

**Regional Advisory Working Group
December 10, 2010 Summary Notes**

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
Initial Vision Scenario Update	<p>What materials are being sent to elected officials?</p> <p>The memorandum indicates that the more comprehensive PDA assessments are expected to be completed in spring 2011, so what is the difference between what you presented today and what you are expecting for next week?</p> <p>What you handed out looks like what we should be doing for the vision scenario. Next week's deadline for the vision scenario is impossible for Alameda County. AC will not be able to submit much information if this is going to be the process; the timelines are not feasible.</p> <p>Previously, the initial vision would talk mainly about land use and leave transportation investments steady, do we want to think more broadly about pricing, TDM, etc.?</p> <p>The word "unconstrained" is nowhere to be found in the template, need a definition of it so that I can explain to my elected officials.</p> <p>My sense is that it is unconstrained in more than just transportation.</p> <p>You will develop the vision scenario first, focused on land use, and then see what is achievable with the more specific scenarios. How do you decide what is achievable on the transportation side to support the vision? What is on/off the</p>	<p>The template staff report and the PowerPoint presentation. We also have had requests for some of the background information on the OneBayArea website.</p> <p>This will be discussed during Item 2 of the agenda.</p> <p>The PDA assessment is something that jurisdictions that have PDAs want to provide, which is why it is agendaized. Some of the more detailed work, less related to the RTP will be brought back in early spring.</p> <p>Additional transportation projects not in T2035 can be submitted with the initial vision scenario, but we want to deal with land use first. We want to know if there are particular transportation projects that would support this growth, but there is an explicit intent to not get into the transportation related material. We want to see how far we can go with land use and then focus on what transportation infrastructure we need to support that land use.</p> <p>We will take a look, but may be worded differently because we are trying to make it as understandable as possible in real world terms.</p> <p>We are intending to be unconstrained and visionary on the transportation side. We cannot think about high-density land use without the supporting transportation infrastructure. Pricing has a life of its own politically. The policy framework is on</p>

**Regional Advisory Working Group
December 10, 2010 Summary Notes**

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
	<p>table regarding transportation, how visionary will you be on the transportation side since it's not included in the vision? Pricing is integrally related to infrastructure investments to determine how cost effective they are.</p> <p>Would like MTC to speak on the vision side of transportation. We are getting inconsistent guidance on how much input to give on the transportation side. There are a limited number of scenarios that can be run, right?</p> <p>Current transit services definitely needs to be discussed with MTC.</p> <p>Glad to see it is titled "initial," this implies a draft status. Understand there is significant feedback from elected officials regarding the process. Comments heard in this morning's joint meeting sound like board members are looking for opportunities to describe the SCS to other elected officials. What will you do to the process to respond to those comments?</p> <p>When do you plan to have those meetings?</p> <p>We are preparing our memorandum to our city council. Our council will be interested in the schedule and the detailed milestones, how do we communicate that things are still in flux? We need to know what the schedule really is. This is important for those who want to participate actively in the RHNA process. We need to make sure the data flow is moving between the two processes.</p>	<p>other constraints, like CEQA, schools, etc.</p> <p>Yes, and we are operating under many institutional constraints. The vision is intended to start the dialogue. MTC requested that we not identify specific technologies, but could identify headways.</p> <p>This issue would be better addressed if you submit it in writing.</p> <p>We defined a roadmap at the leadership roundtables, there is not enough content to attract elected officials. They want to know how we will proceed with their local staff. We cannot do this without the staff report to city councils. It is incumbent for this relationship to work in order for elected officials to know what the SCS and the vision scenario are. Our elected officials have offered to contact their peers/staff to bring this item forward. If placing this item on their consent agenda is all they can do, it's better than nothing. Once we have content, we are also planning to have members of the public and elected officials meet once there is something on the table, this would be in addition to staff reports to the city councils.</p> <p>Spring 2011.</p> <p>There is nothing more on the schedule that is pressing at this point. There has been a call regarding the SCS housing methodology committee being established. The RHNA process is moving forward and there have been no changes to the schedule.</p>

