

Sustainable Communities Strategy
Regional Advisory Working Group
 Meeting Notes
 October 18, 2010

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
Vision Scenario Planning Approach	<p>Is there just one vision scenario? How do we get from competing concerns to one scenario?</p> <p>In looking at the jobs reduction from 5.1 to 4.4 million, how many regional households does that reduce the need for?</p> <p>Are you asking us to present something to city councils by the end of the year?</p> <p>Commend the county/corridor process; how do you see reconciling some of the issues between counties?</p> <p>Is it possible for local jurisdictions to do the presentation and get on councils' agendas? What are you hoping to get from initial presentation; wouldn't it be better in Jan-Apr in order to be able to have a more leisurely pace, more meaningful feedback?</p>	<p>We'll be running many scenarios. When engaging city councils, it's important to work from a document that can be modified. The vision scenario is for political engagement. The base case is another scenario we will be releasing, which demonstrates where we are with projections. After the vision scenario comes out and we start the engagement, there'll be lots of questions and there'll be lots of different scenarios that are run for discussion purposes, especially here and at the CMA level.</p> <p>Very little reduction because population has not changed much. It reduces some in-commuting. The number of jobs and the population numbers don't change when shifting to headship analysis. The household needs numbers will come up substantially even if the jobs are being lowered in the forecast.</p> <p>We are asking every planning director to present to their city council about the SCS process; how it may affect their city, etc. Engagement is critical; the window of engagement is very narrow, regional housing needs assessment is tied to SCS process.</p> <p>Not all issues will be addressed at the county level, we will develop inter-county groups. Planning context based, will develop inter-county tools.</p> <p>January will be included in the request. The reason we think it's so critical to get that out before the vision scenario is released is because the vision scenario will have numbers relating to the jurisdictions. We need to have a planning context for those numbers and the SCS process. The decision making is pretty fast in the first half of 2011. I think through the county/corridor</p>

	<p>The presentation sets the context for what we will come back to them with later in the year?</p> <p>It makes more sense to wait until January when the new councilmembers are seated</p> <p>Is there any process to engage/inform the general public?</p> <p>Suggest the PPP include press releases, billboards, public service announcements, etc. Councils need to be able to answer the public's questions about the SCS process.</p> <p>Local elected officials want to hear how this process is going to affect RHNA numbers and transportation funding, if planning directors can't answer that in the presentation then they've accomplished nothing.</p> <p>When will the template be available?</p> <p>What's the feedback loop, in terms of affecting those numbers and is that a message that we carry to staff, to ABAG, to this process?</p> <p>Can you say a little bit more about the place types framework? Is MTC defining an original set of place types and how will this be used to define the strategies and the performance measures?</p> <p>What data goes into the vision scenario and how is that distinct from the realistic scenarios? Why is the vision scenario developed first?</p>	<p>engagement process we can prepare local governments so that they should be able to get it done in December or January.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Earlier would be better.</p> <p>The Public Participation Plan is a very comprehensive engagement strategy, and the city council meetings are a good opportunity to engage the public.</p> <p>We will answer those questions.</p> <p>The first week of November.</p> <p>The numbers are produced by our modeling effort. The actual planning context for the place types will be done through the engagement process between now and the end of the year. This is just a surrogate RHNA number. We won't know the actual RHNA number until much later in the year.</p> <p>We have a full report coming in November on the place types.</p> <p>We're developing two scenarios simultaneously. The first is the base case – Projections 2011. The vision scenario uses the unconstrained number, the much larger 25-year number. There is a strong relationship between the vision scenario and Projections</p>
--	--	--

