

# **2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy**

## **Sounding Board Meeting Summaries**

## **MTP/SCS Stakeholder Meeting Summary Report October 18, 2013**

On Friday, October 18, 2013 staff met for 5 hours with stakeholders representing agriculture, active transportation, affordable and market rate developers, the environment, social equity, rural communities, public health, air quality, and economic development. The day consisted of topic-specific presentations followed by prompted discussions on each topic. As staff presented the meeting outcomes for the day, participants were encouraged to ask questions during the presentations for clarification and share their opinions, concerns, and ideas during the discussions.

### **Meeting Desired Outcomes:**

- Hear participant perspectives on issues the SACOG Board will consider when adopting a framework for the development of the 2016 MTP/SCS
  - This includes issues around growth projections, investing more into fix-it-first projects, and the infrastructure and economic challenges of infill and Greenfield development.
- Create a shared base of knowledge of the state and federal requirements for developing the MTP/SCS
- Create a shared understanding of the Blueprint and the 2012 MTP/SCS
- Create opportunity for cross-sectoral conversations
  - Build a cross-sectoral sounding board that staff can tap into during the plan update to provide the SAOCG Board with feedback throughout the process.
  - As a sounding board, participants are critical in presenting the interests of your constituents, and helping staff understand the impacts of our work on your constituents in the near- and long-term.

Below are the prompt questions used to start the stakeholder discussions. For each question, themes are teased out with the supporting comments made by meeting participants.

### **Question 1: Is the direction of the Blueprint consistent with the mission/goals of your work? Of the information presented, what are priority issues for you?**

*This discussion varied from table to table but the conversations were primarily about challenges and opportunities related to the implementation of the Blueprint. The conversations also identified issues related both to the Blueprint and the 2012 and 2016 MTP/SCS.*

Theme: There are Blueprint implementation challenges that should be addressed at the local and regional level.

- Barriers to infill need to be removed; infill is far more difficult without subsidies.
- SACOG should work to get a form of Redevelopment back.
- There is a challenge with people or groups thinking growth is growth. There are differences in how to plan for economic growth in rural settings while maintaining the rural character. There is no cookie cutter for growth.
- Agricultural lands need to be preserved, spheres of influence are moving into agricultural lands.
- Local plans i.e. general plans/specific plans need to better align with the Blueprint and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)

Theme: There are no local incentives to implement the Blueprint.

- There are fewer or no incentives for infill/smart growth in rural communities where there is already a lack of water/sewer infrastructure increasing costs to developers.
- Blueprint is only a plan with no teeth, there are no carrots or sticks-how do you keep people interested? There should be some incentives to implementation. If not financial then some policy related levers/incentives.
- SB 375 CEQA streamlining is not enough, local governments need to make infrastructure improvements.

Theme: What are unintended positive and negative consequences of the Blueprint?

- There are other issues besides transportation that have an effect on communities such as education, job training, and access to other areas.
- There needs to be more emphasis on rural land (ag/open space/habitat) planning.
- A strategy to build affordable housing not just plan for it across the region.
- Blueprint implementation is important in the downward trend of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the region.
- Where are the jobs going in the Blueprint, regional planning should support neighborhood planning.
- Need to identify the unintended consequences to rural areas because of the urban infill focus, rural towns and cities need their own infill.
- The lack of planned public investment in rural areas can lead to more segregation.

Theme: Blueprint (and MTP/SCS) should do more.

- Additional work on how the road/transit systems and other transportation modes affect public health.
- There should be more emphasis on bringing/linking destinations closer to existing and planned transit, biking and walking.
- Good infill needs better transit.
- Air quality should be considered at the base of the Blueprint.
- How do we begin to frame and plan for growth and sustainability that is appropriate for rural areas? Centers of development and public investment are needed to support local rural economies.

**Question 2: How do you see the transportation and land use elements of the MTP/SCS affecting your work? What are your thoughts on updating the current MTP/SCS with a focus on addressing challenges to implementation?**

*Some of the issues described below came naturally from the first group discussion about the Blueprint presentation, but are separated out to align with the topic they most relate to.*

Theme: More incentives are needed to implement the SCS, and there are challenges to implementing the SCS at the regional, local, and neighborhood scales.

- There is a need for incentives/planning to make the SCS more meaningful at the neighborhood level.
- There are challenges with implementation at the local level, and very little resident capacity in certain areas to drive the implementation investments from the local government.
- There are no local incentives to implement the SCS.

- There needs to be planning to prevent displacement when gentrification occurs in transit priority areas.
- General Plans are not consistent with the MTP/SCS.
- CEQA streamlining is not enough to support infill and SCS implementation; would like to see some type of streamlined public review process.
- The MTP/SCS should consider and identify new funding to make up for the loss of Redevelopment and other lost revenue.
- There are analytical gaps due to limitations of the regional travel model. There is need to better understand neighborhood/local travel to understand the needs of the community i.e. the underserved by affordable housing and transit.

Theme: The current SCS does not adequately address the growth of rural areas.

- Transit does not serve the rural areas of the region well; it is infrequent and unaffordable.
- What are the unintended consequences of the emphasis of investment and planning in the transit priority areas (TPA)? Particularly, what will be the effect on rural areas?
- The next MTP should include information on what rural investment looks like with rural centers helping to reduce commutes and support smart planning.
- The SCS has little impact on what greenfield developers will do.

Theme: Additional or enhanced analysis of low income and minority populations should be included in the next plan.

- Better environmental justice analysis that looks at people in place, housing + transportation cost burden and access to education and jobs.
- TOD investment in low income areas is hard because of the market demand, how do you support the low income areas rather than maintaining areas of poverty?
- There needs to be ways to encourage job growth that will meet the needs of all economic levels. Is it prescriptive or market based?
- There are many unmet needs in transportation and housing.
- Public transit fares are too high and should be part of the discussions.
- There are historic and unintended bad decisions. We have to make sure growth and investment meet the needs of low income people, we cannot only think of the future markets.
- How do you link public transportation investment in building more affordable housing? Create trade-offs and incentives.

Theme: Better understanding of the health impacts of the MTP/SCS should be developed. Health impacts include the traditional issues around air quality, chronic disease, but in the growing practice of research on health and the built environment, also includes access to: affordable health care, affordable housing, affordable food, affordable transportation, affordable education/training, employment opportunities, and parks and open space.

- People don't understand the link of transportation and jobs. There is a need to provide information on the implications of jobs and housing getting further separated.
- If you have a strong SCS you should have a strong Regional Housing Needs Plan.
- There should be emphasis on the health impacts (positive/negative) of the transportation system.
- There should be consideration/research done on the health impacts of transit-oriented development (TOD).

