority for Merced County

The MCAG Governing Board serves as the policy board for the Regional Solid Waste Management Agency. MCAG staff supports that Board and the Local (Resource/Recovery) Task Force. MCAG staffs the countywide public information and education programs addressing both non-hazardous and hazardous materials, and administers resource recovery projects funded by the State on behalf of the cities and county.

BUDGET

The budget assumes a reduction in staff from 19 to 18 equivalent regular employees. The retirement at the end of February 2010 of our Public Information Officer, Candice Steelman, will be filled through internal promotion and the existing transportation planning position will not be replaced.

No cost of living adjustment is proposed for the salary schedule. Merit pay increases are budgeted and may be awarded if personnel performance merits.

Federal Transportation Planning funds, (\$700,161-FHWA, \$68,846-FTA) available through TEA-LU provides the majority of funding for the transportation program.

Local Transportation Funds, required for match and to fund federally non-eligible costs, are proposed at \$133,360, no change from last year. Transportation Development Act Administrative funding is proposed to remain the same as last year at \$62,100.

Local Contributions remain at the same level as last year at \$82,200.

The One Voice Legislative Program is funded through local contributions on a per capita basis, no change from the current year, at \$113,000. No State or Federal funds may be used for the lobbyist or associated staff time or travel costs.

The Solid Waste Public Education work element is proposed at \$112,700, no increase.

No other significant changes in other budget line items are proposed, other than those noted above.

APPROVAL SCHEDULE

The Work Program and Budget will be submitted to the Technical Planning Committee (public works and planning staff) and the Citizens Advisory Committee for their review and comments in February. This document has also been submitted to state, federal, and regional transportation and air quality agencies. This group will meet with MCAG staff in early March to provide their comments.

Each City and Merced County is requested to approve the FY 10/11 MCAG Budget and Work Program during April.

The Draft FY 10/11 Work Program and Budget are scheduled for submittal to the MCAG Board at its May 20, 2010 meeting.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board transmit MCAG's FY 10/11 Work Program and Budget to the member jurisdictions.

ITEM 6

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 29, 2010

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: TERRI LEWIS, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

RE: DRAFT FORMAL AMENDMENT NO. 16 TO THE 2009 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (FTIP) – ADDS STIMULUS 2 REVENUE SOURCE ONLY

Enclosed for your review and discussion is the draft Formal Amendment No. 16 (Type 2 – Funding Change - New Revenue Source) to the 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).

Amendment No. 16 adds the new Federal Jobs for Main Street Act of 2010 or Stimulus 2 anticipated revenue as a funding source to the 2009 FTIP.

Amendment No. 16 meets all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450 and 40 CFR Part 93.

Due to very short deadlines in the currently voted version of the Stimulus 2 Bill in Congress (50% of the funds awarded within 90 days of the Bill being signed), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has given Caltrans the approval to have MPO's process the addition of Stimulus 2 federal funds as a "reasonably available" source of revenue.

Once the amendment adding the Stimulus 2 federal revenue source to the FTIP is federally approved, MPO's can then process another FTIP amendment programming specific projects to the Stimulus 2 revenue source.

The financial tables of Amendment No. 16 have been updated to include the most current Stimulus 2 FHWA apportionment figures as distributed by Caltrans Headquarters Programming Division on January 27, 2010.

| Stimulus 2 (estimated apportionment) | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|------|-------|----------|-------------|--------------|
| RSTP | STIP-RIP | STIP-RIP/TE | BOND | SHOPP | STIP-IIP | STIP-IIP/TE | TOTAL |
| \$5,054,316 | \$4,550,026 | \$462,966 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,067,308 |
| Note: Distribution will change based on bill signed into law | | | | | | | |

As required by MCAG's adopted Public Participant Plan (PPP) a formal amendment to the FTIP requires a 14-day public review period. Amendment No. 16 documentation is available online on the MCAG website www.mcagov.org.

The MCAG Governing Board of Directors is scheduled to approve formal Amendment No.16 to the 2009 FTIP by resolution on February 18, 2010.

State and federal approval is required for formal Amendment No.16.

REQUESTED ACTION

Recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt Formal Amendment No.16 to the 2009 FTIP adding the Stimulus 2 Revenue Source by Resolution No. 2010/02-18-01.

