Regional Advisory Working Group
November 15, 2010 meeting

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
Vision Scenario Approach and Local Government and Stakeholder Engagement	When will the presentation template be ready?	By Friday.
	Is the Basecamp Web site the place where jurisdictions will enter place type/alternative PDA/infill locations, etc.; or is there another process for that?	We are having meetings in the counties to answer initial questions, and staff is available to follow up. Given how much information needs to come together, we have put this tool in place, but meetings can be scheduled as well.
	It's not clear what feedback you want from local jurisdictions, not getting the specifics about what you want local jurisdictions to tell you.	We have a staff report that is available, which has list of policies and incentives that can support infill development that we need to hear about from the local jurisdictions. From a policy perspective, it would be useful for the regional agencies to know, for example, that 90 percent of local jurisdictions say CEQA streamlining is critical. Also, if there is another issue that is not important and it is on the list we need to get that information from the local jurisdictions. Specifically, we are looking for specific places that can accommodate growth, and from the local jurisdictions' perspective we need to know what it would take to support that growth. Regarding transportation, we are using T2035 as a base because it encompasses the full range of future transportation projects, but if there are specific transportation projects that are new and would really help incentivize growth in a particular area then we need that information.
	The questions "do we have the right place types for the PDAs, should they be shifted a little, are there other areas for growth, etc.?" all seem to be important questions that the public should be engaged on. What is the process for getting input from the public?	We want to put local jurisdictions in the driver seat at the county level in order to facilitate dialogue and because that is where land use authority resides and where things are implemented, it is a county issue. The regional agencies see the benefit of NGO involvement at the local level, how things role out in the spring is up to the counties. When the vision scenario is released will provide materials/visuals to move forward. We are relying on the county/corridor groups to find out what the input can be at the local level.
	In terms of the timeline, you want local jurisdictions to provide	We have a framework for gathering the information, but this is

	you with the information about growth areas, etc. before February? Like the approach of starting with the vision scenario, but need to have a shared understanding of what "unconstrained" means.	only a starting point.
	The downtown Berkeley area is a place where we should be building a lot on new housing, but on a policy level, how do we look at this land issue as it relates to the policies of the other regional agencies? Specifically, how do we make sure all the regional agencies work together to get the result we are looking for?	This is an issue we're hearing from a number of corridors; ensuring that the policies of the four regional agencies are really folded into the SCS is an issue of future discussion. How joint policy is developed in the region is key and we will be hearing more about it in the future.
	Comment regarding Agenda Item 3 (not about the Vision Scenario): Regarding No. 8, where employees live is a private decision; San Jose has an imbalance of residential development, TOD could help meet No. 8, but you are going to have trouble reaching No. 8. Regarding No. 5, people are not really interested in increasing walking/biking time, but rather making it easier and safer.	
	Can you say more about how the transportation investments will be folded into the process of developing the SCS? You will be asking local governments what key transportation investments would support unconstrained development, so will these new projects be added to the RTP? How will you ensure that there is back and forth iteration between the land use and transportation side	The commission will issue a call for projects into the spring, that process will be going hand in hand with the more detailed scenarios that get developed in the spring. We are looking at how to refine adjustments to the vision scenario once the transportation inputs start coming in. First, we will see how far we can get by focusing on land use only. Regional agencies are trying not to bring in non-transportation related inputs not related to land use at the beginning of the process. We are trying to look at land use up front then we will focus on what kind of transportation is needed to support the land use. Through a refinement process in the spring we will be looking at how the scenarios are refined and then at what kind of new changes relative to transportation the CMAs will have.
	Not understanding how the county/corridor engagement process is intended to work, concerned about how it is working so far. We should be engaging everyone who should be engaged in this	The leadership roundtables were held in each of the counties in order to have a discussion among the policy makers involved at the regional level, the CMAs and local about how the SCS