**Regional Advisory Working Group
December 10, 2010 Summary Notes**

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
	<p>One third of Alameda County jurisdictions are in furlough over the holidays, can this item be put on the February agendas?</p>	<p>It does not hurt the process to do it in February, but would prefer January.</p>
PDA Assessment	<p>We started looking at the vision scenarios and the place types, but have concerns: 1) appreciate large opportunity areas have been identified outside PDAs, how will these be evaluated? 2) the opportunity areas in Sunnyvale, how were they identified? Recommend that you coordinate with local agencies to make sure that the information you get is what the local agencies believe; 3) regarding place types, there is a lot of interest on residential development, some definitions focus on residential development 4) the definition of place types vs. density ranges needs to be better coordinated with the place types.</p> <p>How is this going to be used? The issue of readiness does not seem like an issue if you are looking at 30 years. How is this important in defining the initial vision scenario?</p> <p>This is not really about refinement of the scenarios, so it is important to define how we will achieve the ultimate scenario.</p>	<p>The place types came from the Center for Transit Oriented Development. Based on that framework, we know there is overlap between place types. Recognize that it is not perfect; if there are particular density issues that are problematic, let us know. Regarding the jobs issue, we are well aware. The PDA assessment found that although the PDA framework in focused on housing, many of the PDAs are major job centers. We will be looking at developing criteria that is a subset of the PDAs parallel to the job centers. We are also looking at MTC's TOD policy, which speaks directly to housing, not employment. The additional opportunity areas were arrived at using basic data sets for employment intensities, based on current job locations; also some input from regional planners based on their work with local jurisdictions. Regarding how new areas will be assessed; we are going to have to see what we get. We hope to get information relative to density and intensity. Part of the process is to see what the jurisdictions submit.</p> <p>It's about getting from point A to B; it is a long term plan. We will be starting with an unconstrained scenario. As we make refinements, we need to understand what is going to take to get there. We are trying to understand how to move the PDAs from the original framework to a neighborhood level, and really understand the policy supports needed. In terms of making the SCS work, we need to see what areas are closer in terms of readiness and see which have challenges and find out what policy changes need to occur. Local agencies want to understand the process to help with funding decisions.</p>

**Regional Advisory Working Group
December 10, 2010 Summary Notes**

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
	<p>Regarding quality of life in these PDAs, are we to assume that it is better to support higher scored PDAs? It is arguable that the higher the score the better assessed; that runs the risk of being challenged. What are you assessing? The transit capital category of infrastructure was not consistently established during the PDA assessment.</p> <p>Concerned that there is no clear assumption, especially on the transit side. What are we assessing? Are we assuming that Resolution 3434 investments will be there? Are we making our own assumptions? On the planned growth criteria, parking ratios and parking management is another area that needs to be evaluated. Regarding readiness, it's important to measure the likelihood of the transit investment to actually be there. Please clarify how this assessment will inform the allocation of growth beyond the PDAs.</p> <p>The memorandum talks about the purpose being connected to the growth allocation model, is this just within planned PDAs?</p> <p>PDAs will accommodate 50 percent of the housing need, how will growth beyond that be accommodated?</p> <p>My assumption is that in order to even get close to the GHG</p>	<p>In general, we need to do better scoring. This in one look at the PDAs. In term of infrastructure, we will be looking at in parallel with this. The information we are looking at here is one input for the modeling for the vision scenario. This is a check on other information that we will be using.</p> <p>This will apply to the planned PDAs because it is based on information we received during the PDA assessment survey.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The 50 percent figure for the PDAs is based upon the application of other information we received. There is also the other 40 percent figure that comes out of the PDA assessment that looks at, through the assessment the planned PDAs in aggregate can accommodate between 35-40 percent of the region's projected housing needs based on the old number. The 50 percent figure includes both planned and potential. It is a constrained number because it assumes existing resources at the time the plans were adopted. The potential number is pretty low if you are considering an unconstrained scenario. The PDA and other subjurisdictional areas are the places where we want to accommodate as much growth as possible. What is not included will be part of this process.</p> <p>On the scheduling, the results of this analysis fit into the model,</p>