	<p>1) How do we get to find out about meetings of these county/corridor working groups? 2) It looked like you are putting the PDAs into different place types and not any of the other land in the region, so what about the land outside of the PDAs where people do live and changes will occur? 3) Could you give an example of some of the mechanisms of how you're going to model policy changes?</p> <p>Are those public meetings or not?</p> <p>It sounded like you're going to assign place types to a set of geographies that are the PDAs, or should be PDAs, correct?</p> <p>Are we assuming a certain generalized list of transportation improvements?</p> <p>Can you give an overview of the Public Participation Plan?</p> <p>How is public transit going to blend in to this process?</p>	<p>2011.</p> <p>The place types are not limited to the PDAs. The intent is to have place types that really fit where we're trying to go with the performance measures and not to have place types for the entire Bay Area because we couldn't get that done. We're not exactly sure what the model can do, it's a new model, but if it works, you can look at an area with a GIS map, determine what policy changes you make in that area, and provide you with a growth and how it will perform. So the basic concept is, you take a transit corridor, you apply an overlay to infrastructure investment in that corridor, you release some of the zoning constraints, and then you see how much shift of travel activity would occur if you did that properly. The group meetings will take place at the CMAs, we're looking at how to use the Web as our primary process for engagement.</p> <p>All meetings are public meetings, but the real public meetings are city council meetings where you really get to discuss things holistically. I would suggest you contact your CMA director with helping to facilitate the administration of whenever these larger meetings take place.</p> <p>That's basically right.</p> <p>Yes, we will provide information on headways, not on specifics, and then we can see how you might achieve those headways.</p> <p>The Revised Draft Public Participation Plan has been released for public comment. The deadline to comment is up on the Web site and we welcome your thoughts. We'll have links to the new Web site, we want to emphasize that we are shooting for great transparency through the use of the Web.</p> <p>A really important part of the visioning scenario is to demonstrate what land uses would support much better transit use. The vision scenario helps to guide how the region could</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Is equity going to be part of the vision scenario?</p> <p>When is RAWG going to see the numbers?</p> <p>Are we taking the numbers to our councils before we have a chance to review them?</p> <p>I suggest doing a drilled out map.</p> <p>Last week some of our city staff received a letter from Paul Fassinger regarding a request to form a sub-region for the RHNA allocation and that we have a deadline of March 2011; in the template report, is there going to be some discussion of this and why the sub-region formation is so early in the process</p> <p>Yes, because when you look at the rest of the schedule for RHNA, we will not get going on the rest of the regional methodology for quite some time, so for some counties we may choose to participate in both processes and not be obligated so early on. I think Santa Clara will be forming a sub-region, but I think we also want to participate and learn from what's happening with the regional methodology as well.</p> <p>Is there any plan for considering input from members of the public who are not planning directors, who are not city councilmembers or other elected officials?</p>	<p>make decisions that would help support much better transit use.</p> <p>Yes, those are the key issues that need to come out of the vision scenario. Equity will affect every aspect of the decision making; it's not a separate, stand-alone analysis.</p> <p>Early 2011.</p> <p>No, you're not taking numbers. The staff report to the councils is only the planning context. It sets up the conversation. That's why we want to have it before the numbers come out.</p> <p>We are constrained with resources.</p> <p>You would like to see that?</p> <p>That goes to the integrity of the Public Participation Plan, which has just been re-released following extensive comments by members of the public, take a look at it and take another shot at providing comments. It is our intent to make it work.</p>
--	---	---