Attachments: Resolution 2010/02-18-01

**BEFORE THE
MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 2010/02-18-01**

In the Matter of:

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE formal Amendment #16 to the Merced County Association of Governments 2009 Interim Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP),

WHEREAS, the Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) is a Regional Transportation Planning Agency and a Metropolitan Planning Organization, pursuant to State and Federal designation; and

WHEREAS, federal planning regulations require Metropolitan Planning Organizations to prepare and adopt a long range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for their region; and

WHEREAS, federal planning regulations require that Metropolitan Planning Organizations prepare and adopt a Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) for their region; and

WHEREAS, Formal Amendment No. 16 to the 2009 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (Interim FTIP) has been prepared to comply with Federal and State requirements for local projects and through a cooperative process between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans), principal elected officials of general purpose local governments and their staffs, and public owner operators of mass transportation services acting through the Merced County Association of Governments forum and general public involvement; and

WHEREAS, Amendment No. 16 to the FTIP program listing is consistent with the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the air quality conformity analysis.

WHEREAS, Amendment No. 16 to the 2009 FTIP contains the MPO's certification of the transportation planning process assuring that all federal requirements have been fulfilled; and

WHEREAS, Amendment No. 16 to the 2009 FTIP meets all applicable transportation planning requirements per 23 CFR Part 450.

WHEREAS, Amendment No. 16 adds the anticipated federal Stimulus 2 funds as a revenue source in the 2009 FTIP with Federal Highways authorization that these funds are considered "reasonably available" and when included in the financial plan affirms fiscal constraint; and

WHEREAS, Stimulus 2 in the current legislative version identifies the delivery deadline of 50% of these funds as "90 days to project AWARD"; and

WHEREAS, Amendment No. 16 to the 2009 FTIP does not interfere with the timely implementation of the Transportation Control Measures; and

WHEREAS, Amendment No. 16 to the 2009 FTIP conforms to the applicable State Implementation Plans (SIPs) for air quality; and

WHEREAS, the documents have been circulated and reviewed by MCAG advisory committees representing the technical and management staffs of the member agencies; representatives of other governmental agencies, including State and Federal; representatives of special interest groups; representatives of the private business sector; and residents of Merced consistent with public participation process adopted by MCAG; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that MCAG adopts Amendment No. 16 adding the anticipated federal Stimulus 2 funds as a revenue source in the 2009 FTIP with Federal Highways authorization that these funds are considered "reasonably available".

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was passed and adopted by the MCAG Governing Board on this 18th day of February 2010:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of a resolution of the Merced County Association of Governments duly adopted at a regular meeting thereof held on the 18th day of February 2010.

Signed:

Signed:

Jesse Brown, Executive Director
Merced County Association of Governments

John Pedrozo, Chair, Merced County
Association of Governments Governing Board

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 29, 2010

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: MARJORIE KIRN, DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RE: TERM LIMIT ON THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Attached for your review are the current bylaws for the Citizens Advisory Committee. Included in these bylaws is a stipulation that each member may serve two four-year terms. At a recent meeting, several committee members requested that this stipulation be reviewed by the committee as a whole and consider removing the two-term limitation.

The procedures for amending the Bylaws are as follows:

The bylaws of the Citizens Advisory Committee for regional transportation planning as officially adopted shall be amended only in accordance with the following procedures:

- a. All members holding official appointments to the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be furnished a copy of the proposed changes and amendments to the official bylaws at least 30 days prior to any official vote on said proposed changes and amendments; and
- b. Any changes in amendments to the official bylaws by the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be read at one (1) meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee. Said meeting shall be a regular meeting held in accordance with the provision of the bylaws presently in effect.

At your meeting, committee members can discuss possible changes and at the following meeting those changes can be recommended to the Governing Board.

REQUESTED ACTION

Discuss possible changes to the bylaws for the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Attachment: The Citizens Advisory Committee For Regional Transportation Planning Bylaws

**THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FOR REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING**

BYLAWS

WHEREAS, This Committee having been officially appointed by the Governing Board of the Merced County Association of Governments and having been designated as the Citizens Advisory Committee for Regional Transportation Planning is desirous of operating in an organized manner. The Committee fulfills requirements of the 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) to develop a proactive public involvement process in developing transportation plans and programs. Now, therefore, be it resolved that the following bylaws be adopted and by the passage of this resolution by the majority vote, are declared to constitute the official bylaws of the Citizens Advisory Committee for Regional Transportation Planning.

