

**Regional Advisory Working Group
January 4, 2011, Meeting Summary**

Section I: Revised Recommendations for Performance Targets

Question/Comments

Why were the auto and transit removed from Target 9? So the thought is that walking and biking trips will be to a closer destination? If I stop driving to lunch and walk, it takes me longer, but that's a good thing?

Response

We received a comment that Target 9 should be a combined target for all modes. People didn't want walking and biking excluded, so we thought it was simpler to express it as an average.

The concept is -- can we get people to where they want to go quickly and efficiently. We are trying to reduce the time it takes for people to get to where they want to go. This will be done through a combination of moving origins and destinations closer together, as well as transportation system improvements. There will be lots of analysis to determine how that will happen which will show the different modes.

Question/Comments

We fully support Target 6 as you have presented it this morning. I can also say as a planning director who deals with the implementation of a city centered General Plan on a regular basis, the devils in the detail. As you evaluate the target, I would encourage you to be very transparent about how you're approaching that and engage local governments as you go through that exercise for a little bit of a reality check from our perspective and we'd be happy to stay involved in that.

Question/Comments

Regarding reduction in premature deaths from particulate matter goal (3) -- is this goal predicated on the reduction of the emissions at the source or more from removing the people being exposed to the particulate matter?

Response

Because it is largely being measured at the regional level, it is largely going to reflect reductions from sources.

Question/Comments

This is good work and really reflects good thinking. I am concerned that some of the targets, although worthy, may be an overreach. Certainly, the targets should have relevance and pertinence with respect to SCS and RTP policy, but there has to be a reasonable expectation that they will actually influence outcomes with respect to SCS and RTP policy tools. So, I think the gross regional product and the transportation and housing cost distribution are affected by a lot of big macroeconomic trends. They are very difficult to influence from the standpoint of regional transportation sector or housing policy tools -- so, I would caution that. If we get the land use

right with respect to putting resources close to where people live and work, people will walk to those activities, rather than driving -- so that indirect effect should be recognized.

Question/Comments

Given that this is suppose to give us tools for measuring different scenarios and to meet the statutory requirements, I think it is a good mix of the 10 targets and we can certainly use it for that scenario measurement. We should go ahead with them as they are.

Question/Comments

I want to commend the committee that worked on this because it is a difficult task. Dave and Lisa did a great job in administering the committee. You've struck the right balance as far as pleasing everybody. Regarding Target 9, decreasing average per-trip time by 10 percent, I assume that this goal is regarding fixed trips and trying to make those quicker and more efficient. Their budge for travel is fixed. If people have a 35 minute budget for commuting and you reduce the time for a commute from 35 minutes to 15 minutes, the tendency is, they will move somewhere and situate themselves somewhere where they are comfortable with their 35 minute commute. They don't necessarily stay where they are. I assume that Target 9 is based on fixed origins and fixed destinations.

Response

We are drafting the methodology for all of the goals and we will have that information available and we would be happy to talk about it. I am not sure that we have thought about the distinction that you are making, so we'll give it some thought and get back to you.

Question/Comments

A comment on Target 9, travel time -- part of increasing the efficiency of the freeway system should include pricing and it doesn't necessarily mean expansion of the highways to achieve reduced travel time. It should include measures to spread trips more evenly throughout the day and incentivize people who have other options for transit.

Regarding Target 10, we want to voice strong support for retention of the maintenance target and including keeping distressed lane miles of State highways to less than 10 percent of total lane miles. It makes since to maintain what we have because that's an investment that we have already put into the system. We have state highway miles that are urban boulevards that connect to transit. A lot of serve buses and buses wear and tear on buses when hitting pot holes. If we want to attract people to live in the urban core, the transportation system should be maintained and smooth and easy to use. We have new roads in the suburbs and we need to maintain what we have in the cities as well.

Question/Comments

We should be making sure that targets are measurable and can be linked to the RTP and SCS. There are a number of these goals that can be achieved through ways other than land use. For example, target number three and target number four. I think we want to make sure that we are trying to drive load split changes and I suggest that we be more explicit in trying to determine what those are. In terms of Target 9. If we are serious about increasing transit, I would suggest deleting auto modes from Target 9, but retaining target 10, because of the maintenance.