	process, but it seems pretty opaque. Is the county/corridor process and the leadership roundtables the same thing? There is no information about how to find out about those meetings. There is not posting or opportunity for public comment, so these are not really public meetings. Are there two types of meetings? Who should be participating in each one? It is important to clarify which are public meetings and which are not. For those that are public, there should be notice and information on how any member of the public can attend.	process would unfold in each county. Each county is taking a slightly different approach. They will probably not be meeting on a regular basis. It's important to understand that the county/corridor engagement process is just getting started. Contra Costa had a meeting, but the purpose was for staff to discuss how to work together, it was not a public meeting. In each county there will be public meetings in the future, which will be noticed, but there are no meetings of that nature scheduled at this time. There will be meetings that will be working meetings for local staff. How the information regarding local public meetings will get out to the public will need to be discussed in one of these working meetings.
	The attachment to the JPC memo titled "Leadership Roundtable Meetings: Summary of Key Issues," has a column for second meeting date, which have dates set for most of the counties. Are those public or staff meetings?	Those second meetings are working group meetings of planning staff and CMA staff, and they deal with some of the technical information, so they are working meetings.
	So those are the working meetings?	Right.
	So when will there be opportunities for any member of the public to have any input on the vision scenario? If there are no public meetings prior to the development of the vision scenario, that is of concern. Who does what in these different processes? Understand that the vision scenario is a starting point, but not understanding the process for providing public input. If we are developing a vision scenario and then we are going to be iterating it, who will be iterating it? With what inputs/outputs? With conversation from which people?	The vision scenario will be released in February. We will bring it to the policy boards and the county level. It sounds like some would like to see an opportunity for public input when it is brought to these bodies. In terms of transportation and land use, this process is new. We'll see what it looks like to accommodate the regional housing target in places where we are trying to meet the GHG target for the region. What kinds of policies will be needed for jurisdictions to be able to take on this level of growth in specific places over the next couple of decades? That will be the process into the summer and fall, to figure out what kind of policies support this growth. This is the firsts SCS, so understanding where the inputs come from will be underway in the next year. There are three important partners in this process: regional agencies, CMAs and local governments. The idea is to put something specific forward that will get more meaningful engagement. The engagement should occur at the level where

		the decisions are being made. Once we have the vision scenario created as the first place for dialogue, we will have something specific on the table. We can see where the growth is being accommodated, where the unconstrained transportation investments may be, how the performance measures come out of the model, etc. This will start the conversation on how to make the vision better. The RHNA process also needs to be consistent with the SCS, and that process occurs between January and July 2011, concurrent with the vision scenario discussion. There will be a committee established to work on the RHNA. There is a lot of activity in 2011, so to the extent that you want to engage, you need to identify specifically what you want to engage on. We have created a Web site that will have all the documents created relevant to this process: scs.abag.ca.gov.
	There is problem with calling it a vision scenario. It is really a first step scenario, and anyone who thinks we will have a visionary vision will be disappointed.	
	Will you be combining/simplifying similar place types? If not, would be helpful to have a presentation on the place types; There is a need to coordinate what the different regional agencies are doing. When talking about infrastructure money, it would be important to try to get them to put in green streets, this is a significant mitigation issue; they are already doing this in Sacramento County. We should be talking about green streets in the Bay Area.	In terms of the place types, we are using the C/COG framework. We have a memo to help understand the place types. In terms of the public, we need to create materials to help understand what they are.
	If the RHNA process will be decided between January and July 2011 by a committee made up of ABAG and MTC staff, how will local agencies participate in the methodology for that process?	This item is on our Executive Board agenda for November. In the last cycle we created a Housing Methodology Committee comprised of local agency planning directors and local elected officials that helped advise ABAG on the RHNA methodology. The process for determining that committee for this round is on the Executive Board agenda for November 18, but it is not entirely staff-driven. This time the SCS process will be incorporated. The committee will be structured similar to the last time, except