ARTICLE I - PURPOSE

The purpose of this Committee is to serve as the formal means by which public input is provided and aid is given to the development and maintenance of the public involvement of the Merced County Regional Transportation Planning process, and to advise the Governing Board of the Merced County Association of Governments, who serve as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for Merced County. The objectives of the Committee include:

1. The use of the skills, knowledge and experience of its members, and the organizations and groups they represent, to assist and advise the Merced County Association of Governments, in respect to plans and programs for the orderly development of the various modes of transportation in Merced County;
2. Facilitate transportation systems in such a way as to foster job creation and enhance current employment levels and improve the business and economic climate for the region;
3. Identify and discuss issues on public safety on the region's transportation system;
4. Facilitate two-way communication between the citizens of the region and the Governing Board, through the MCAG staff; and
5. Serve as public advisory medium for the promotion of public and private programs and support of the above-stated objectives.

*** ARTICLE II – MEMBERSHIP**

The membership of this Committee shall be composed of representatives from the fields of: real estate (one), commerce (one), economic development (one), construction (one), civil engineering (one), goods movement (one), agriculture (one), small business (one), *education (one), a student representative (one), a financial representative (one) and a water/irrigation district representative (one)* and citizens at-large members (five) to provide geographic representation.

The official membership may by majority vote appoint special committees composed of non-members or request special information or advice from knowledgeable persons as is necessary to carry out the objectives of the Citizens Advisory Committee. Said non-member committees or persons shall be appointed for the time required to accomplish said objective.

ARTICLE III - TERM

Each member of the Committee may serve up to two complete, four-year terms. At the end of a full first term, a member may be re-appointed by the Governing Board. A member appointed to serve out the balance of the

term of an existing vacancy may be re-appointed at the conclusion of the term and may ultimately serve two, complete, four-year terms in addition to the initial term.

ARTICLE IV - ATTENDANCE

Members shall attend all the scheduled meetings of the Committee. In an event when a member cannot attend the meeting an alternate may be substituted. The member shall contact MCAG staff and notify staff that they will be sending an alternate to the meeting, along with a name and phone number. The alternate shall have the same voting privileges as a member. If a member fails to attend two (2) consecutive meetings, the member is considered to have vacated the position. Another representative shall be appointed to fill the position subsequent to notifying the member.

ARTICLE V - VOTING

Each member of the committee shall have one (1) vote. The above-stated members shall in the manner stated above be entitled to cast their vote on all matters brought to a vote during a regular or called meeting which said member is present and providing a quorum is present at the time as specified in Article VI.

ARTICLE VI - QUORUM

The majority of the voting membership of the Citizens Advisory Committee officially holding appointments from the appointing authority shall constitute a quorum. A quorum shall be necessary for the transaction of any official business by the Citizens Advisory Committee for regional transportation planning.

ARTICLE VII - OFFICER, ELECTION OF

Section 1

The officers of the Citizens Advisory Committee for regional transportation planning shall be a Chairperson and a Vice-Chairperson and shall be selected in accordance with Section 2 of this Article. MCAG staff shall act as Secretary for the Committee.

Section 2

All elected officials shall serve for a term of one (1) year.

ARTICLE VIII - DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1

The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Committee, and is eligible to vote on all matters coming before the Committee. The Chairperson shall be responsible for conducting all meetings in an orderly manner and of appointing the necessary committees which are needed to meet the objectives of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Section 2

The Vice-Chairperson shall perform all the duties and assume all the responsibilities of the Chairperson in his/her absence.

ARTICLE IX - MEETINGS

Regular meetings of the Committee shall be held no less than one (1) in every quarter. The Committee shall meet routinely on the first Friday of the month at 8:30 a.m. at the MCAG Conference Room. At least 72 hours before a regular meeting, the agenda for that meeting shall be posted at the MCAG office. Notice of regular meetings shall be mailed or delivered to each member of the committee at least five (5) days prior to each meeting

and accompanying the notice shall be the written agenda for that meeting and supporting or pertinent documents relating to the agenda items.

Any regular meeting of the committee may be canceled by the Chairperson upon giving of at least 72 hours written notice to all members of the committee.

ARTICLE X - SPECIAL MEETINGS

Special meetings of the Citizens Advisory Committee may be called by the Chairperson, or in his/her absence, the Vice-Chairperson or by a majority of the Committee. Notice by letter or by phone 24 hours prior to the scheduled time shall be considered adequate.