**Question 3: What do you think about the current proposed approach to updating the growth projections for the 2016 MTP/SCS (i.e.using the same projected amounts of growth in the current MTP/SCS and extending the end year from 2035 to 2036?)**

*This conversation also included comments on new approaches or issues for implementing the MTP/SCS.*

Theme: An approach that considers only minor refinements to the growth projections for the 2016 is a strategic move that will better allocate resources to focus on the implementation issues with the current MTP/SCS.

- It seems like a sound approach; there is still the same growth speed projected; better to use available resource for research on implementation issues.
- Are there other innovative lower-cost ways, besides public transit, to move people efficiently such as pay-as-you-go or private transportation opportunities that are not being considered in the MTP/SCS?
- When considering the growth projection approach, consider what the goal is and that the best use of resources may be spent on implementation.
- Not enough time has passed to re-do growth projections; four years in planning is no time at all.
- Better use of resources is to work on the current financial/performance monitoring implementation commitments presented in the current plan. Help local governments get and use the data.
- The growth projections should stay the same; they may already be too aggressive.
- Jobs drive population increases, not housing. It's not clear yet what the economy will look like in the future, so there is no basis for updating the projections.
- Given the past few years, the reliability of the growth forecast is questionable and updating it wouldn't spur a policy change
- There could be issues with redoing the growth assumptions given the uncertainty of the current economic climate.
- Implementation should include plans for station planning, with a look at displacement issues associated with TOD, develop impact assessments. Provide more assessment information to policy makers and provide funding for project implementation.
- The MTP/SCS should focus on researching and addressing implementation challenges. It is a reasonable approach and it's best to keep the projections where they are so that they don't decrease.
- Are we so focused on the status of the current transit system that we aren't innovating new transit ideas?

**Question 4: What do you think of the trade-off issues presented associated with a transportation system maintenance strategy?**

Theme: Better data and tools are needed to understand the near- and short-term trade-offs of different types of investment.

- Provide us with more tools/analyses are needed to better weigh projects. For example, comprehensive return on investment.
- Need a clearer understanding of the costs of money, and eligible projects in order to weigh in.
- What are equivalent measures for different types of measures?
- What type of road lifecycle should we target, what is long term payoff?
- Should we reconsider pavement types and the overlay/patch maintenance model? What are the cost tradeoffs over time?

- There needs to be more information to understand road system efficiencies.

Theme: A maintenance approach should be context sensitive.

- It is difficult to determine where to put transportation monies because there are so many competing needs.
- You should maintain roads that transport tourists to farms and other agricultural-related travel, especially in areas where the economy is dependent on these sectors (e.g. El Dorado County).
- A maintenance plan should also focus on where we want to concentrate growth.
- There needs to be balance in maintaining the transportation needs in rural areas.
- Since maintenance of existing roads is key to avoid spending more money later, the real wiggle room in transportation funding is in developing new roads. More money should be shifted from new roads to transit and other modes of transportation. Plus new roads also have an air quality component and may generate more use, thus increasing the need for maintenance funds in the future.

Theme: There needs to be more clarity in the process of how projects get funded.

- The MTIP list of improvements is a black box to the public. It's difficult to know what projects have the most impact. The public depends on SACOG staff to do that analysis.
- Clarity in the process (MTP/SCS and local road investment) is important.
- It is important to know the specific trade-offs and amounts of grant/discretionary funds to make good decisions.

Theme: Additional funding should be secured for the 2016 MTP/SCS.

- We should look into financing mechanisms and funding sources that do not require us to tap into funding for other modes (e.g., maintenance). We need new compelling financing models and we need to change public's opinion that they shouldn't pay more for something they already get. We could consider road tolls as a revenue source, but would need to weigh the impacts on tourists. Mode shifts also means less revenue from the gas tax.
- There needs to be plans to increase resources for system maintenance.

**Question 5: Does the information presented reflect your understanding of the current economic, housing, and transportation climate? Are we missing anything? (Full Group Discussion)**

Theme: Additional reporting that breaks out the current conditions in low income and minority communities and by income and age.

- The report could use more demographic breakdowns by race, income and other factors against the trends we're seeing.
- Can you break down the report by different communities?
- There should be more detail on the economic reporting that includes breakdown by race, ethnicity, household size, and age.
- The type of data reported at the regional level would be useful at the community/neighborhood level, to better understand local needs.
- More information on Generation Y/Millennials would be good to have and consider. They are still doing many of the same things as Generation X and Baby Boomers, just later in life, and their early choices are different than previous generations.

Theme: Better understanding of the job market is needed.

- Jobs are a driving factor to growth in the region. The report shows job loss; is there information about corresponding higher education enrollments, retraining etc?
- Types of jobs are changing.

Theme: More housing information is needed.

- SACOG can make assumptions about jobs and transportation but it needs to include housing and the types that we need.
- There could be more information on housing costs trends.
- You are missing a housing piece, on the trend of new housing and preference, current vacancy rates for different housing types and economic factors related to housing.
- This should include housing cost information, this is an important market factor to understand.
- Do we expect a housing market comeback? Generation Y is a big market – bigger than the Baby Boomers, and they are getting married and having kids later and buying their first house later. They will also drive the housing type demand differently than previous generations.

Theme: Additional comments.

- The information is helping to quantify what we are observing.
- “The Lost Decade” of economic growth (2008-2018) is an interesting observation, does this hold true for education and other areas?

**Question 6: Which of the performance measures presented are the most important to you/your work? Which additional performance measures would you be interested in seeing? (full group discussion)**

*A deeper presentation and conversation on performance measure will occur at the next meeting of this group. Participants, expressed interest in more detail on current performance measures, and what types of data are needed to create new measure to better address their questions. As such, staff committed to the topic for the next meeting in early 2014.*

Theme: Additional transportation measures.

- The report could measure proximity to medical services and the relationship between transportation and housing costs.
- Is there a metric for connectivity, such as density of intersections in an area?
- Is there a way to show how we performed as a region (looking backwards) versus what we projected it to be (looking forward)?
- Jobs are not equitably distributed throughout the region. Jobs that require work at night are not conducive to transit and they don't go into the neighborhoods that need them.

Theme: Additional measure for environmental justice communities is needed.

- One request is that we measure EJ areas versus non-EJ areas for transportation performance. We need to look at the age and condition of housing in those areas.
- The problem with the federal poverty data is that it doesn't including the cost of housing.

- The relationship between displacement and community development should be examined.
- Are local governments meeting the goals of RHNA?
- How do you assess, especially in environmental justice areas, that you are increasing opportunity?

Theme: Measures associated with quality of life.

- The Human Impact Partners has quality of life performance metrics that we should consider using.
- We should consider coverage of green trees as a metric, and housing units per acre. We could also include access to parks and open space.
- It would be good to share what innovations are working at the local government level.

