

July 6, 2010 Regional Advisory Working Group Summary Notes

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
<p>Public Participation Plan Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it possible to get materials like this in advance? • Meetings will be primarily hosted by CMAs (p.46), county corridor meetings? What will be the venue for community outreach? • What are the best opportunities for people to engage and influence the regional plan? Corridor meetings or workshops? What decisions are they going to have a voice over? • From local government perspective, in order to get effective local government participation you need to do two things: 1) need to come to the local governments vs. them coming to you; and 2) need to provide tools to help local government staff to prepare elected officials. The more prepared local government folks are the better. How are you going to do scenario planning at community input based level? What tools will you have? How involved are individuals at the meetings going to be? This can be effective if done right. How are you going to engage the limited English proficiency communities? • Suggest you use what SACOG used • One of the challenges is that this is a totally new process for everyone; over 100 NGOs in the region want to participate in this process. The challenge is to make the participation really effective, which will be very difficult considering all the levels that must be addressed. Building relationships must be a high priority. Suggest: 1) find a way to support conversations among NGOs about key topics; and 2) leverage the limited amount of dollars that go into citizen participation available to regional agencies with outreach to foundations — a more coordinated approach, having a region-wide NGO process that is supported by the JPC will help us build the bridges with local government. • Request that this group be kept fully abreast of the public opinion poll and provide opportunities to comment on draft questions. • This process is unlike anything we have ever had before. You have two jobs in this: 1) engage interest in members of the public and organizations and inform decisions (the typical engagement process); and 2) expand the pool of people who understand that they should care about this and want to participate in this process. You need to forget about the regional planning process and recognize that you are engaged in changing the lives of people 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are delaying the release of the PPP Update till after MTC’s Legislation Committee reviews the PPP Update at its July meeting. We will release the PPP Update following this meeting. • Don’t confuse county corridor meetings with formal public engagement meetings. County corridor meetings are part of the local government engagement process. Public workshops we are required to hold separately. • Were trying to decide that now, how to establish vehicles for people to become engaged. County corridor meetings involve local governments, meetings for the public will not be necessarily hosted by CMAs. • The county corridor meetings are designed for all of us to prepare ourselves going forward. • Regarding the scenario planning, the law does require us to prepare visualization tools that will help us conduct public workshops so that residents actually understand what we are trying to accomplish; however, while we do not yet have a budget, we do intend to employ this kind of tool to engage the public. • Regarding the LEP community, in the past, we have worked with local organizations that work with the communities of concern and ask them to host a meeting. We will work with the community group to develop tools that are understandable. • We did have a conversation with SACOG, and have found certain things that are really good. Once we get a budget, we will start to move forward. • Community building vs. civic engagement, do community building so that people are ready to participate in the engagement process.

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
	<p>in the Bay Area at the lowest level of their community — the street-level, their neighborhood. You need create a narrative about what is happening through the planning process and how it will play out within the region and every level throughout the region. Use that story line to build interest, in engaging with media, through the Web site, social networks, etc. Come up with reasons why it is important. Why should people care?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should add 1) an assurance that public input will be taken into consideration at the beginning, rather than at the end; 2) understand the scenario alternatives and how to actually influence those alternatives; 3) understanding how to influence the objective criteria by which to evaluate those scenarios; 4) transparency about the modeling and data; and 5) accountability that when public comment is given they actually impact the decisions. • In the public process, whatever you can define as what the public can influence — there are certain things in this process that are limited by the modeling, etc. — whatever the assumptions are that are steadfast and not changeable, they should be revealed to the public. It’s hard to know what a variable is and what isn’t. Knowing what they have influence over is important. • From the community-based perspective on the outreach process: regarding two earlier comments that it is important to provide earlier preparation for local governments and that it is critical to create a narrative on how issues will impact people, suggest that it is important to incorporate both of these elements when outreaching to local communities. Make sure that when there is a meeting in the communities, the meetings are not just one and run (?) type meeting, people need to have an understanding of what is going on. To ensure meaningful participation, invest in NGOs in a way that they can work with their communities early on so that they can prepare them on the issues, so that when they step into the one meeting there can be meaningful engagement. A lot of education can be done through the NGOs. This will build a longer-term infrastructure to support this kind of engagement. • Add some metric regarding the interactive nature of the process; acknowledge how you are using the correspondence. If there is a way of indicating how people are participating, i.e. how does this matter to them, what they are going to do to change behavior, how is this going to affect 	