**Regional Advisory Working Group
December 10, 2010 Summary Notes**

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
	<p>reduction target, we have to raise the amount of development that is proposed in TODs from the 40 percent to 80-90 percent, based on ABAG's Projections. Would like to see what it will take to increase the amount of projected growth under PDA than you have shown in the past. What policy levers and incentives will encourage local governments to take on more growth? It needs to be an initial statement. How does this fit into the process? Based on the memorandum, this will be used in developing the vision scenario to be released in February, but these are due in the spring. Please clarify the schedule.</p> <p>The expectation for local governments is to fill these in during the next month?</p> <p>Still confused as to how this will play into the process due to the timing issue and how the information will be used. You should clarify exactly how this matrix will be used and how it fits into the SCS process.</p> <p>What was the response rate for the detailed assessment?</p> <p>Would like to reiterate to look at non-residential components as well. It seems that this is all oriented towards "where do we put housing?" There are important non-residential components. The fear in some communities is that the process will not be broad.</p> <p>Regarding completeness, schools are an issue. Good schools attract residents but schools are at capacity. Need to look at what schools can really handle.</p>	<p>which will be done in the next month.</p> <p>No, this is all based on the PDA assessment that the local jurisdictions filled out last summer. We have to use the data we have. We are continuing to asses this as we move forward.</p> <p>It's important to understand this information is from the analysis that occurred at the local level. We are using that information to inform the initial vision scenario. "What will it take to accommodate additional growth?" is one of the key questions we asked jurisdictions. Some jurisdictions did not answer the question.</p> <p>Depending on the question, it ranged from one third to two thirds.</p> <p>We recognize that the quality of schools affects housing location decisions. We will try to asses the role schools play. In terms of allocating growth, do we allocate more growth to places with good schools, or do we try to look at areas that need resources to improve schools? We will try to identify both. The</p>

**Regional Advisory Working Group
December 10, 2010 Summary Notes**

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
	<p>How will the new opportunity areas be able to catch up to this level of detail? Concerned that we are investing most analytical time to PDAs. There continues to be a disconnect that PDAs are the priority. Thought that the vision scenario would be an opportunity for a broader discussion. At what point do we broaden the discussion and stop focusing on the PDAs to a more realistic view of all the areas we are planning for jobs and housing?</p> <p>San Jose does have additional growth areas that we want to include that are accessible by existing and planned transit. Make sure we have a level playing field for all the areas where growth makes sense. The location and transit access, is not clear whether that is existing or future. The PDAs are on different scales, how will staff equalize those?</p> <p>For the planned affordable housing units, it's one thing to have a plan and another to have the dollars to build affordable housing. The number of projects in the pipeline is not a good proxy for real market demand and economic feasibility.</p> <p>PDAs are one particular type of area. There are two other place types that are ignored, including places that are appropriate for growth that don't want it and places that will not grow much. Both of those places will require an informed distribution of households that include some of the indicators. Encourage you to take this type of analysis beyond PDAs to accommodate equitable growth.</p> <p>Appreciate the approach, the framework is helpful, but when you start getting into the flow of travel how will you take transit and infrastructure capacity into account? Regarding any</p>	<p>goal is to make sure all communities address this as a factor of completeness.</p> <p>This depends on what is submitted. The PDAs are the starting point. We are interested in seeing what jurisdictions submit for areas beyond the PDAs, which is why we started with this local input component. Local elected officials will want to know what the new input areas are. We will be looking at this through the detailed scenario process through 2011.</p> <p>Part of it will be how well they perform. Part of it will be determined by the resources needed to advance these areas. They will be compared, but not necessarily equalized because the goal is to determine where we can accommodate growth.</p> <p>There have been meetings among staff of all regional agencies. There is a general commitment to integrate the Bay Plan and CEQA Guidelines into the SCS. We will be working together.</p>