### MTP/SCS Stakeholder Meeting Participant Evaluation Summary

<b>RANKING:</b> 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree
<b>This meeting was well organized.</b>
Average: 4.69
<b>The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material.</b>
Average: 3.92
<b>I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the 2016 MTP/SCS.</b>
Average: 4.54
<b>I have a good understanding of the 2016 MTP/SCS process.</b>
Average: 3.16
<b>I understand this this was this a first step in creating a cross-sectoral sounding board for SACOG staff and the Board of Directors.</b>
Average: 4.08
<b>The meeting was beneficial to me.</b>
Average: 4.37
<b>Were there any parts of the meeting that should be avoided in the future?</b>
* Can' think of anything.
* No.
* Nothing really - liked discussion foremost.
* No.

* Not sure.
<b>What should be done next time to make the presentations more effective?</b>
* More front end info about your (SACOG) resources; processes to help frame the input you get.
* Not sure how to do it, but would've been nice to be able to reference back to slides during smaller group discussions. Some of this happened organically during large group discussions.
* A bit more data is needed to better answer some of the questions.
* Maybe handouts so we can mark and reference? This is a bit more detailed and you want us to do more than just nod.
*Perhaps encouraging everyone to read documents ahead of time so the presentations reference knowledge.
* Maybe provide a "key" glossary.
* Pre-meeting information. I was not fully aware as to the purpose of the meeting.
* Perhaps - handouts of some additional information.
* Tighten some of them up a little - be more succinct - but this is a minor comment. Overall, the day was excellently organized!
<b>How can SACOG make the information presented at this meeting more meaningful or useful to you?</b>
* More background? Not that I have time to read everything.
* Materials provided are helpful.
* Send out the presentations and the compiled comments.
* A little homework .... Not too much.
* Did a good job.
* Keep explaining it with its implications.
* Advance access to presentation/reports.
<b>Additional Comments</b>
* Try to focus in an implementation. How to streamline and deal with community or special interest "pushback".
* Please use other economic benchmarks, and not just FPL.
As being a first time attendee of such a meeting, thank you. Very well done and I look forward to continuing to be engaged and provide input

## 2016 MTP/SCS Sounding Board Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: Wednesday, February 19, 2014

Meeting Location: West Sacramento City Hall Galleria

### Meeting Attendees:

Alchemist CDC

American Institute of Architects

Brookfield Residential

CA Rural Legal Assistance

Community Link-Capital Region

Cooley & Associates

Domus Development

Environmental Council of Sacramento

Housing California

League of Women Voters

North State Building Industry Association

Resources for Independent Living

Richland Communities

Sacramento Co Ag Commissioner

Sacramento County Public Health

Sacramento Housing Alliance

Sacramento Tree Foundation

SMUD

WALKSacramento

Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation

Yolo Co Housing Authority

### Meeting Agenda:

-Welcome & Introductions, Monica Hernandez

-What's Happened Since We Last Met, Monica Hernández

-Transit State of Good-Repair Research Initial Findings, Sharon Sprowls

-Approach to 2016 MTP/SCS Scenario Development, Kacey Lizon & Mike McKeever

-Approach for Public Workshops\*, Monica Hernández

-Wrap up & Next Steps, Monica Hernández

*\*Due to extensive dialogue on earlier agenda items, this topic was not covered thoroughly and will be brought back to the sounding board in a subsequent meeting.*

### Meeting Summary:

Staff provided meeting participants with a summary of the board actions and informational presentations related to the 2016 MTP/SCS update that have happened since the group last met in October 2013. Staff explained how the information the sounding board provided was presented and considered prior to board actions. During the staff summary, participants were reminded of the purpose of the sounding board, the upcoming actions staff will be asking the Board to consider, and the timing of research updates relative to the next sounding board meeting. Participants were encouraged to communicate to staff, if there were any additional concerns or questions not addressed during the meeting.

### Transit State of Good-Repair Initial Findings

Staff presented the initial findings of Transit State of Good-Repair Research (presented to Board Policy Committees in March) to the sounding board. Meeting participants were encouraged to ask clarifying questions as needed during the presentation, and the intent of the presentation was to get feedback on issues of interest and concern to the participants.

### Discussion Themes & Comments

THEME: Fleet Expansion and Clean Fuel Requirements

- When discussing capital costs, are the statutory requirements for clean fuel vehicle replacement and the higher per vehicle cost included?

- A chart that shows what percentage of current fleets, by transit operator, that are clean fuel would be useful.
- Do you have the replacement of transit vehicles and/or additional demand broken out by Community Type—interested in the increased costs associated with new growth areas.
- Has anyone considered the possible diversion of transit (and other transportation) funds to water, water storage, energy for transport, in light of the current and potential future drought?
- When planning for vehicle replacement, is reducing vehicle size considered (shuttles vs. large buses) for lower ridership corridors?

THEME: Transit Operations Cost and Service Differentials between Bus and Light Rail

- Can you compare the number of people being moved on light rail vs. bus in 2020 or 2035?
- What is the per capita cost of operations for light rail vs. bus—when thinking about trade-offs, this seems like an important consideration.
- When working within a constrained budget, an overall policy consideration should include whether investment in bus or light rail will move the plan closer to the 2020 and 2035 numbers.
- When thinking about investment, you have to consider that light rail reaches fewer people, and bus serves to connect to light rail and more destinations and the same when planning for service expansion.
- Can you compare farebox recovery rates for similar metro areas that have higher ridership than our area?
- Can you compare farebox recovery by different bus and light rail lines?

THEME: Transit System Expansion Planning

- Transit passengers need to be better engaged when planning for system expansion, planners need to better understand where people need and want to go—to be successful, transit routes should be like a web as opposed to linear.
- When you talk about the air quality improvements from increased transit ridership, can you talk in terms of public health benefits?
- What are the new technologies and services being adopted—in terms of planning and service delivery, e.g., consideration of electric vehicles, driverless cars?
- When planning for a truly regional transit system, partnerships and collaboration are key—and should not be only the transit agencies, but large employment centers, hospitals, and other desirable/needed destinations.
- Housing Authorities need to be engaged in the rollout of the ConnectCard.

THEME: Transit System Needs in Rural, Suburban and Urban Communities

- When considering fleet replacement needs, is there a way to assess the needs and costs for different community types?
- Will there be more neighborhood shuttles?

**Approach to 2016 MTP/SCS Scenario Development and Land Use Inventory**

Staff discussed the state and federal requirements associated with the land use inventory, the process collecting the data, and how the land use inventory is used to create scenarios for the Environmental Impact Report for the 2016 MTP/SCS. After the initial process description, staff walked participants through the regional land use inventory map and data used to develop the map. Staff explained to the meeting participants, that this was part one of two land use inventory reports, and that staff would be asking the board to take action in March on the proposed approach to develop scenarios.