ARTICLE XI - ANNUAL MEETINGS

An annual meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be held at the last regularly scheduled meeting in each year. During this annual meeting, the following activities shall take place:

- a. A summation of progress made, work accomplished, and the proposed work program shall be prepared for the coming year for delivery to the Chairperson of the Governing Board of the Merced County Association of Governments; and
- b. Officers for the coming year shall be elected at the annual meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

ARTICLE XII - AMENDMENTS

Section 1

The bylaws of the Citizens Advisory Committee for regional transportation planning as officially adopted shall be amended only in accordance with the following procedures:

- a. All members holding official appointments to the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be furnished a copy of the proposed changes and amendments to the official bylaws at least 30 days prior to any official vote on said proposed changes and amendments; and
- b. Any changes in amendments to the official bylaws by the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be read at one (1) meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee. Said meeting shall be a regular meeting held in accordance with the provision of the bylaws presently in effect.

Section 2

A quorum of the members present at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee shall be deemed sufficient to recommend the MCAG Governing Board adopt any changes in amendments to the bylaws of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 29, 2010

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: JESSE B. BROWN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RE: BLUEPRINT STATUS REPORT

BACKGROUND

Over the past three years, the eight COGs in the San Joaquin Valley (SJV) have accomplished many goals that have moved the process closer to consensus on a Valleywide preferred growth scenario. These accomplishments are even more noteworthy when one considers that each step required approval or endorsement by eight separate and distinct policy boards. The major tasks undertaken are summarized as follows:

Institutional Framework, Management and Community Outreach: The SJV Blueprint process created a project management team comprised of a program manager from the lead agency and project managers from each of the other seven COGs. Three major Valleywide events were presented: the Blueprint Kickoff Workshop in June of 2006; the Blueprint Executive Forum (aimed primarily at elected officials) in April of 2008; and a Valleywide Summit in January 2009 where the Valleywide alternative scenarios were presented to the public.

The SJV Blueprint has produced a variety of communication materials including websites, videos, brochures, print and electronic media advertising and project reports. Extensive mapping helps member agencies and the public understand the concepts being portrayed. Ultimately, the Blueprint must be integrated into the local general planning processes in order to ensure implementation.

Now, with the legal requirements of AB 32 and SB 375, some type of certification process will need to be established so that the planning principles defined in the Blueprint can be implemented throughout the Valley.

The SJV Blueprint has been, and will continue to be, conducted through a “bottom-up” approach to secure government and community support. Maps showcasing and explaining the local and Valleywide Blueprint options were generated by U.C. Davis/Valley COGs and circulated to Valley communities through public outreach orchestrated by the Great Valley Center, and by each individual planning agency. Public meetings, presentations, newsletters, and online publications were used to obtain feedback from the public, elected officials, and a variety of community, business and government agencies.

Land Use, Transportation and Air Quality Modeling: Status Quo scenarios were developed in each county and alternative scenarios were created. During the scenario planning stage, UPlan, a modeling tool developed by U.C. Davis, has been used by all eight Valley COGs. Each COG translated the UPlan land use categories into the categories in their individual traffic models. Traffic model output was then input into the air quality model to measure emissions from on-road vehicles. Throughout the scenario planning stage, UPlan runs were conducted for each scenario with review and input from local planners and stakeholders. This “feedback” process will continue to be a central part of the integration stage of the SJV Blueprint.

When Blueprint principles are incorporated into local projects, more fine-grained software choices will be explored for community, neighborhood, or even project-level planning. The SJV Blueprint planning process is creating a long-range regional vision that includes land use, transportation and resource planning. Each of the eight SJV COGs and the SJV Policy Council adopted the 12 SJV Blueprint smart growth principles. These principles were incorporated in the Blueprint process to ensure a spectrum of housing, employment and transportation choices in walkable, livable neighborhoods. They can be applied to a wide variety of development projects, small-scale infill development; new neighborhoods built on large infill sites; and public improvements such as streetscape projects and civic buildings.

The smart growth principles for the SJV Blueprint are:

- Create a range of housing opportunities and choices
- Create walkable neighborhoods
- Encourage community and stakeholder collaboration
- Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place
- Make development decisions predictable, fair and cost effective
- Mix land uses
- Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty and critical environmental areas
- Provide a variety of transportation choices
- Strengthen and direct development towards existing communities
- Take advantage of compact building design
- Enhance the economic vitality of the region
- Support actions that encourage environmental resource management

Individual COG Planning Process: Each of the eight Valley COGs conducted the Blueprint process at the local level, which included convening stakeholder groups, engaging their member agencies and conducting outreach to community groups and the general public. Much time has been invested in working with local agency planners so that the Blueprint can be integrated at the local level.