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
	<p>implementation, etc. Use social media, you can reach more people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like the idea of narratives, it should have a regional element, but also a local element in each county or corridor that is based on existing adopted plans and policies. 	
<p>Draft GHG Targets</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding some of the figures on GHG reduction, the current RTP is projected to reduce GHG per capita in 2035 by 3%, in Steve Heminger’s memo to the RTAC on May 17, the figure is different, which is correct? Are the 2020 and 2035 reductions additive? In other words, if it’s 5 and 3, is it an 8% reduction by 2035? • Housing product mix slide: the regions with the largest change in product mix are the Bay Area and SCAG, meaning that the other two regions have a smaller change, and yet those two regions appear to get the largest GHG reduction in their existing RTPs. • How did you come up with the recommendations for the Bay Area Region itself? • Like the principles, what is the linkage between principle 6 and 7 — will this be discussed on Friday? Elaborate more on the geographical differences. Very concerned about the Central Valley MPOs, you can’t look at the Bay Area in isolation; we need to understand what the targets are going to be for those rural areas. Regional agencies should also advocate for meaningful targets for the Central Valley, so we can be mindful of how all this fits statewide. Finally, the schedule does not show other regional agencies participating in the targets discussion. Are the other Boards going to comment on the ARB targets? • It would be helpful, given the level of skepticism, to convert the GHG emissions into some of its component parts, i.e. CO, the ability to breathe, death rates, etc., and also go back and have a “do nothing” scenario and outline the impacts. Mention all this along with the benefits of reduction. • Regarding the new scenarios, in terms of the total growth being planned for in those scenarios, are they the same projected total growth for the region? It’s easier to reduce emissions from new growth, so what’s the number of homes that it is being planned for? • Regarding the new scenarios, it would be interesting to look at growth in other cities along transit lines and near jobs, not just the three big cities, are you looking into that? You should wait on principle 7. • Is MTC asking for 7% in 2020 and 10% in 2035 as a reduction compared 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the second part of the question, everything got measured back to 2005. Regarding the first question, the correct numbers are 3% for 2020 and 2% for 2035. The reason they are different is because we made adjustments and had a miscalculation. Gas prices were overstated, so we brought those down and it brought down the GHG estimates. • The reason is that they are so dispersed and sprawling that any improvement in terms of more dense development is going to make a big difference. Also, not so much on the land use side but in terms of congestion as compared to the Bay Area, those regions are not as congested as the Bay Area, as congested speeds go down, GHG emissions increase. • Starting with the position of -3 for 2030 and -2 for 2035, there are several areas where you can get GHG emissions. One is, which you can cry foul on, that with the prolonged recession you will see a projection that sees economic activity go down so you get some reduction there. We think we will get some improvement just by the accuracy of our model. We are acknowledging that the new activity based models will be more accurate. Where the real emission reduction will occur is on the transportation demand management (TDM) side; we have not been pursuing TDM activities. We think we can get more aggressive on the land use side, and last, we can get some improvement on the pricing side, which may require legislation. We need to be realistic but at the same time ambitious. • The other Boards will be commenting, but it is the MPOs’ responsibility to adopt the targets. There will