#### THEME: Addressing Current and Future Housing Capacity

- If you look at the table of approved and planned housing a critical factor is affordability, and it isn't factored—if you don't factor in affordability, your assumptions will be wrong—you will overestimate.
- Does this information create a perception of an over-supply, so that it appears there isn't a need to plan for more housing—how you talk about that is very important.
- Be critical of the information from different segments of the development community and the local jurisdictions, they may not give good information for fear of being excluded in the plan, or dropped from the map.
- Rather than picking 'winners and losers' could you consider an approach that allocates market share to an area and essentially allows rules, standards, and/or policies to pick the winners and losers?
- You may be able to demonstrate significant capacity, but it may not be capacity for the people who are here, or will be here—you need to better match the new housing with the need today and in the future.
- Do you look at the regional percentage of growth per community type over time?
- When preparing your land use inventory, across community type, how do you adjust to include, or exclude at different points of time in the plan? This map shows projects that have been approved and/or planned since the early 2000s—but they are not currently being built, and may not be.
- Do you have a sense about how the supply and demand (capacity to 2035) line up in terms of multi-family and single family? For example, do you maybe only have 10 years of multi-family capacity beyond 2035 (or less) while 60 years of single-family products?

#### THEME: Addressing Current and Future Housing Market Demand

- When you forecast where growth is most likely to occur, how heavily do you weigh how projects are planned (i.e. type of housing, growth pattern, cost to consumer, etc.) compared to current and future market trends and demands? Projects designed and sited in the 1990s don't match the current demand but are still reflected in the map as future growth. They don't seem like viable projects today.
- Addressing the issues of current and future demand is key, with a focus on meeting the current need which may continue to be the needs in the future—related to affordability.
- Is there a way to assess quality education and housing patterns?
- A policy discussion around need and land availability should occur as part of the planning process.

#### THEME: Current and Future Housing Affordability and Access

- The homeless are not factored into the market segment growth segments.
- There is an equity issue underlying this map, you may need a disproportionate investment in housing for low income/underserved people and seniors.
- Policy considerations beyond affordability need to be given to issues of race, ethnicity, family size, unit size, and income—there is potential to allow/force certain inequitable growth patterns to continue.
- How does the future size and affordability address existing need?

#### THEME: Regulatory Barriers

- The regulatory environment is “truthing out” greenfield and infill project viability and will continue to do so for the next decade.
- AB 32 and SB 375 have changed how greenfield patterns will happen in the near term.
- When conducting your market tests for potential of greenfield and infill projects, you need to realistically look at the regulatory and infrastructure hurdles they will have to overcome.

THEME: Scenario Development and Performance Metrics

- Will the issues being discussed (affordability, market realities, regulations, infrastructure needs, water availability, etc.) be addressed in the scenarios?
- Will a fix-it-first (maintenance) model self-direct a more compact growth pattern?
- We know that many factors will continue to change, but water availability, energy cost, social equity, and public health will continue to be real issues, Scenario 3 doesn’t go far enough to address these.
- Will you be adding new inputs into performance metrics for the 2016 MTP/SCS update?
- Have you looked at Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Equity Scenario and compared it to yours?

## MTP/SCS Sounding Board Meeting Participant Evaluation

February 19, 2014

### Ranking

5. Strongly Agree

4. Agree

3. Neutral

2. Disagree

1. Strongly Disagree

---

This meeting was well organized: **4.4**

The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material: **3.8**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the Land Use Inventory and approach to scenario development: **4.5**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the initial findings of the Transit Maintenance Research: **4.2**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the draft approaches for conducting public workshops: **3.7**

The meeting was beneficial to me: **4.2**

I have a good understanding of the 2016 MTP/SCS process, and how my input is being considered: **4.2**

### Were there any parts of the meeting that should be avoided in the future?

- I wished Kacey's presentation had more charts to give a better articulation of her dialog. Some of the dialogue was repetitious.

### What should be done next time to make the presentations more effective?

- Average daily VMT would be a good chart. Per Capita was a little bit different. The population density in rural areas would be low so the absolute magnitude is misrepresented. Average VMT/vehicle would be useful.
- Allow more time
- Some supplemental information—emphasizing the benefit of different options
- While I appreciate the free-conversation during presentations, I felt it got away from the presentations a little too much
- Better outline— One overview presentation + workgroups with a final wrap up
- Find ways to be sure everyone participates

### Additional Comments:

- I believe we need to incrementally move more in the direction of Scenario 3
- Meeting could have been longer
- Having the list ahead of time of the questions you'd like our feedback on would be helpful
- Need to discuss Climate Change—droughts and floods do have a lasting effect

## 2016 MTP/SCS Sounding Board Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: June 9, 2014

Meeting Location: West Sacramento City Hall Galleria

### Meeting Attendees:

Brookfield Residential	Richland Communities
CA Rural Legal Assistance	Sacramento Housing Alliance
Cordova Hills/SMB Corporation	Sacramento Metro Chamber
Domus Development	Sacramento Tree Foundation
Environmental Council of Sacramento	Taylor-Wiley/Stonebridge Properties
Health Education Council	Wade Associates
League of Women Voters	WALKSacramento
National Safe Routes to School Partnership	Yolo County Housing Authority
North State Building Industry Association	
Resources for Independent Living	

### Meeting Agenda:

- Welcome & Introductions, Ms. Hernández
- Update on Board Actions, Ms. Hernández
- Transportation & Land Use Scenario Framework, Ms. Lizon
- Transportation System Maintenance & Preservation, Mr. Holtzen
- Transportation Projects Phasing Analysis, Mr. Griesenbeck
- Public Workshop Approach, Ms. Hernández

### Meeting Summary:

Staff provided meeting participants with a summary of the board actions and informational presentations related to the 2016 MTP/SCS update that have occurred since the group last met in February 2014. Staff described how the input of the sounding board is part of three components of public input the Board will consider as they develop the draft preferred framework for the 2016 MTP/SCS. The additional two pieces of public input are the findings from the public workshops and public polling. Participants were encouraged to communicate to staff if there were any additional concerns or questions not addressed during the meeting. Meeting participants were provided a copy of this meeting summary and asked to review it in advance of staff's reporting to the SACOG policy committees.

### Discussion Themes & Comments

#### **Transportation & Land Use Scenarios Framework**

THEME: New Growth and Projected Land Development

- Are there a lot of assumptions about land dedication vs in lieu fees and/or both? If SACOG is just looking at zoning for land uses allowed and not policies (like the MTP/SCS and others that influence where growth happens) then we're not getting a true picture.
- There is a market conflict between slow growth and/or phasing growth and developers needing to show the bank you can build it at once.
- How will SACOG articulate what you are doing with the land use forecast before getting to the end? We would like a very descriptive narrative explanation of the analysis, thought process, assumptions made, etc. before seeing the final plan.

- Are you talking to other developers to test/vet the scenarios and/or the framework, beyond the Building Industry Association (e.g., affordable housing developers, Infill Builders Association, etc.)?
- Is SACOG's parcel level data available to show developers which parcels are available for infill and what the MTP/SCS is assuming for those sites?