Valley Planning Process: The eight COGs have been collaborating on a Valleywide basis as part of the project management team.

Health and Obesity Awareness: Smart growth strategies can encourage physical activity by making a community more walkable and can provide greater access to healthy food options, thus contributing to healthier eating. A comprehensive approach to planning can be implemented that focuses on identifying priority areas where public health strategies can be incorporated within the local planning process. In the short-term, these planning efforts will help create healthier

lifestyles; in the long-term, these efforts can have a measurable impact on chronic health conditions such as obesity, diabetes, stroke and heart disease.

DISCUSSION

A major work element for 2010 is the consultant preparation of the following products:

A Summary of Work Accomplished in the First Three Years of Blueprint Planning that was reflected in the Regional Policy Council's adoption on April 1, 2009.

This document will provide context and serve as the introduction to the implementation strategy (SJV Blueprint Roadmap). Another possible use for this document (in a stand alone format) might be those practitioners and professionals seeking a more in-depth review of the Valleywide Blueprint process as well as Caltrans, the funding source for the San Joaquin Valley Blueprint Process. The document should address the following:

The development of an implementation strategy with supportive policies and performance measures, including recommendations for next steps including:

- Assessment tools or a process that institutions can use to guide them through Blueprint implementation.
- Identification of how Blueprint principles can be integrated into local General Plans and the tools needed for local practitioners and elected officials to address local implementation.
- Identification of possible barriers preventing change as well as the driving forces for change, which will support the Blueprint's implementation at the local level.
- Development of "best-practices" guidelines and process assessment metrics that institutions can use to guide them through the implementation process.
- Identification of the institutional arrangements necessary to successfully carry out Blueprint implementation and make recommendations for implementation oversight. Examples would include the roles of the Policy Council, COGs, local agencies, and lawmakers.
- Identification of financial resources needed to implement the Blueprint at the Valley and local levels.

Creation of a toolkit of resources to implement the 12 Valley Blueprint Principles into local planning processes.

- Identification of Legal Issues in Planning associated with land use regulation, including State Planning and Zoning Law and the California Environmental Quality Act.
- Development of a Common Issues curriculum on such issues as urban design, transportation, air quality, climate change, adequate housing, and environmental resources. Develop a compendium of model codes and zoning ordinances, policies, plans, and techniques that can be used to address particular issues related to integrating Blueprint principles into the local planning process.
- Provide a series of Case Studies providing examples of how rural, suburban and urban areas have addressed similar planning issues.

Ongoing Outreach Tools: Develop recommendations to enhance public outreach in the ongoing Blueprint process.

- Development of a list of electronic media tools and/or strategies to reach a broad audience of public stakeholders, elected officials and practicing professionals. The tools should include, but not be limited to, websites, forums, blogs, advertisements, publications, and/or educational curriculum/tools to expose students of varying ages to the process, principles and practice of Blueprint planning.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information and discussion only.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Highlights January 8, 2010

CAC representative to Governing Board items:

4. **California High-Speed Rail Authority Working Group Between Merced and Sacramento**

Jesse Brown provided a brief history of the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission, which has convened a group of local and regional agencies from the Counties of Merced, Stanislaus, San Joaquin, and Sacramento to study the feasibility of commuter rail service between the regions.

Jesse Brown explained that after the passage of the High Speed Rail Bond, the California High Speed Rail Authority entered into an MOU to partner on the development of the Altamont Regional Corridor and the Merced to Sacramento Corridor. Jesse Brown commented that the Rail Commission recommended that the Merced to Sacramento working group become a partner in the development of the Merced to Sacramento Corridor, which could be shared to include both High Speed Rail and commuter services. He asked for the CAC's recommendation to the Governing Board to show a unified voice and active involvement through an MOU.

Dennis Cote suggested that the first item of business for this partnership include a fiscal impact study to determine if the High Speed Rail is worthwhile.

Tom Grave commented that no mass transit program operates without some sort of subsidy and that the proposed ticket costs have already doubled since discussions first began.

Jesse Brown asked if the CAC would be interested in having a representative from the High Speed Rail speak at a future meeting. He also directed the committee to an Open House for the High Speed Rail taking place on January 21, 2010 at the Merced Senior Center from 3 –7 p.m.

