

April 28, 2010 Regional Advisory Working Group Summary Notes

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
General Comments/ Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Climate change and sustainability are important social justice issues. Concentrated poverty is the shadow side of sprawl. We need to focus a lot more on the housing/job balance. Also, the health disparity question is important.</li> <li>• JPC and regional agencies must seize this moment. Get processes underway. Be comprehensive: energy, food and water security, etc. Take advantage of self-help opportunities. Need a broader range of stakeholders to come together and make this successful. Make an inclusive process.</li> <li>• Sprawl is not the trend now; compact development is. Let's not set the targets too low because we have momentum behind us.</li> <li>• What is the organizational structure for JPC, ABAG and MTC for this effort?</li> <li>• Two documents that I did not see referenced, yet are important, are the SB 375 Implementation Policies and the California Transportation Commission's Regional Transportation Guidelines.</li> <li>• Please explain the relationship between the advisory and decision making bodies for this effort and when decisions will be made.</li> <li>• I was depressed about the widening of SR 84 in the age of global warming. I know that this project was approved long ago, but it would be great if we could revisit projects like this.</li> <li>• If SCS fails to meet the final target, then we will create something else. I would like for us to remember the ideas we come up with throughout the process and then recall them if we fail.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCS is a joint effort of the two regional agencies – MTC and ABAG – in partnership with the BAAQMD and BCDC. Ezra Rapport of ABAG and Doug Kimsey of MTC are the lead staff the effort; and Ted Droettboom from JPC is coordinating the discussions.</li> <li>• Staff will make the SB 375 Implementation Policies and the California Transportation Commission's Regional Transportation Guidelines documents are available to the attendees, and the policies for SB 375 Implementation can also be accessed on the JPC website: <a href="http://ABAG.ca.gov/jointpolicy">ABAG.ca.gov/jointpolicy</a>.</li> <li>• Under the law, the Sustainable Community Strategy will be adopted as part of the Regional Transportation Plan by MTC. ABAG is required to work with MTC in the preparation of the SCS and all items related will also go through ABAG. We are a consortium of four regional agencies, and the other two agencies in that consortium – BCDC and the Air District – will also be involved in discussions. The involvement of the local governments in the land use area as partners in the SCS is critical. Internally, there are two advisory groups for ABAG and MTC staffs. One is the Regional Advisory Working Group, which is the place for open exchange for ideas between the staff and a broad set of stakeholders. There is also a Regional Executive Committee which is composed of the executives of CMAs, the executives of the four regional agencies, and a select group of city and county managers from around the region.</li> </ul>
Greenhouse Gas Targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is the turnover in fleet not the magic bullet? Congestion and parking charges creates a revenue pool. Will this pool get reinvested into green transportation?</li> <li>• Regarding the 3% reduction in the carbon dioxide emissions from cars and trucks by 2020, and the 5% by 2035, is this due to assumptions about efficient use of vehicles? Does this mean that VMT will increase? Regarding the 11% reduction in best scenario, how does this compare to the 1990 level scenarios?</li> <li>• In order for this to be truly comprehensive, we need to consider more than just transportation and land use, but also recycling, energy, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing is a magic bullet, although technology shouldn't be undersold. On the second question, to some extent, yes that was done as part of the vision analysis completed for the Transportation 2035 Plan.</li> <li>• MTC can't take credit for technological improvements in the fleet because that is dealt with elsewhere in AB 32. We are dealing strictly with improvements associated with land use, pricing, and transportation investments. For the RTP investments, gross tonnage is increasing by approx. 20%.</li> <li>• Yes, information about alternatives will be available to the</li> </ul>

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
	<p>The City of Oakland has a great plan, please take a look. Maintaining equity is also important.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Slide 20 shows things that would change for best alternative. Will all of the alternatives be made public?</li> <li>• MTC is working on updating their transportation model. We all know that this model isn't perfect and won't show the best changes we can make (e.g., market demand for urban neighborhoods, etc.) Is there any thinking to having a post-processor adjustment to compensate for this?</li> <li>• Federal requirement calls for land use reasonableness with the Clean Air Act when developing the SCS and RTP and updating housing elements. Given that there are years between adoption cycles, how will we make the link to what's reasonable?</li> <li>• How will pricing mechanisms impact different populations? Will there be graduations in fee pricing mechanisms that affect the impact in different communities?</li> <li>• How are we going to engage in the modeling? And what kind of the recommendations can we put forth?</li> <li>• Suggest more detail in what the various alternatives were; it would be helpful to have a matrix to explain the process. This way, we will be able to evaluate strength of alternatives.</li> <li>• BAAQMD has proposed a target for land use given air quality issue. How does this fit into target we will be discussing with CARB?</li> <li>• Interested in what the 11% reduction on the per capita basis translates to with respect to the overall AB 32 goals. Did AB 32, just for the transportation land use sector, break out what those targets would be? How far do we need to get in the transportation and land use sectors to meet AB 32 goals?</li> <li>• Strategies are geared toward residential vehicles; any policies for commercial vehicles being considered?</li> <li>• What do you know about CARB's technical analysis?</li> <li>• How did we get to 1990 as the base year for AB 32?</li> <li>• Was the 20% increase in growth tonnage under the best alternative or the project alternative?</li> </ul>	<p>public. Pricing and land use changes make the biggest difference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ABAG and MTC are updating the land use and travel demand models, respectively. We think that these new models will address the issues raised.</li> <li>• When we adopt the SCS/RTP, it will have the land use element and the transportation element, and it will be what ABAG assumes is going to be in the land use part of it and would have adopted densities and population figures in each of the local jurisdictions. We will need to bring the federal agencies along in this as well.</li> <li>• Income levels are part and parcel to our model. Income level and travel are built into the model. Right now, everyone get priced the same but we may want to rethink that during the SCS. Equity issues may be considered during the next several months.</li> <li>• A schedule of the Regional Advisory Working Group committee's can be accessed on <a href="http://www.onebayarea.org">www.onebayarea.org</a>. If there is a need of detailed discussion of modeling, it may occur here or there may be a more limited set of people who are interested in that discussion and may create a subgroup. If there are specific questions regarding the modeling process, please contact Doug Kimsey at <a href="mailto:dkimsey@mtc.ca.gov">dkimsey@mtc.ca.gov</a>.</li> <li>• Planned target discussions with Air District about the potential discrepancies between both plans; real question, what does this mean for local plans?</li> <li>• The targets that are established in the AB 32 scoping plan are for on-road vehicles. Their mechanisms account for about 91% of the changes required through AB32 leaving us with about 9% to accomplish at the regional level.</li> <li>• AB 32 plan will look at reduced fuel and emission reduction targets for commercial fleets. SB 375 is for passenger vehicles and light trucks.</li> <li>• CARB is not conducting its own technical analysis but is relying on metropolitan planning agencies.</li> </ul>
Three Es/ Other Targets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When we think about the economy, beyond the types of homes and surrounds, some of the region's economic sectors are impacted by housing targets. We should make sure that industry's considerations are</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To address the in-commuting issue, our current thinking is to have regional jobs-housing balance.</li> </ul>