THEME: Demographics, Environmental Justice

- Where does demographic analysis fit into scenarios and how does RHNA fit?
- Did you use the work from UC Davis Center for Regional Change (opportunity index) and will Center for Regional Change be involved in the MTP/SCS again?
- Rural areas fall out of favor if you only plan transit around high density in TOD areas so not all planning should be for TODs. There is a need to look at rural areas where concentrations of poverty exist. Unintended consequence of SB 375 is rural areas are left out of smart growth incentives.
- Where does planning for affordable housing and other social equity issues fit into the scenarios?
- How can you make sure that new affordable housing goes in with the new bike and/or transit investments?
- It is important to remember that rural areas are often out of the state and/or federal investment strategies, they are not getting the infill benefits.
- A better linking of local housing elements to the SCS would make for better planning and outcomes.

THEME: Water Supply & Agriculture

- Placer and Regional Water agencies are going to hire a consultant for some supply/inventory work; this could be an opportunity to share consultant costs if interests/needs align.
- SACOG should look at Sacramento County's Water Supply Management Plan for information on potential water availability.
- It is unclear how agriculture is addressed in the scenarios. Agriculture should be considered in the scenarios as part of the water topic— water needed for agricultural land should be a constraint for new development needing the same water.

**Transportation System Maintenance & Preservation**

THEME: Fix-it-First Investment Strategy/State of Good Repair

- One thing mentioned in a recent NPR report is there is continued and growing demand for walkable and bikeable streets. It discussed how changing the way your streets are designed is an economic development strategy.
- It seems like there is more opportunity in a State of Good Repair strategy for adding in bike lanes and sidewalks when resurfacing or doing other maintenance.
- Complete streets are an economic development strategy and when you maintain/rehabilitate roads you have the opportunity to add bike lanes, pedestrian crossings, etc. at very minimal costs so it's a win-win.
- Can you assume future Cap & Trade dollars in the revenue side?

THEME: Technology and Innovation

- How much influence do future innovations have on what SACOG is assuming?
- It feels like we are taking an as-is condition (for roads and travel mode) and just projecting it out versus assuming some big changes in innovation. Is SACOG thinking about this?

- What we assume now won't necessarily be what is 10 years from now. What if gas was at \$6 per gallon? Instead of adding more roads, there may be more transit need. What other possibilities are in the universe that might have bearing?

#### THEME: Project List

- Is the universe of projects provided by different jurisdictions included in your land use inventory? Since we're looking at a 20-year time frame, how much influence does future innovation have on the assumptions you're making?
- In the universe of transportation projects SACOG is considering, are they all jurisdiction-submitted projects?
- Will you look at the vehicle miles traveled effects of these different scenarios?

#### Transportation Projects Phasing Analysis

- How do you know when projects are scheduled?
- Is the hypothesis of the phasing analysis that if you advance and/or delay projects there could be GHG reductions or other benefits?
- Is there ability to do back and forth with the jurisdictions on project phasing? If they have 12 projects you could suggest to them an opportunity for the best outcome?
- On a per unit basis the big projects look more cost effective; do the other investments on parallel corridors have as much or more impact?
- If you have good info on an ongoing basis on vehicle miles traveled, and recognizing these projects have long lead times, it might be possible for local jurisdictions to make minor decisions to push out and pull forward projects?
- Aside from VMT can you factor safety aspects into the phasing analysis?
- Is the McKinley Village build-out in the plan?

#### Public Workshop Approach

##### THEME: General Approach and Framing Topics for Public Workshops

- Many public workshops are very abstract and if you want to hear what's important to people, consider asking personal and relatable questions. Not too simple that they are unusable, but try to draw out information about how people live and not so much about whether the plan does this or that.
- A lot of government workshops tend to be too abstract. You're looking for people's visions of how they want to live and what's important to them.
- Residents need to understand longer term consequences vis à vis air quality and greenhouse gas emissions when you ask questions. Frame questions to make residents think more long term and not just in their backyard.
- Lay out the plan's underlying assumptions (or planning realities) very clearly. Explain why there is a connection between land use and transportation and what that does to vehicle miles traveled, greenhouse gas emissions, etc. It will help people to understand the materials and questions if they understand the underlying information.
- It is important to frame questions in terms of not just either/or. Avoid framing questions as either/or because that's not usually the case. Most things are not black and white like that so try to ask trade-off questions that are more realistic and not extremes of this vs. that.
- Ask participants, "Where would you like to see more housing near transit planned?"
- Ask workshop participants, "What do you want streets (in your neighborhood) to look like?"

- Focusing on people's preference for the future can be hard for people to think about, consider addressing their needs today and focusing questions on the present.

THEME: Scientific Polling

- The idea of a survey to reach more people is good, but would like to see additional effort engaging low income and minority residents.
- It is important to frame questions in terms of not just either/or. Avoid framing questions as either/or because that's not usually the case. Most things are not black and white like that so try to ask trade-off questions that are more realistic and not extremes of this versus that.

THEME: Environmental Justice

- A more present orientation for low income people is more appropriate, keep choices appropriate for low literacy levels.
- When you're constructing scientific survey, include some extra effort to reach out to people impacted by the plan but who don't get engaged because they can't afford to or are just disengaged, especially low-income and minority populations.
- You have to ask your questions differently for low-income and minority communities.
- Ask participants, "Where would you like to see more housing near transit planned?"
- Ask workshop participants, "What do you want streets (in your neighborhood) to look like?"
- Focusing on people's preference for the future can be hard for people to think about, consider addressing their needs today and focusing questions on the present.

## **MTP/SCS Sounding Board Meeting Summary September 19, 2014**

Meeting Location: West Sacramento City Hall

### **Meeting Attendees:**

AIA Central Valley	Sacramento Housing Alliance
BREATHE CA	Sacramento Metro Chamber
Brookfield Land Co.	Safe Routes to School National Partnership
CA Rural Legal Assistance	SMUD
Economic & Planning Systems (EPS)	VCS Consulting
Environmental Council of Sacramento	Wade & Associates
Health Education Council	WALKSacramento
National Safe Routes to School Partnership	Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
League of Women Voters	Yolo Housing Authority
Resources for Independent Living	

### **Meeting Agenda**

Welcome & Introductions, Monica Hernández  
Update on SACOG Board Actions since June, Kacey Lizon  
Public Workshop Update, Monica Hernández  
Phasing Analysis, Part II, Binu Abraham  
Economic Analysis, Matt Carpenter  
Land Use Forecast Methodology, Kacey Lizon

### **Public Workshop Update**

#### ***Theme: Accessibility***

- What are you doing for non-English speakers?
- Are all of your locations ADA accessible?

#### ***Theme: Outreach***

- What are your strategies to engage non-English speakers and/or environmental justice communities?