Richard Jantz made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board approve the MOU between the listed parties as stated in the MOU.

Seconded by Dennis Coté.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. **Merced County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (MCSAFE) Program**

Marjie Kirn provided an overview of the Merced County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (MCSAFE) Program. She explained that usage of this program is very minimal and requested the CAC's recommendation regarding the programs future.

Richard Jantz commented that Stanislaus County discussed installing call boxes in the past, but due to politics, the program was never implemented. He believes that times have changed and that the technology may be unnecessary today.

Dennis Cote commented that the alternative technologies listed in the staff report are a great alternative to discontinuing the program. He recommended a MCSAFE committee be established. Dennis Cote also commented that he would be interested in serving on the committee.

Richard Finney commented that the program seems unnecessary due to everyone owning a cell phone. He further commented that he couldn't see the logic in spending more money to install more boxes.

Kyle Ford commented that cell phone towers typically follow traffic patterns.

Larrae Iencarelli thanked Marjie Kirn for catching the minimal use of this program for review.

Dean Wilson commented that if the call boxes were linked with smart technology, it might become more of a benefit.

Mary Ford-Azevedo made a motion to recommend the MCAG Governing Board establish a MCSAFE subcommittee to evaluate and recommend possible service enhancements to the Merced County SAFE program and that Dennis Coté would represent the CAC on this committee.

Seconded by Kyle Ford.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

| <u>MCAG staff / CAC follow-up items</u> | <u>Action</u> | <u>Date</u> |
|--|---------------|-------------|
| 1. Merced County staff – Property Tax return percentage | Richard Jantz | February |
| 2. CAC Bylaws – Term limits | Agenda | February |
| 3. Future CAC Goal Discussion Topics <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dennis Cote – Tighter bonding for development - February• Marketing the Blueprint - March• Water Issues – Presentation from Westside – Kyle Ford to make contact with potential speaker | Agenda | Ongoing |
| 4. Abandoned Tires Program | Agenda | ? |

**SIGN UP SHEET FOR CAC REPRESENTATIVE AT MCAG GOVERNING BOARD MEETINGS
2010**

| DATE | LOCATION | CAC REP | ALTERNATE |
|---------------------|--|--|--------------------|
| January 21 3pm | City of Atwater, Council Chambers | Tom Grave | Dennis Cote |
| February 18 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | Tom Grave | |
| March 18 3pm | City of Dos Palos, Council Chambers | | |
| April 15 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | Diana Westmoreland- Pedrozo | Kyle Ford |
| May 20 3pm | City of Gustine, City Hall | | |
| June 17 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | Kyle Ford | |
| July 15 3pm | City of Livingston, City Hall | Richard Jantz | |
| August 19 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | | |
| September 16 3pm | City of Los Banos, Council Chambers | | |
| October 21 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | Richard Jantz | |
| November 18 3pm | City of Merced, Council Chambers | | |
| December 16 3pm | Merced County Admin Bldg | | |

MCAG GOVERNING BOARD

January 21, 2010

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the **MERCED COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS GOVERNING BOARD** held on Thursday, January 21, 2010, at the City of Atwater, Council Chambers, 750 Bellevue Avenue, Atwater, California, was called to order by Chair Pedrozo at 3:29 P.M.

DIRECTORS PRESENT

Tommy Jones
Deidre Kelsey
Mike Nelson
Johnny Mays
Jerald O'Banion
Joe Oliveira
John Pedrozo
Joe Rivero, for Joan Faul
Bill Spriggs
Hub Walsh

DIRECTORS ABSENT

Daniel Varela

GUESTS AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Sam Chandler, Merced County Solid Waste
Ross Chittenden, Caltrans District 10
Rod Ghearing, Merced County Transit
Tom Grave, Citizens Advisory Committee

STAFF PRESENT

Jesse Brown, Executive Director
Robert Haden, Legal Counsel
Marjie Kirn, Deputy Executive Director
Robin Lamas, Administrative Assistant II
Candice Steelman, Public Information Officer
Dick Whittington, YARTS Transit Manager

7. Oral Report – Citizens Advisory Committee

Tom Grave gave the report from the Citizens Advisory Committee.