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
	<p>to 2005?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the slide showing the targets released by ARB, how does that compare to 1990 levels, why would ARB be tiering this off of 2005 when AB 32 is based on 1990 levels? How does that help the region and the state do its share to reach 1990 levels called out in AB 32? • How much of a percent reduction is that compared to 1990, or is it an increase? How can ARB propose that when SB 375 is supposed to help achieve the goals of AB 32? • It would be useful information for stakeholders around the state to know what the numbers mean in terms of AB 32. • It is hard to understand what the percentages mean, they are very abstract. The percentages are expressed in per capita reduction; it would be interesting to review what the total emissions in the future would be taking into account population growth. If we provide the total we could incorporate the in-migration of GHG emissions for the Bay Area. How will the targets be used in forming the SCS? Will it be a similar process as RHNA? • Would like to cry foul on the economic assumptions. • Regarding having county by county targets, it will be very difficult to get local agencies to feel that their decisions make a difference if it's not targeted or measured at a level that matters to them. Might get the mindset that if they are regional targets, then the region can take care of it. • Why is the Bay Area asking for such low targets? • We need to realize that we are really talking about increasing GHG emissions between 2005 and 2035 at gross level. We are nowhere near 1990 levels or below. If 2005 is 100%, there is a 50% increase in VMT by 2035, so 2035 becomes 150%, and you are talking about reducing that by 10-11%, so that becomes 135%, that is a 35% increase. What happened to the linkage to AB 32? The targets should be much greater. • What do I need to be focusing on as a city planner? The 7% per capita reduction for 2020, or the 10% for 2035? • Comparing us to any other region, we are much more efficient, our projected reduction targets still leave us ahead of other regions. It's misleading to compare our targets to other regions. How far can land use move the needle? Land use by itself can make dramatic changes in these numbers. Even under very aggressive assumptions, targets have to be 	<p>be opportunities to comment with the other agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the subject of the next agenda item. • Regarding the cities, some of the aggressive growth assumptions already incorporate a lot of that. • That is the ceiling we are asking for. ARB should not set the target any higher than those two. • This is what was recommended by the advisory committee. Ultimately, they recommended that they use a 2005 base year for SB 375 because they want to take credit for the land use and transportation improvements that occurred between 1990 and 2005. 2005 will likely be the base year for the next RTP. • It would actually be a bit of an increase compared to 1990. SB 375 does not prescribe how we are going to measure targets. The law says that RTAC has to advise ARB, but ARB sets the targets. Don't know if it is in fact higher, it would require some backcasting and the 1990 data is not as reliable as 2005 data. We will look into that. • We don't envision county by county targets. The RTAC recommended that it be a statewide target. We are proposing to have regional targets, not by counties, we should be looking at the region. Commuter sheds are multi-county. • The law says that GHG targets for the region, that sets the tone of what we have to address. • This speaks to the necessity of having a regional target that translates into targets based on actions that local governments can take; however, the law states that targets be for the region. There will be action targets for the jurisdictions. • We don't think we are recommending low targets. Our RTP gets us to 2% for 2035, and we are recommending to ARB a target of no more than 10 percent, that's pretty aggressive and ambitious. Trying to understand other MPOs data and

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
	<p>realistic and based on what the data tells us that land use changes can do in reducing GHG emissions, rather than setting the target based just on what AB 32 says; it has to be based on what the science and research tells us is reasonable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this just talking about GHG generated by vehicles? • In terms of target levels, they are extremely aggressive, but some of the assumptions were surprising, for example San Francisco is supposed to absorb an additional 200,000 residents by 2035. If land use is going to be one of the major components of target-setting, you could be significantly reorganizing the social pattern of the urban areas absorbing the growth. Our concern is, how do you absorb these new occupants without impacting the existing communities? Suggest that as you move forward, you really need to take into consideration that even more aggressive land use policies will have social impacts. • Above what projection above the current RHNA projection is the 200,000 growth? Does this take into account some of the baseline displacement, or is it new people in aggregate? • Would be helpful to provide the data on the net aggregate impact of GHG emissions. On economic activity, helpful to use adjustment. In terms of modeling, get the model working group together region- or statewide. What are the comparisons? Show how the RTP itself performs using the new model. Also, other scenario tests with new demographic numbers, expect a real demographic shift in age. This information could be useful for the September date. • Land use in combination with pricing can make a huge difference in behavior. Comparison to 1990 levels in aggregate and not just per capita, to see what it means in terms of AB32. It would be helpful to understand the numbers. 	<p>assumptions, Sacramento is just different. We need to keep that in context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you look at the numbers, you discover that the largest contributor to VMT is population growth; the number of people in the state will make a greater difference than anything else. Nobody has a salable policy to limiting population growth — that is not in the cards. • We’re asking them not to set our targets above 7 % and 10%, the timeframe is correct. • Regarding the AB 32 target, it says that if your current plan is improving reductions you should take credit. Our plan is headed in the right direction, but it’s not enough. We get overwhelmed by population growth. • Passenger vehicles and light trucks. • It is 200,000 above projections, and 200,000 new people, i.e. incremental growth. • We can present some numbers that relate to 1990.
<p>Regional Housing Target</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not understanding the trend in the number of workers per household. If there is a shift in these numbers that would affect several of these options. • But how does what you assume affect the first option? • In option one, how did you get from 1.6 million new jobs to 800,000 housing units? • The idea that you are going to fill the Bay Area with housing and that the jobs-housing balance is going to be the magic bullet is an empty promise. Suggest you look at people’s commute time budgets. Have to think about 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When we did the projections in the past, we suggested an increase in the workers per household. If you think about the aging population, there is evidence that people will not be retiring as quickly, there is some increase in labor force participation in terms of workers per household. • You have to do some analysis of what you think the number of workers per household would be. We need