### **Phasing Analysis**

#### ***Theme: Application of Phasing Analysis***

- To what extent does SACOG provide technical assistance to communities or groups on smarter growth for infill sites and new development? This type of assistance aligns with the Strategic Growth Council and other national efforts on planning for infill across different community types, (i.e. rural infill, suburban infill, and urban infill).
- What exactly does the Phasing Map show?
- Is the map simply reporting what agencies are telling you?
- Is the Phasing Map the adopted 2012 MTP?
- The Phasing Map should include clear information on why projects are included in as early, mid, or late year projects.
- What portions of these projects are “well planned”? How much do you assess the feasibility to get all the funding to complete a project?

- There is some danger in showing historical investment and where funding is planned.
- Is this showing decisions already made by the SACOG Board and staff, or representing an interpretation of when things will happen?
- This doesn't show the trade-off or investment choice that goes along with all these projects. Investment trade-offs should be part of the conversation with the SACOG Board.

**Theme:** *Transit Phasing and Mapping*

- Rural transit appears to not improve service; there is a social justice issue there.
- There are unique transit needs in rural communities that are, or are developing into tourist destinations (Winters, Camino)
- You should map transit with the underlying land use. It is very important to see the relationship of land use and transit, you cannot separate them.

**Theme:** *Social Justice/Equity and Rural Community Needs*

- What is missing in this approach is that you don't see what type of transit is there (frequency) and how affordable it is.
- SACOG is reactive, but we would like to see how the SACOG Board can address the gaps in Environmental Justice communities. There are lots of people who will ask about road maintenance, but do not ask about affordable transit. SACOG (and transit agencies) need to take an affirmative role in addressing transit access in low income areas, and ask the jurisdictions to be more proactive.
- The region has areas where residents don't know that they are transit dependent. Many areas have very poor residents who could depend on transit to improve their current conditions, but it isn't available.
- SACOG needs to pay special attention to rural areas and their transit need, and ensuring that rural communities are not being left out of competitive funds from State and Federal resources that are intended for GHG reduction.

**Theme:** *Bike and Pedestrian Funding*

- How do you ascertain the benefits and timing of bike and pedestrian projects? How do you project the funding for bike and pedestrian projects?
- Can you portion out the amount of investment for Complete Streets that is retrofit compared to new development?
- Are Complete Street projects mapped?

**Economic Analysis**

**Theme:** *Expanding Beyond Traditional Measures*

- This is good, and you need to continue the research for better metrics, quantification, and analysis for public health and the environment. A first good step is to look at MTC, and apply their methodology to the Metropolitan Transportation Implementation Program (MTIP).
- You can measure the cost of poor health, affordable housing, and not getting to jobs/schools. With that information you can do some imperfect analysis to start the important work of affirmatively addressing low income community needs and the economic benefit of doing so.
- It is important for everyone to understand that you are trying to get in "all the issues" with reliable information and then make decisions about what is "most" important.

- Your approach here is good. Nationally, MTC is currently the best in action. Addressing internal rate of return is challenging.
- Is there anything about private investment as drivers for additional investments?
- When looking at investment the key is that you look at net new investment for an analytic measure.

**Theme:** *Social Equity, Public Health, and Human Impacts*

- Traditional economic analysis misses the needs and/or analysis of the underserved populations.
- You need to look at the benefits in terms of better schools, health, increased access to employment, and affecting the ability to provide more decent affordable housing?
- You should take an approach that considers the economic benefit to improve a community by putting in transit.
- The needs of low income communities have to expressly be addressed and on the table of this economic analysis.
- Commit to spending time and money on getting smarter on the equity analysis for SACOG's Benefits Cost Analysis. There is a lot happening around equity investment (e.g. Social Impact Calculator, Social Impact Bonds, etc.), work to stay up on current trends.
- It is understood that there are really distinct differences on health outcomes by income and race. How do you measure for things like that?

**Theme:** *Cross-sector Input*

- As you develop this approach, it will evolve overtime, be diligent about allowing all interested parties in the community to have their say on what should be included and considered, and then the SACOG board has the policy discussion about the methodology.
- Are you looking at the UC Davis Center for Regional Change's Regional Opportunity Index?

**Land Use Forecast Methodology**

**Theme:** *Data Limitations*

- The VMT assessment could be problematic. How do you evaluate for a single project? Do you use more generic categories in SACSIM? Depending on the characteristics included, you can really affect the VMT.
- Fuel switching is going to make a difference in air quality in the future, and it will play out in the infrastructure being built. The years 2020-2025 are the breaking point for electrification of vehicles.
- The future of electrification will change analyses from VMT to investment to support fuel switching. The demand in future housing will see growth in electrical vehicle charging.

**Theme:** *Air Quality and Vehicle Miles Travelled Analysis*

- In the assessment, proximity to services should be explicit, the proximity impacts the per capita GHG and larger climate change issues.

**Theme:** *Land Use Assumptions & Market Demand*

- When you look at market area saturation, you have to consider the areas that are about 1/3 built out since mid-2000. Policies and visions for those projects have likely changed. Are you considering how approved, partially built-out, and pending projects change in the future due to market shift?
- How do the needs of low income communities fit into market saturation?

- When assessing for market saturation, looking at market demand and response, you likely have something else going on, it can be zoning entitlements, approvals, there may be a missing piece.
- When looking at segmentation be certain to consider affordability and demographic change.

## Meeting Evaluation

RANKING:

5. Strongly Agree

4. Agree

3. Neutral

2. Disagree

1. Strongly Disagree

---

This meeting was well organized. **4.5**

The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material: **4.1**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the Phasing Analysis: **4.5**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the initial findings of the Economic Analysis: **4.5**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the Land Use Forecast: **4.5**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the draft approaches for conducting public workshops: **4**

The meeting was beneficial to me: **4.5**

I have a good understanding of the 2016 MTP/SCS process, and how my input is being considered: **4.1**

### Were there any parts of the meeting that should be avoided in the future?

- Need to keep discussions on point. Some parts should be taken offline.
- Need a paper agenda, give out evaluations at the beginning.

### What should be done next time to make the presentations more effective?

- Presenters should try to speak slowly.
- Even with this group, a little more contextualization of the role of SACOG's analysis is needed— regional strategy vs. local implementation
- Limit questions spiraling out of control.

## **2016 MTP/SCS Sounding Board Meeting**

November 14, 2014

Meeting Location: North Natomas Library

### **Meeting Attendees:**

ECOS

League of Women Voters

Sacramento Housing Alliance

Health Education Council

Sacramento Metro Chamber

Resources for Independent Living

Economic & Planning Systems (EPS)

VCS Consulting/Brookfield Land Co.

Breathe California

Wade & Associates

WALKSacramento

### **Meeting Agenda**

- Update on Public Health Research: UrbanFootprint & Health Metrics
- Public Outreach Update: Workshop & Phone Poll Results
- Framework for Draft Preferred Scenario
- Next Steps & Meeting Evaluation

### **Meeting Summary**

Staff provided meeting participants with a summary of the board actions and informational presentations related to the 2016 MTP/SCS update that have occurred since the group last met in September 2014. Staff described how the input of the sounding board is one of three components of public input the Board will consider as they update the MTP/SCS. Participants were encouraged to communicate to staff if there were any additional concerns or questions not addressed during the meeting. Meeting participants were provided a copy of this meeting summary and asked to review it in advance of staff's reporting to the SACOG policy committees.