	When a local jurisdiction says they cannot take on additional growth/units, there should be a really clear process for other local jurisdictions to argue that those unwilling jurisdictions can, in fact, take on more growth. Suggest creating a blog where there can be discussion on developing the future scenarios. It's important for regional agencies to provide more detail on schedule and process for the next six months; this would be helpful in understanding the process of getting from the vision stage to the detail stage. We need to see how we will bridge the vision to the detail. It would be helpful to have a discussion about the outcomes as soon as possible, as well as how can the CMAs facilitate public participation and be guided by the regional agencies so that there is regional participation so we are not just responding to the most "local" concerns. This is an important opportunity to do visioning; we agree that it is best to start with land use. The City of Santa Rosa appreciates comments about the need to plan for growth, we understand that we have people relying on the need for maintenance of our infrastructure, so we need to engage not just planning staff, but also public works staff, transit staff, etc. They seem to be disenfranchised.	we will include MTC Commissioners. The methodology process will be in July.
Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
Performance Targets	Regarding No. 6, there should be an "as of" date. Regarding No. 5, you can actually look at this backwards. You can increase time spent biking/walking by putting up barriers, which is probably not what you want. Change to increasing the number of people in the Bay Area who spend 30 minutes walking/biking. Glad to see No. 10 included. Regarding No. 8, disappointed with it because it does not really measure a healthy economy. Regarding the ability to affect GDP, I disagree. If you have a policy of everything being equal and you implement a certain transportation policy, which can reduce the	

	unemployment rate by two percent, you would get a lot of support. The idea that there would be no changes to city spheres for decades is unrealistic. There are competing regional interests; it's too broad a statement. The idea of preserving open space; to have no growth is unrealistic. Zero development outside of urban growth boundaries does not necessarily promote agriculture. Such a broad statement is naïve; to think that agriculture does require some development. Regarding No. 5, you can model it, but is it really measurable? Does not seem like a transportation goal, it would be more reasonable to say to have cities that are more walkable/bike friendly. Regarding fair housing, Targets 2 & 7 touch on fair housing issues, but not adequate. In order to ensure fair access to housing, we need to work on not displacing local residents through gentrification. In order to further ensure fair housing, there needs to be targets that specifically speak to affordable housing being built in communities where there is access to education, jobs and a healthy lifestyle, otherwise we risk being out of compliance with federal mandates. Regarding No. 7, happy to see a goal for reduced income share going to housing and transportation, but there is no geographic component to that. The RHNA explicitly requires that in doing the housing allocation we take into account existing concentrations of low income populations. To the extent that we want the SCS to be guide for the RHNA, we need a target in the SCS that explicitly addresses the goal of providing equitable access to affordable housing, safe and healthy communities, better schools, etc. Regarding the open space preservation goal, it is good but it needs to allow for some agricultural development. Need to find a way to make agriculture economically viable and perpetuate it	That is a good observation; it means that to measure it we will need more active partnerships with public health.

	as part of open space. Generally, the targets are good. Regarding No. 8, it is a good measure for what we can do in the SCS, but it's unclear where the 10 percent comes from. Regarding No. 2, it seems this will lead to prioritization, so how do you prioritize investment in areas that are willing to accept more sustainable growth? Concerned about the equity measures, the framework is laudable. In Housing Element law there are four objectives required, several are directly linked to the targets. The one having to do with the relation of income to geography is harder to find a direct trail to the targets. Additionally, we are focused on targets; equity analysis is a great step forward. Concerned that equity analysis is not currently part of the discussion; currently, there is a placeholder in the targets so I suggest then put in equity analysis until you are able to give us more structure on what the parallel equity analysis process will be. Regarding No. 7, difficult to boil down to a single target; any of the benefit measures included in the performance analysis should be taken as an analysis of the target population vs. the general population. Under economic vitality, location does not really tell us how well the region is working and how we will be able to close the gap in terms of this region vs. other regions. Why not increase the profile of the percent spent on transportation and housing so that it is not just the low and middle income, but everyone? Regarding No. 8, there is a bias towards the fastest mode unless you break it out by mode. Under transportation system effectiveness, we suggest different measures for different travel markets. Regarding adequate provision of transit s is quite important and overlaps SGR. We should not be turning people away from transit if they want to make it their first choice. Finally under SGR, you should weigh the needs by demand, and we would suggest using cost effectiveness somewhere. Strong support for No. 6, thought this would mean something	The 10 percent is our initial take but we will be doing more review in the next few weeks. Regarding maintenance, this feeds to the notion the targets are tools. The discussion of how we prioritize our investments in order to support sustainable growth is something that needs to go well beyond our targets.