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
	<p>considered. This region was groundbreaking in setting targets in the last RTP. We didn't end up meeting targets in last plan. We need to think about what we need to do differently this time to meet targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding net in-commuting, how will housing and jobs' past imbalances be treated?</li> <li>• One of the challenges is that we may build a plan that is built to fail. Let's build a better plan that will include equity and focus it not only on transportation and housing access, but the broader issues of equity. For example, access to quality schools will be high on everyone's list. So, looking at the percentage of school-aged children may help us with our modeling. Unless we model equity properly, we won't understand it and will create a more segregated environment. Most of us who work on equity issues don't think that this is what equity is.</li> <li>• Some aspects of the 3E's are common sense and some need some sophistication. How do we get the sophisticated aspects into the modeling. Land use, transport and public health have a strong relationship.</li> <li>• Poor people will live 10 fewer years than the wealthy. SCS is so comprehensive, and reducing GHG is so small. We may need to have a framing discussion at a later time.</li> <li>• The architecture that has been proposed puts us in silos. How do we maintain our agriculture, for example? Transportation performance measures and targets are important. Per capita delay should be separated out into different modes.</li> <li>• Regarding reduction in greenfield development and VMT reduction, are these necessary prerequisites for other and/or new targets?</li> <li>• We are really serious about creating livable communities – one BayArea, one world. Transportation and land use process make larger goals. All forms of equity should be considered. Sustainable development can be met because of food and energy development. Meet needs locally.</li> <li>• Echo concern of 3E structure. Losing the VMT target would be a mistake. Need target for open space (increasing the rate of sequestration). Reducing the amount of greenfield development is important.</li> <li>• Local food production and equity are important; SACOG has a good target/plan to consider.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targets from previous plans may be carried forward in this RTP/SCS and new targets may be proposed. At this point, staff has not discarded any target option; everything is on the table for discussion.</li> <li>• Written comments should be submitted to staff at least 10 days to 2 weeks before the meeting date if those comments are to be included in the upcoming RAWG packet materials.</li> </ul>

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environment goal is good. Per capita economic output should be considered. Break down barriers between silos, like the cost of driving and parking. Equity targets: proximity or access needs to be looked at. Low income people don't have ready access to shopping and jobs. Target should include a numerical goal about how many we reach.</li> <li>• Greenfield development and infill are important strategies. Bay Area has done some of it. MTC and ABAG should decide what the future activities are. How do we build off of what we can do in the existing adoption time frame?</li> <li>• We should anticipate skepticism about climate change. Co-benefits, things that are guided by legislation. Reducing VMT has more impact than GHG emissions reduction. e.g., children's health.</li> <li>• Co-benefits are a good idea. Jobs by industry may be a good target. Growth and infill development might be measurable indicators. Economic growth: CEQA-type reductions may be able to meet some of our objectives.</li> <li>• Fourth column should be added that would be based on co-benefits that can't be modeled.</li> <li>• We need to look at the short-term reality of foreclosures and the excessive housing stock that are built for non-sustainable development. Many low income people have moved out to these places without transit. If we are going to be living with 10% vacancy rate in those communities, how will we make our target?</li> <li>• Economic growth doesn't make a lot of sense as a goal. Transportation performance should be a goal or target. Travel time savings is a poor indicator. What is the peak to off peak ratio of a particular traveled market – how do the alternatives compare? Trip length is an interesting measure – it doesn't pick up speed or travel time. It only shows how many of your economic activities and demands can be satisfied in a more efficient way. Suggest livable communities to the extent that it can be represented by travel choices and the expansion of travel choices and the improvement of travel choices. If you need a place to put travel time savings, put it as a user benefit ratio or user benefit measure under equity – as a measure of equity, what is the proportionate realization of those travel time savings and user benefits by vulnerable population.</li> <li>• Spatial distribution and efficiency...how do these different performance matrices work? Is this happening in SF and SJ? Thinking about things spatially will help.</li> </ul>	

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flatlands of 880 needs aren't shown in the land use planning process of the new plan. More impacts to the 880 corridor need to be identified in this plan because impacts will be great. What is the cost to the public health department given the infill in this area and the emissions that the freeway will generate? Also, no one has identified specific issues like noise, vibrations, etc.</li> <li>• How far in advance would you like written comments before each meeting to make it into the meeting packets?</li> </ul>	