### **Discussion Themes and Comments**

#### **Update on Public Health Research: UrbanFootprint & Health Metrics**

*Theme: Monitoring Health Outcome Data vs. Forecasting Health Outcomes*

- We understand that health outcomes are hard to project. Can you start to track growth from a baseline set of metrics? For example, access to healthy foods, chronic disease, access to transit, parks, and other essential services?
- Have you considered the MTC methodology of measuring Active Transportation?
- When you measure bicycling, it is important to distinguish between bicycling for transportation compared to recreation.
- Understanding forecasting and measuring health metrics is a challenge, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction/increase alone is a health metric/proxy. You should include current and projected VMT as a health metric.
- Have you talked to parks districts about monitoring for recreation bike trips?

*Theme: Land Use and Public Health*

- Are you monitoring General Plans and Specific Plans?
- An important consideration when discussing agricultural land conversion is understanding what happened to the formerly thriving agricultural economy of the region.
- Are you looking at the plant-based design improvements that can improve public health and be implemented through this plan?

*Theme: Toxic Air Contaminants and Respiratory Impacts*

- Respiratory effects are very important, but I understand the lack of reliable data. Your focus on physical activity will take us far- you are blazing the trail for this work.
- Digging deep for future research on toxic air contaminants is a good approach.
- With the work you are required to do to arrive at metrics for NOx and PM2.5 measurements, it seems like you have some air quality outputs. Could you connect with health indicators locally to make any correlations?

*Theme: Affordable Housing and Public Health*

- It is important to understand affordable housing and health impacts. There are a lot of issues related to location and access.
- New affordable housing is very environmentally friendly, to the degree the specific impacts from subsidized affordable housing is really worth looking at.
- In terms of respiratory issues, the disabled community is very vulnerable. Affordable housing next to high-frequency transit, even if data isn't there, is too important not to look at.
- How to consider where is affordable housing going to be? Housing is a health issue; don't put on a back burner.

*Theme: UrbanFootprint Application*

- Is point of the UrbanFootprint module for public health advocates to go online and look at regional data, rather than looking at California Health Interview Survey?

*Theme: Behavior and Education in Public Health*

- Recognizing that we are dealing with today, but if you should look back 50 year to a national program at a high school in Carmichael. The program produced amazing results on health, in part due to attitude and culture change as well as land form.

**Public Outreach Update: Workshop & Phone Poll Results**

*Theme: Considerations for Interpretation of Data*

- When you ask regional questions, I think most people still localize their responses.
- Can you correlate answers to if the respondent answered walk/bike as main mode vs. drive to show "not far" in terms of distance questions?
- You will have a lot of weight on congestion and road condition issues, if a lot of respondents are drivers.
- To what level of geographic location can you sort the data?

*Theme: Participant Observations and Reactions to Results*

- It is interesting the mode split between 2007 and 2014. It appears that most recently people are mixing modes for trips.
- It is surprising that people rated biking and walking distance as good.

- Even in suburban communities most master planned communities have intention to have access to walking, biking, and parks.
- It would be interesting to find out zip of where they live and zip of they work and type of job they have.

*Theme: Willingness to Pay*

- I was in a focus group for STA. They seemed to have a city vs. county war on who benefited from the tax—not sure how it plays out. Most people will pay *if* they get the benefit.
- It seems like you were looking for tone, if you were looking for real tax readiness you would do something different.
- I’m struck by this information. People say they won't pay a dollar more for education so these results seem out of whack with what you hear about what people say they are willing to pay. (Willingness to pay per household question)
- It is easier for someone to say they will pay a penny more in sales tax because they can’t relate it to a monthly budget.

**Framework for Draft Preferred Scenario**

*Theme: Assumptions that inform into the framework and travel demand model*

- Did you do a full model run to provide the data in the staff report?
- With the Farmland Mapping & Monitoring Program, do you include all the types of farmland?
- For your vernal pools analysis, what are you counting as impacts to vernal pools.
- I am curious as to why if you are looking at land use, that you aren’t looking at housing element inventories. Housing elements will reflect changes sooner than what the data you use will.
- Are there points where what is modeled doesn't match in roads?

*Theme: Scenario Results*

- Regarding bike lanes for each scenario, the budget is consistent over all three scenarios but you show expenditures going up—how do you analyze that?
- Most if not all new master planned communities have bicycle and pedestrian plans included covered by developer costs. I don’t understand the logic showing less of increase in bicycle lane miles in Scenario 3, when we know the costs for infill and retrofit is much higher.

*Theme: Framework Funding and Expenditures*

- The budget for local funds used for local and/or collector streets, is there squishing there?
- Will a fix-it-first context simply replace and/or improve the system as is, or will it consider changing the character?
- Would you say local funds for infrastructure be more important moving forward?

**Meeting Evaluation**

<b>RANKING:</b> 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree
<b>This meeting was well organized.</b>
Average: 4.8
<b>The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material.</b>
Average: 4.4

**I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the UrbanFootprint Health module.**

Average: 4.4

**I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the research on public health metrics/health impacts.**

Average: 4.4

**I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the draft preferred scenario framework for the MTP/SCS/**

Average: 4

**I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the results of the phone poll and workshop questionnaire results.**

Average: 4.6

**I understand the next major steps in the 2016 MTP/SCS update process, and how my input is being considered.**

Average: 4.4

**What should be done next time to make the presentations more effective?**

I just need to do my homework.

**Additional Comments**

The meeting was long, but necessary.

Loved getting the framework document to review in advance.

## **Sounding Board Meeting Summary**

May 28, 2015

Meeting Location: West Sacramento Community Center

### **Meeting Attendees:**

Health Education Council

Wade & Associates

Breathe CA

VCS Consulting, LLC

Resources for Independent Living

Environmental Council of Sacramento

Sacramento County Public Health

CA Rural Legal Assistance

WALKSacramento

Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates

American Association of Retired Persons

North State Building Industry

Yolo County Housing Authority

### **Meeting Agenda**

Welcome and Introductions

MTP/SCS Process Overview

Presentation on Preferred Scenario

Policies and Strategies Presentation and Feedback Exercise

Next Steps on MTP/SCS Update Process

Meeting Evaluation

Adjourn

### **Meeting Summary**

The bulk of this meeting focused on the proposed refinements to the policies and strategies for the 2016 MTP/SCS. Participants were asked to provide feedback in the response to the following questions:

- What do you think about the approach to updating and refining the policies and strategies for the 2016 MTP/SCS?
- Of the policy themes from the framework, what are priority issues for you?
- How do you see the MTP/SCS policies and strategies affecting your work?
- What are your thoughts on the MTP/SCS policies and strategies and the alignment with the implementation and fix-it-first direction?