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
<p>Transportation and Land Use Performance Targets and Indicators Status Report</p>	<p>In November, when you present the targets, will you also present proposals for the methodology for measuring those targets?</p> <p>So we will have a base case (Projections 2011), then we will have the vision scenario that is trying to house the unconstrained housing population, and then we will look at how the base case versus the vision scenario performs on the slew of targets, correct? How will we see the various alternatives that we could try? Is there going to be sensitivity analysis to the various policies we try? How do we get to see the different alternatives?</p> <p>How will the agencies communicate about the various runs being done? With whom?</p> <p>The targets will be voluntary and non-binding, so will the scenarios be tested to see how they perform at meeting the targets? Will the chosen scenario be the one that meets most targets and then that chosen scenario will be the SCS scenario? Will the transportation money in the RTP be tied to the SCS? The fact that they are voluntary makes it sound meaningless, will you be looking at scenarios against targets and is that going to inform which scenario is chosen for the SCS and be tied to the RTP?</p> <p>Can you recap the high points of the working group about the economy measures? Will there be a report from staff about how well the model forecasts economic activity as an output? Are there ideas about transportation and land use factors that are shown to be predictive of a strong economy that may be used for measures?</p>	<p>Each target will have a short description on how we plan to model and measure those targets.</p> <p>We will create the vision scenario based on local input regarding the place types plus the total regional number we need to accommodate. We will run the scenario against the recommended targets, after seeing how they perform and receiving feedback from local governments there will be revisions to the scenario and we will have to run revised scenarios against the targets again to see how they perform. We don't know how many times we will repeat this process yet.</p> <p>We will bring back the modeling efforts and the results to the RAWG, this will be the bulk of RAWG's work for the next year. There will also be key issues for some of the county/corridor working groups, but don't know how we will be running scenarios for the county/corridor level.</p> <p>That is a fair criticism. The reason I say they are voluntary and non-binding is that there is no penalty associated with the target if not reached, they are used for evaluation but we will not be penalized if not met.</p> <p>There is potential of using Gross Regional Product as an economic target, there are a number of factors that go into GRP beyond transportation and land use policies that we will be looking at in the SCS.</p> <p>In the past we relied on a proxy measure of transportation delay and now plan to use real economic measures. One of the goals of</p>

	<p>Is it becoming any clearer that you can model economic activity? The way the models have been run to date is that the only decisions made in the planning process that affect economic output is the size of the population.</p> <p>It seems some of the targets will be competing with each other; you should recognize that when you identify the targets, and indicate what will be the priority.</p> <p>Will the equity analysis be run prior to the run of other analyses?</p> <p>Concern about the scenarios and visioning. There are questions about how many scenarios we will actually have. Given the timeframe we have to evaluate them at the city level, we are hoping to have more scenarios up front. Understanding how the base case will be different from the vision scenario would be helpful. If not, it would be helpful to have an understanding of the geographic distribution might be between the two scenarios.</p> <p>Do you envision that the totals or the geographic distributions will be different between scenarios?</p>	<p>this RTP/SCS process is to shift to a true economic measure like GRP, personal income, employment, etc.</p> <p>Some of the more obvious targets like increased employment, or decreased unemployment cannot be used because they are input into the model.</p> <p>We are using two new models, and will potentially be able to do a more extensive impact analysis using an additional economic model input. This will be decided in the next few months.</p> <p>It's not that it will be run prior to other analyses; however, in the past RTPs the equity analysis came at the end of the RTP in order to look at how the final plan performed against a number of equity goals. MTC is considering based on input is to run the equity analysis earlier, during the scenario evaluation.</p> <p>The city councils around the region that have huge agendas to deal with cannot be confronted with multiple scenarios for evaluation. They need to focus how their city will be impacted. If given a scenarios, they are like to focus on which number is lower for them, in terms of the housing need and that would be the end of the conversations. The goal is to have a realistic conversation about how the region could come as close as possible to meeting reality. Certainly there will be places where the alternative will be better, but we need the feedback.</p> <p>Yes, because we are using the unconstrained number for the vision, as far as geography goes, that's what the engagement process is about.</p>
--	--	---