	about urban infrastructure that would allow for new development, not development of wells and septic systems. This is about measuring impacts of alternatives, when we measure these scenarios it is important to know if we have the ability to accommodate projected development in this region to an infill-only strategy. If this is meant to be targets for both SCS and RTP, No. 4 and 10 are just about transportation and it is not measuring the impacts of the SCS process and the RTP, and how they will work together. We should have targets that cover both. 1) Need to identify what the forecast measurements are going to be, 2) need to define terms, 3) should be looking at health impacts, not just death. Regarding No. 6, define what development is. Regarding No. 8, 45 minutes can be the Merced HSR line. Regarding No. 5, is this really something you are putting out to show a big number percentage increase? I don't see measurable difference. Why don't you go with something standard like the Surgeon General's recommendation? There was consensus on reducing $PM_{2.5}$ emissions in communities of concern adjacent to hot spots. The fact that any measure of disproportionate impact disappeared in the recommended target is of concern. It's hard to have confidence on how the equity analysis will take shape because it is not in the timeline, there's no way of knowing how it will fit with the other decision-making processes. It is hard to know how it will be addressed. I want to stress the importance of addressing the equity issue in all its dimensions, if we do not do that we will create inequity by default. Regarding No. 8, there needs to be some way of placing poverty reduction in the economic vitality frame. Focus on access of the lowest 20 percent of the population and whether or not we are meeting that goal. Where are the job centers and how are they going to be affected by all this, what about job	

	sprawl? Unsatisfied with the economic vitality measure, there is a lot of concern from the business community that the attention to creating a strong economy out of the SCS process not be treated as a step child of the analysis and it feels like it is. Employer access to a qualified labor market is important to a competitive economy, but it is only one of the important things. It is not even clear how this measures that. If you just have a metric that says “strengthen the economy, grow GDP or employment” that would satisfy the Bay Area Council and the business community. As is, then it needs significantly more thought. Also, not crazy about the idea of having these quantitative numerical targets because they are arbitrary or they are based on something that is arguable. Cannot envision how these numerical targets get used in the application of these criteria. This suggests pass/fail. What we really want to know is how well it meets those goals. What we want to know is “does this scenario do a better job of accomplishing this worthy goal than this other scenario?” and you do not need the number in there to do that. Useful to add a column with which regional/local agency is most involved with each target and what it would take to achieve it. Transit and land use are two big categories of regional goals that are not included. Only No. 6 speaks to land use. You are missing something tremendously by not having a mode share target. Regarding No. 5, concerned that you can achieve it by making it harder o walk or cutting bus service. Think about the implications of achieving the goals. Regarding No.8, do not understand what part of the region would not count towards achieving this goal. Better to consider the percent of future growth of employment that is in transit served locations and transit centers. Same is true of housing; there is no role around housing within some distance of transit centers. The targets should somehow push toward that as a goal, the percentage of the region living within some distance to transit. There should be a transit-based target specifically.	

	Regarding No. 5, agree to increasing the number of people who are getting the recommended 30 minutes of activity per day. Regarding No. 4, better to focus on fatalities and permanently disabling injuries in order to focus resources where you can make the most difference. If we are really going to work toward increasing the number of people walking/biking, in order to mitigate that we need to figure out how we can help those people and what we need to focus on. If it is just injuries in general, we will not see it in the numbers.	