8. Consent Agenda

- a. Minutes of the December 17, 2009 Governing Board meeting
- b. California High-Speed Rail Authority Working Group between Merced and Sacramento
- c. Support for the California High-Speed Rail Heavy Maintenance Facility Site in Merced County and Station in Downtown Merced
- d. Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account Program (PTMISEA)
- e. Merced County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (MCSAFE) Program

Director Oliveira moved to approve the Consent Agenda.
Seconded by Director Kelsey.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. Information/Discussion Only

- a. Minutes of the January 13, 2010 Technical Review Board meeting
- b. Regional Transportation Impact Fee Report
- c. 2008/2009 Financial Audit Management Comment Letter
- d. California High-Speed Rail – Project-Level Environmental Work
- e. Status of Regional Road Projects for Merced County
- f. TRIP Report
- g. Applegate Road Interchange Flyer – final version
- h. Legislative Update

So noted.

10. Oral Report - Caltrans

Ross Chittenden gave the report from Caltrans.

11. Continuum of Care Update

The Directors discussed the Continuum of Care Program and Plan. It was requested that staff hold a study session with the Directors and the City Managers at 1:30 prior to the February 18, 2010 Governing Board meeting. The Directors would like additional information on what types of services are currently available; what is occurring with the homeless and what can occur; how do other jurisdictions handle the homeless situation, and what is it going to take to move a 10-Year Plan along.

A study session will be set for 1:30 p.m. on February 18, 2010 at the County of Merced, prior to the Governing Board meeting.

12. 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Draft

Director Jones moved to approve:

- a. Option 2 as a preferred programming option for the 2010 RTIP; and
- b. The adoption of the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) with the preferred programming priorities for submittal to the California Transportation Commission in the 2010 RTIP no later than February 12, 2010.

Seconded by Director Walsh.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

13. One Voice Priorities

Candice Steelman gave a review of the One Voice Priorities. At the December meeting the Directors approved the state/federal One Voice priorities with the addition of the Atwater-Merced Expressway Project and the Streams Flood Control to the state priorities and the Atwater-Merced Expressway Project, MID Hydroelectric Re-licensing Renewal, Raising the spillway at Exchequer Dam and Streams Flood Control to the federal priorities.

The Technical Review Board recommended not including the three new projects (a. Request legislation to change a restriction to the New Exchequer Dam spillway project, b. Fund the Streams Flood Control project; c. Fund the Atwater-Merced Expressway) as they should have been engaged in the One Voice process from the start, and should not be allowed to submit requests at the last minute.

Director Nelson moved to ratify the prior prioritization of the One Voice Priorities as shown.

Seconded by Director Spriggs.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

14. Anna M. Fuentes Memorial Scholarship Committee Selection

Director Pedrozo nominated Director Walsh to serve on the Anna Maria Fuentes Scholarship Selection Committee.

Seconded by Director O'Banion.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

15. Personnel Evaluation, Executive Director

The Directors authorized the MCAG Executive Committee to convene and conduct the annual performance evaluation of the Executive Director and to report their findings and recommendations to the Governing Board.

16. Executive Directors' Report

So noted.

17. Directors Report

So noted.

**THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS OF THE MCAG GOVERNING BOARD
THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 4:29 P.M.**

_____/s/_____
Robin Lamas
Administrative Assistant II

California Transportation Plan 2035 Scope Document

The *California Transportation Plan* (CTP) provides a long-range policy framework for meeting statewide transportation needs. The CTP defines goals, policies, and strategies to achieve our collective vision for California’s transportation future. The plan envisions a sustainable system that improves mobility and enhances our quality of life. Key to this vision is considering “the 3 E’s”—a **prosperous Economy**, **quality Environment** and **social Equity**—in all transportation decisions.

The current focus is to review and update the CTP for a 2035 planning horizon by incorporating elements of the previous plans (*CTP 2025 and 2030 Addendum*) and integrating new recommendations. Ongoing community outreach through an interactive website as well as workshops and focus groups throughout the State will be important elements of the plan’s development. By collaborating with us, the public can influence the content of the final plan and, ultimately, decisions about investing transportation dollars.

THE VISION The Three E’s of Sustainability



Working with transportation partners and stakeholders, Caltrans will take the following actions in developing the *California Transportation Plan 2035*:

- **Validate** and build on *CTP 2025* vision, goals, policies and strategies.
- **Review** current trends, challenges and emerging issues such as global warming, climate change and transportation financing.
- **Evaluate** all proposed policies in the broader context of sustainability considering how they impact California’s economy, environment and social equity.
- **Expand** the direction set in the *2030 Addendum* to include consideration of environmental issues early in the transportation planning process.
- **Enhance** existing planning by integrating the five “opportunity areas” identified in the *2030 Addendum*, such as coordination of State infrastructure planning.
- **Implement** a “complete streets” approach that integrates bicycling, walking and transit to provide mobility and access for all.