I want to make sure that we don't have unintended consequences from these kinds of goals with the work that BAAQMD is doing. I want to make sure that we know in advance what might be achieved if we implement these goals.

Question/Comments

I was late because the gross regional product is going up and I got stuck in traffic coming over here. The point being, some of these targets conflict with one another. I would build into this process the recognition that we will be monitoring the targets annually and adjusting them. There are some tolerances between them going forward and we should be honest about what might happen.

Question/Comments

Target 9 is very problematic to include autos. It is profoundly contradictory to the goal of SB375 and the mandate to reduce CO2s by reducing driving. It should be transit only in there. I don't think in a post carbon world that we should have decreasing time of driving as a goal. That is an outmoded goal. We need to be a lot more visionary and just look at reducing transit travel time.

Question/Comments

I would echo some of the comments about reducing auto travel time. One of the concerns that we had in our letter dated December 6th is insuring that the adequacy of supply is sufficient to meet demand. I am wondering if the indicators or the data summaries will provide this information and how that will be used. Weighting asset age by demand with respect to transit and wondering if that information will be available and wondering how it will be used in prioritizing.

Response

We have received letters and e-mails and may be behind in getting response due to the holidays. Yes, we will look at adequacy of supply in some of the indicator work and also in the data summary. In terms of weighting assets age by demand – the thought is, how we prioritize our investment is the subject of the analysis that we will do over the next two years. It is probably premature at this point to weight our target by usage. But, in terms of how we prioritize what kind of maintenance needs we are going to meet with our limited dollars -- that discussion will take place.

Question/Comments

Will that information on investment prioritization be made available?

Response

That is not something that we are going to provide in the scenarios, but should that be something that people want to look at when it comes for invest prioritization tradeoff discussion, we will be able to provide that information.

Question/Comments

If you go back to the smart mobility document, which I had been involved in commenting on, it goes back to his point about using fixed OD pairs and using those to compare alternatives. What you've done is something that is not consistent with smart mobility. Namely, you've turned it

into a target. Having been involved in five RTPs, I've never seen average travel times go down. As a target this is something that is unrealistic and that is a giant problem. For location efficiency, transit mode share is more appropriate. Smart mobility measures the match between transit and land use. There isn't a measure in this set of targets that evaluates the match between transit and land use. Transit mode share is far more appropriate in evaluating alternative SCS.

Question/Comments

Looking at the Target 1, which is focused on cars and light trucks, I have some concern that there needs to be a more integrated approach to goods movement issues. The goods movement has a big impact in CO2 emission, as well as the protection of jobs for working families and to the extent that is excluded, we might not be getting the most reasonable solution to addressing CO2 emissions and economic opportunity.

The studies that were done from Welfare to Work revealed that the most important factor for low income families to get access to jobs is their ability to have a car. We want analysis on what reducing the use of the automobile may mean for people who are in the lowest 20 percent of economic bracket.

We may displace industrial lands to places that are on the outside and that may do a disservice and negatively impact CO2 by placing those jobs further out. It makes a lot of sense to include industrial land use and jobs in the analysis.

Response

The transit sustainability review will inform the SCS. The TSP will be looking at how we make our transit system sustainable and not specifically at reducing transit time. We will look at how operating costs are not sufficient to meet cost today and in the future.

Under SB 375, our charge is to look at cars and light trucks – it is the standard metric. We will be calculating total emissions reduction from all sources. Preserving industrial lands and jobs is something that is very much on our minds, but not specifically addressed in the targets.

Question/Comment

Speaking to Target 1 -- why are we just looking at cars and trucks? Why aren't we looking at all uses?

Response

We will also be calculating total emissions reduction from all modes. Our target is consistent with the statutory resources.

Question/Comment

Regarding, Target 2 adequate housing, I am concerned that we are not including in the SCS something about the distribution of very low and low income housing and postponing that to the RHNA. The charge to offset populations of low income housing is a statutory requirement of the RHNA and the statutory housing requirements needs to be central to both the SCS and RHNA

processes. If we are trying to ensure that the SCS and RHNA are consistent, we need to bring that statutory requirement into the SCS process and make it central to both processes.