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
<p>PDA Assessment</p>	<p>If one of the promises of the SCS is CEQA streamlining, and the PDAs are informing some of the basis of the SCS, how is that being worked into the final analysis?</p> <p>Assistance from the regional agencies would help the local agencies be able to streamline.</p> <p>The number one determining factors is CEQA readiness and whether or not there has been some comprehensive CEQA guidelines document adopted.</p> <p>Will the raw data be available for people to look at which of the cities are participating in the survey? Need to disaggregate the data in order to understand what we're learning.</p> <p>Regarding the role of place types and the other geographies that are not in PDAs, I'm concerned about the level of investment that MTC and ABAG puts into this level of analysis. I'm concerned about how these other place types will be able to catch up in terms of readiness. Clearly, the SCS and the RTP are building PDAs as the primary location for investment and we may find that there are other geographies that could also accommodate us. Make sure we give ourselves the time to allow for those other geographies to have equal participation.</p> <p>How will the non-designated PDA areas have a role, or how are they able to participate in the SCS process? What does it mean if there is no PDA in place? Regarding funding for implementation of the SCS, it seems to all be going to land use and transportation investment. There is other infrastructure, which has not been discussed, that is critical to making these PDAs work. We should bring this into the PDA process in order to be</p>	<p>Once the SCS is in place there is a big push to work with the state to provide some relief. There are also some streamlining policies that the local jurisdiction can implement not related to CEQA. I presented some of those policies. We can work with the jurisdictions where it seems that development is slow because of the policies and help them implement ways to streamline development.</p> <p>We will provide the data to the local jurisdictions and RAWG so you get a better picture of how each PDA is performing.</p> <p>At the last meeting, we did present findings from the PDA assessment regarding infrastructure needs for the PDAs that included categories outside of transportation funding.</p>

<p>successful.</p> <p>It's great that there is a lot of emphasis on the PDAs on where future growth should be targeted, but the bottom line is that the majority of planned growth is outside PDAs, so while the emphasis on the PDAs for the SCS process is good, it does depend on infrastructure of non-PDA areas. We need to think about how much future growth the PDAs can truly absorb.</p> <p>It is important to consider investment attractiveness. In the current climate, with single-family homes at such a bargain, developers are pushing us to and extending out the timeline for when the market will recover.</p> <p>Which have the biggest impacts? Which provide certainty? What should we prioritize? Would love to hear from the developers side, what are their thoughts regarding PDAs.</p> <p>It would be helpful to have a survey done of the developer community. Ask the top five or ten developers.</p> <p>Like the idea of surveying the developers. It would be interesting to see which jurisdictions were able to get through</p>	<p>This is good input for next month when we will be discussing the framework of the place types. It is also good for how we go about building the vision scenario. We are tracking the conversation that is happening outside PDAs. Our regional planners have been sketching some of those areas that have great potential to address sustainability. The place types will be a platform to have a concrete assessment of all the places with substantial engagement in the SCS. All of you have recognized it took a lot of effort to compile a lot of data for the PDA assessments, which would be impossible to replicate in all areas. To the extent that we can hear from you what the key issues are that we need to recognize to understand the different places, with the quality of life that can contribute to the SCS, would be extremely helpful in framing additional scenarios.</p> <p>We can provide that information.</p>
---	---

	<p>the CEQA process in a couple of months. It takes a lot longer than that for suburban jurisdictions.</p> <p>There is a tendency to feel like the plan is the product. It's incredibly hard to develop the plan, but it is only a step in getting to the work of the developers, who will actually do the work of developing the urban form we want. Spend more time talking about the role of the developers in the SCS process. The Bay Area Council would be happy to arrange a discussion with our developer members. We need to hear directly from developers about issues of predictability, streamlining, fee structures, type and density of developments, etc.</p> <p>There is a focus on all areas that have the potential to develop in a way that is advantageous to the region as opposed to those that are advantageous to just the local jurisdiction. It is important to acknowledge that the regional planning process is going to require concessions and negotiations on the part of jurisdictions that have decided that something is more important for their jurisdiction that may not be aligned with the SCS. Would like to see that policy and funding implementations for the SCS are not solely based on PDA readiness but also based on the targets, indicators, and the vision scenarios.</p> <p>Given how easy it was to meet the criteria to qualify as a PDA, it is important to keep in mind what the regional goals are and how well different locations will help to meet that, as opposed to having to have PDA designation in order to qualify for infrastructure funding.</p>	
--	--	--