The *CTP 2035* is scheduled for approval in Fall 2010. To offer your input on this Scope Document and the *California Transportation Plan 2035*, go to <http://www.californiatransportationplan2035.org/> and leave a comment.

A New Plan

FOR A NEW TRANSPORTATION ERA

Integration of State Plans, Regional Transportation Plans, and Regional Blueprint Planning in Relationship to SB-375 and AB-32 Goals

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) invites your input on the new **California Interregional Blueprint**. The **California Interregional Blueprint** will be the foundation of the next California Transportation Plan and will be responsive to SB 375 and AB 32 goals. Caltrans will host six workshops throughout the state to provide an opportunity for you to:

- influence **long-range transportation planning** goals, policies, and strategies; and
- provide input into the **statewide data modeling framework**.

The workshops feature informational presentations, large group discussions, and electronic polling (so that everyone can instantly see the group's response to questions that are posed).



For more information, e-mail Maria Mayer, MIG Inc., at mariam@migcom.com or call her at 510-845-7549 (voice) or 711 (TTY). If you need physical accommodations or other assistance, please contact Maria as soon as possible, but no later than 2 work days before the workshop you plan to attend.

JOIN US! Workshop dates, times and locations are listed below. No RSVP necessary. Please arrive at least 15 minutes early for sign in and refreshments. The workshops will begin promptly.

OR CHECK IN! All workshops will be webcast. If you'd like to participate in the webcast, join us at: <http://livemsmmedia.dot.ca.gov/channel12>.

WORKSHOPS

SACRAMENTO

Tuesday, February 16, 2010
1:00 - 4:00 p.m.
Secretary of State Building
1500 11th Street, 1st Floor
Auditorium

SAN DIEGO

Monday, March 1, 2010
1:00 - 4:00 p.m.
Caltrans District 11, Garcia Room
4050 Taylor Street

LOS ANGELES

Tuesday, March 2, 2010
1:00 - 4:00 p.m.
Southern California Association
of Governments
818 W. Seventh Street
12th Floor Board Room

REDDING

Wednesday, March 17, 2010
1:00 - 4:00 p.m.
Shasta County
Public Library Community Room
1100 Parkview Avenue

FRESNO

Monday, March 22, 2010
1:00 - 4:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
2600 Fresno Street

OAKLAND

Tuesday, April 6, 2010
1:00 - 4:00 p.m.
Metropolitan Transportation
Commission MetroCenter Auditorium
101 Eighth Street

MEMORANDUM

DATE: JANUARY 29, 2010

TO: CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: CHRISTINA SMITH, ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES MANAGER

**RE: MERCED COUNTY ABANDONED VEHICLE ABATEMENT PROGRAM
 STATUS**

BACKGROUND

Section 22710 of the California Vehicle Code allows counties to form a Service Authority for the “abatement, removal, or the disposal as a public nuisance of any abandoned, wrecked, dismantled, or inoperative vehicle ... from private or public property”. Section 22710 allows for the imposition of a one-dollar (\$1.00) vehicle registration fee.

Based on expressed interest in the Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program in Merced County, staff worked on the tasks required to establish this program. Formation of the Service Authority, imposition of the one-dollar registration fee, and adoption of the Plan required a two-thirds vote by the Board of Supervisors, a vote in favor by the majority of the cities having a majority of the incorporated population, and adopted ordinances by each participating jurisdiction. All of the above-mentioned tasks have been completed. Final approval by the MCAG Governing Board was received on December 18, 2008 and the final documents were sent to the State Controller’s Office for implementation on December 19, 2008.

CURRENT STATUS OF PROGRAM

By December, MCAG had not received any funds for the registration fees that were to have been collected. After many telephone calls, staff was finally able to determine that the State Controller’s Office did not forward any of the required documents to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to begin collecting the \$1 per registration fee. MCAG staff has forwarded the required documents to the DMV so that the program can be implemented. MCAG staff will contact the DMV in about 30 days to request a timeline for when the fee will begin to be collected and when MCAG can expect to receive the funds that were collected. Staff will continue to keep the jurisdictions updated as information becomes available.

REQUESTED ACTION

For information only.