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
	<p>mobility and accessibility, affordability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to recognize that the Bay Area region is actually bigger than the region. • Do we want to plan for a complete regional jobs-housing balance? A complete jobs-housing balance would be that the people who are currently commuting in are no longer commuting in, and one of the options is addressing the people who are currently commuting in. • The in-commute and jobs-housing balance options are pretty similar, what is a more likely jobs-housing ratio? It would make sense to combine them. • Would like to see on each of these options, which will do a better job of capturing each market, i.e. income level, race, etc. In the memo, explain how that could fit in the housing target process. • Should not just be calculating a number, but a number that has all the right segments, SB 375 states you must include all economic segments of the population. We should be a lot more concerned about the person who chooses to commute a longer distance. To what extent is this target going to deal with that? Should be looking for targets for the region and sub-regions. • If there is a clash between what the market wants and what government wants, the market is going to win. Reason people commute is because they need their car once they get there, no adequate public transit. • Considering strategies for better use of existing housing. A lot of people who are retired cannot move because of Prop. 13, find a way to relocate these people to smaller housing to make room for larger families. • Regarding commute sheds, what this is all about is a housing number, could we arrive at a different number if we use a different methodology. If jobs is the driving factor, suggest you think about how the jobs change the in-commuting assumptions. Think about the geography of employment and using that as the starting base. Is pursuing any of these four options going to follow the letter of the law? • We are conducting this discussion assuming that it will be forever free to drive into the Bay Area. • In terms of jobs-housing balance, this needs to sync up more with the scenarios. You are focusing development in the three big cities, but the jobs-housing balance only works to reduce VMT if there is a transit system that is adequate, is it really the goal to produce housing where there are 	<p>to bring you more information about what we are putting together in terms of labor force participation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding the 1.6 million new jobs, may have made a math error, we will check the math. • Need to look at more localized areas • It addresses both current and future in-commuters. • Once we start the analysis we will see the strong relation between the two. • It's just not the total number of jobs and total number of households; need to look at more characteristics. It makes the most sense if you have job and income information about those jobs, not just two columns of numbers. It could be a regional concept, but also think about a sub-regional level. • Part of the work that we need to be doing is about the people who are in-commuting in the Bay Area, need to have a detailed idea about the people who commute in/out. Generalizations occur and it would be better to know how far they drive, their income, etc. Part of that is some of the work we need to be doing, gets you to more realism about how to address the issue. • As they are laid out, all options meet the overall jobs-housing balance. • We want to people to get to their jobs in environmentally benign ways. • More detailed in terms of demographics, at the aggregate level it would be hard for us to look at. • In the past we have not taken full credit for TDM, can use as part of the tools we have. The data we have is specific enough to tell us about the households and travel patterns. • We don't have the info but will be made available when we do • Complicated issues, TDM can be successful, no one

Topic	Comments Heard	Staff Responses
	<p>jobs or is it to produce housing where the residents can get the jobs by environmentally benign means? Not sure what scattering around the region gets you.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These in commute numbers are predicated on comparatively cheap energy costs, we may have very sharp increases in the future. In terms of sensitivity testing, energy cost increases should be modeled. • In terms of jobs-housing balance, think about displacement due to affordability issues. What is the affordability of the housing being created? Consider accounting for a shift in employment sectors, as industry goes away, are we providing the types of jobs suited to the residents? Suggest doing a more fine-grained analysis, what is the correct commute shed that would relieve the burden on residents? • All options assume that jobs are the primary factor of where people chose to live, model using other elements such as quality of schools, etc. • Like some reassurance that both these bodies of work are coordinated. • How specifically we're taking credit on the transportation side in terms of telework? Are we then going to reduce housing based on those factors? • You have info on jobs-housing balance, are you going to share? • Some cities need more jobs, we need to think differently, use telecommuting, TDM. Need to factor in TDM, encourage high TDM and telecommuting. Concern that just building more housing will create more housing demand. Better to go outside the region and not build housing there. • Important to stitch this together closer, we're using pre-existing models, and we are detached from the transportation model. How are we updating Projections 2009. According to the work plan, we're using 2009 and the base case for the SCS. Concerned with are going to be working with older assumptions. • No discussion about the fiscal implications at the sub-regional level, no discussion about race. Is there some dynamic that we should be discussing? • Do all these models meeting the legal needs? At least two of the options focus entirely on employment growth. Is there some way to make sure that the options we are considering are valid and will not be derailed by the state? 	<p>has the power to require employers to do that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are updating Projections 2009 now. This does not meant there will not be updates to the data • There are people at the state level who we are working with.

J:\PROJECT\2013 RTP_SCS\RAWG\August 2010\Final\4a_RAWG Summary Notes_070610.doc