**Regional Advisory Working Group
December 10, 2010 Summary Notes**

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
	<p>emerging BCDC and Air District policies, how will that be used as a filter in terms of where growth should/can occur?</p> <p>How does either of those issues differ from being identified as a filter?</p> <p>Regarding planned affordable housing, having housing for a range of incomes is central to creating complete communities. Concerned that the metric does not really get at that. It would be useful to look at what policies are in place. We need to assess which PDAs are really planning for affordable housing, and which are not.</p> <p>The assessments asked those questions, but concerned that as the metric is described, it is not hitting the data that was collected in the assessment.</p> <p>This is a really useful framework. This is our first bite at the apple, and we will be doing this every four years. In terms of which areas are most useful to inform the SCS growth distribution, we are looking at a growth plan for the next generation. To answer what we can do in the next 25 years, the first two columns are best for the long term, shorter term, and the first two buckets of the 25-year distribution. Putting actual transit and operating dollars into places that are ready now, is an important distinction.</p> <p>Good start. What investments are needed to identify those areas</p>	<p>Regarding the transportation question, the modeling process will look at the relationship between certain approaches to growth. We will measure impacts on the transportation system, both existing and future.</p> <p>We have really been looking at land use-specific and financing-specific issues for neigh development assuming T2035. Additional information that may be in the next RTP is not in this process; as such it is not described as a filter.</p> <p>Regarding the issue of transit capital, the local jurisdictions did not answer that consistently. This will be assessed elsewhere.</p> <p>Those were the subset questions in the assessment. One of the biggest challenges will be subsidies for building affordable housing.</p> <p>We will have to take a closer look.</p>

**Regional Advisory Working Group
December 10, 2010 Summary Notes**

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
	<p>that are most ready to accommodate growth? Concerned that this could result in de facto redlining of certain areas, e.g. how schools are performing, that's caused by issues of wealth distribution. Caltrans provided a grant to Oakland to study International Blvd. potential for TOD. Consultant was surprised to learn that only one market-rate housing project was in the works for the entire corridor. We need to make sure we are not writing off areas where it makes sense to have density and growth, proximity, etc. They have all kinds of things going for them, but they may be lacking in terms of readiness for market-rate development.</p> <p>Location and planned growth are helpful for figuring out distribution; readiness and completeness seem useful to figure out how to get from A to B. This is a terrific step that can be useful in many ways outside the SCS. Agency staff can look at the completeness issue and figure out what to offer to PDAs. Also concerned about the lack of focus on jobs, the questions about how this will be used in the process, and the need to push for PDAs beyond only 40 percent of the growth. One thing is missing: parking and TDM. Free parking is a huge driver of how much people drive. We need to make sure that parking isn't thrown off the mix. Would like to see this as a metric.</p> <p>Thinking about The Crossings in Mountain View as probably as important as intersections in terms of walking.</p> <p>Caltrans also wants better parking management and more TDM measures. Jurisdictions about that should be rewarded. We are concerned about impact of traffic on our facilities.</p>	<p>We will look at this as a potential metric.</p>
<p>Proposal for Formation of a Regional Equity</p>	<p>Thanks to staff for committing to time to do this task.</p> <p>There is a concern about knowing how the input from this committee will influence the decisions. Please share any lessons</p>	<p>The way the federal regulations lay out when to do an equity analysis is at the end of the process. You cannot get meaningful</p>

**Regional Advisory Working Group
December 10, 2010 Summary Notes**

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Response
Working Group	<p>learned from past experiences. How can this committee really inform the decision making that happens?</p> <p>Make sure this is something that is not just taken serious at regional level, but is something that is done by the county agencies as well. Suggest that one area of work for this area is to engage with the CMAs, provide assistance and make suggestions on how to do their share of equity analysis. Consider developing countywide TSP plans or develop other inputs for the SCS.</p> <p>Clarify the function of this group. Are you looking only for NGO participation?</p>	<p>input then. You end up with a lot of limitations. By moving up the process and sequencing it through a number of steps we hope to get more meaningful input.</p> <p>We are looking for a diverse group, historically has not included transit operators, Caltrans and CMAs. We want to see a shared dialogue. Would like to see participation from the CMAs, land use planning directors, senior staff, transit agencies, etc.</p>
Equity Analysis Framework	<p>Would like a better understanding of how this equity process might inform the RHNA process as well.</p> <p>We need to marry these overall capacities.</p>	