The following is a summary of the participant's questions and discussion on each agenda item:

### **MTP/SCS Process Overview**

- No comments

### **Presentation on Preferred Scenario**

- How are centers and corridors defined?
- Are there overlaps between the different community types?
- When you describe lot sizes, what do you mean/what are you trying to do?
- Regarding revenues, how do you handle local revenues that are generated from and tied to specific developments? There are restrictions on how some fees can be used.
- Are the projects delayed/added largely based on local decisions?
- Are you folding in RT's Master Plan? Curious as to what degree local governments are looking at RT's Transit Renewal Plan. Seems like a great opportunity to talk at local level on major infrastructure plans.

- Seems like now is prime time to talk about the underground infrastructure when adding new roads. If you are forecasting a higher density area, the local government should be planning to align with strategic improvements/investments below ground.
- Explain why trips by transit, walk and bike in the Preferred Scenario are less than in the adopted plan?
- How much does the delay in transit capital investments play into the transit performance in the preferred scenario?
- We haven't talked about distributive transit (e.g. "Uber/Lyft for buses). Has anyone thought about and what it looks like?
- Seems like the most important thing moving forward is to monitor how the plan compares to what actually occurs over time. A component of this should be systematic checks on projects and growth pattern. For example, maybe air quality is getting better, but other predictions are not occurring such as seniors and millennials behave differently than predicted? Want to see a process for evaluating that systematically and refine project performance evaluation.

#### **Policies and Strategies Presentation Discussion:**

- The use of the policy themes as a framework for updating the policies and strategies makes sense and generally aligns with what has been discussed during the process.

#### **Theme: Transit Connectivity and Expansion**

- Want to see a policy to develop guidelines/recommendations for new developments on how to establish and sustain a small transit system that feeds into a larger transit system. In new master plan projects there is opportunity to build transit and there is initial funding from the construction of the community; would like to see guidance on how to coordinate new systems with existing transit systems. Guidelines would be for local government staff and developers.
- In the future, going beyond ConnectCard, being able to transfer from system to system is one thing, but want to see a connected larger system that performs well.
- Strategy 20.2: can you add cross-county access to healthy foods, community services, and other points that are not available within point of origin.
- We talk a lot about end points versus origin points. We need to think about transit from the point of origin, or where the transit riders are located, not just about the popular destinations.
- There is a large private sector competition for distributive transit services, but there is also an opportunity for public sector distributive transit and would like to see that explored.
- RT is looking at modifying systems and using smaller buses and there is a union issue. Does SACOG get involved in those things by giving data and/or information on demand or options?
- Think about alternate definitions of transit oriented development, specifically what it might look like in rural communities.
- If you want to change transportation choices, transit needs to be handled different. For example light rail needs to feel safer and more user friendly.

#### **Theme: Access to Transit**

- Looking at transit from point of origin is an important way to address transportation needs of underserved communities. Affordable housing locations are places with a high concentration of riders.

- Issue with different operations for transit affordability (Policy 23): how much can SACOG ask operators to modify fare structure? Paratransit is very expensive for many people. ConnectCard opens options for sliding scale fares.
- ConnectCard could be problematic for some people, especially undocumented residents, seniors, and incidental riders who pay cash. You will have data issues with people who opt out. Working to promote ConnectCard through distribution through non-bus outlets

**Theme:** *Suburban Communities Opportunities & Challenges*

- SACOG helps local governments on infill/urban core planning, which is great. Take it a step further with planning technical assistance to older suburban communities. That is the key to reducing GHG. Want to see SACOG investigate that much more.
- On Strategy 2.4, adding suburban areas to the language is important. Many residents don't understand the different benefits of transit, walk, bike.

**Theme:** *Fix-it-First Investment Strategy*

- On system maintenance and operation/Fix-it-First: need to make sure that a road is not given funding priority just because it exists. There needs to be analysis of or policies about the performance of existing roads and whether they should be maintained/rehabilitated to their current state, or rebuilt into something different (e.g. road diet).
- Infrastructure is cool. Operations are not. Are you looking for operational funds that can be used for transit? Low income and disabled communities are highly impacted by the operations costs.

**Theme:** *Public Health and Safety*

- The MTP principles of access and mobility, smart land use, and equity and choice are important to improving public health.
- Where a policy or strategy discusses transportation, land use and public health, it is important to include safety under the definition of health. For example, changing street design to ensure safe travel and minimize collisions. Health is more than just health; should include street safety.
- What are strategies to relieve congestion in Midtown/downtown Sacramento? ESC is going to make it worse. How does SACOG deal with downtown congestion?
- Regarding health and social equity and Strategy 2.5, as public health stakeholder, the physical activity indicators are highly anticipated. We need more data so keep working on this.
- The Livability Index from AARP is trying to encourage members to be more active in community. See that you are considering aging population in the policies. Baby Boomers are very active; continue to bring the older resident voice to the table.

**Theme:** *Performance Measurement, Monitoring Travel and Growth Trends, Data Development*

- Want to see a comparison of current trends to what was predicted in past MTPs.
- Is there consideration on how the drought may impact growth in the future?
- Developers like to meet demand, agnostic on the product. Idea of changing people's demands doesn't work. You have to understand the dynamic of different segments of the population.
- Under the category of land use and environmental sustainability policies: When the 2020 MTP/SCS is under development and regional projections are re-done, SACOG should look at not just the types of employment sectors but also the nature of employment. For example, working from home or in satellite locations may be an increasing trend, which connects directly to land use patterns.

- Being able to access detailed data from the plan is important. To the extent possible, make it a high priority to continue to make more information available up-to-date.
- Understand you are working on open data policies generally. Want to see that progress in this region.

**Meeting Evaluation**

RANKING:

**5. Strongly Agree      4. Agree      3. Neutral      2. Disagree      1. Strongly Disagree**

---

This meeting was well organized: **4.08**

The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material: **3.92**

The materials provided in advance were useful to prepare for this meeting: **3.5**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the direction of the Policies and Strategies for the 2016 MTP/SCS: **4.5**

The presentation on the Draft Preferred Scenario was clear: **4.17**

I understand the next major steps in the 2016 MTP/SCS process, and when the draft plan will be released for public comment: **4.17**

**What should be done next time to make the presentation more effective?**

- Provide a printed copy of agenda with meeting objectives, as sometimes this can feel less than clear what staff wants from attendees.
- Make PPT font larger or hand out the PPT for folks to read & take notes.

**Additional comments or questions not captured in the meeting:**

- It would be great to have a performance measure to gauge effectiveness to these groups.
- I hope the sounding board continues until the update is adopted and continues looking toward 2020.

**Other comments:**

Response to question 4 – it was too much to sift through.

Consider recording and posting board committee meetings the way board meetings are recorded and posted.