Response

We are going to be supplementing these performance measures with a set of adopted policies and these policies will help govern decision made on land patterns and then will be reflected somewhat through the measures. But, a lot of the work of the SCS will not be captured with the measures. For example, with the RHNA issues, we are creating an SCS and RHNA methodology committee starting at the end of January that is intended to merge both sets of policies at that point. The definitions or the tension between over concentration of poverty and affordability of housing are issues that need to get resolved through the policy.

Question/Comments

I recognize that your goal is not to please all of us, but to come up with a reasonable and internally consistent set of measure that doesn't displease to many people by too much. The greatest opportunities for improvement are with targets numbers 9 and 10. With Target 10, I think that we know that there is the reality that we don't have enough money to meet that goal of being able to get all of our system in good repair, or if we did, we would have nothing left for anything else. These should focus on the areas that the region and local governments see as the target for the focused growth. If we are going to focus on maintenance, let's make sure that we don't have distressed lane miles of State highways in areas where we have focused growth and that we reduce the transit asset age for places that are serving focused growth and the same thing with the pavement conditions index. That's where we need make sure our system is well maintained where we want people to be, otherwise we're driving people away from those areas.

With Target 9, there are lots of problems with the methodology. It is subject to the efficiency capture and I am surprised to hear that that wasn't something that went into the consideration, because that is a big deal. If you make it easier for people to get there, people will make longer trips or make trips that they wouldn't have normally made. It is really unclear rather this target would lead to a better world, which is what we are trying to get to with this. I get it that this is a simple target, but this target has a host of unintended consequences. I would suggest that Target 9 be changed so that it just focuses on transit. A mode share target would be better. It would be even better to decrease the average travel distance per trip.

Question/Comments

I think Target 9 has two different issues. Issue one is a transit issue -- reducing transit travel time by 10 percent. There is also the issue of reducing vehicle miles traveled by a certain percentage.

Question/Comments

We don't live in an all or nothing world. So to say that trying to reduce auto trips is an outmoded goal -- I strongly disagree with that and our planning directors do as well. So I think that any time you can shorten the amount of driving that someone does, it helps to achieve the overall goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Having shorter auto trips is a good thing and should not be eliminated as a goal. Having strategies to do that is important, so that it does become easier to walk to lunch instead of driving. I would encourage you not to remove the goal of shorter trips. For Solano County that is a critical matter that could help reduce greenhouse gases.

Response

So, is part of the issue measuring trip distance in time or in distance?

Question/Comment

Exactly, and it could be both.

Question/Comments

There is a mention of February to September 2011, as when we will be applying the targets to detailed scenarios. So, I wanted to follow up in regard to a letter dated December 9th about releasing raw technical data that will go into the iterations of the analysis. This would allow others that have resources to do research on targets and perform the analysis. Examples of the data that we had asked about are parameter calibrations, loaded networks, modes and market segments.

Response

Yes, we are happy to provide you data and we can sit down and talk about the analysis and methodologies.

Question/Comments

Education could be added to implementation strategies for Targets (1), (4), (5), (6), (7) and (10). Bicycle education classes could be included in implementing targets.

Question/Comments

I have been a bus rider, riding public transit for 50 years. Thank you for looking into encouraging public transit. For me to come from Santa Rosa to here, it takes three to four hours. Look into making buses and transit systems more attractive for the users so that people will want to get out of their cars and use public transit. Reducing greenhouse gases and reducing the unemployment can also be achieved with better transit. Just think of public transit riders and cheer us on this year.

Question/Comments

With Target 9, you can achieve a decrease in auto travel time without increasing driving through full roadway pricing. You could spread trips more evenly throughout the day, but also incentivize people to travel through other modes. So if there are equity concerns, there is potential to deal with that in various ways, such as a subsidy program for low income people that could possibly be dealt with through fast track cards and how they are distributed and the revenues that are generated could be used to support transit. There are ways of achieving these goals and getting multiple benefits, as well as being consistent with the target of decreasing carbon emissions.

Question/Comments

There is a need to include the RHNA goal for distribution of fair share housing with the SCS. How can the SCS include policies with an aim towards fair share housing if that is not one of the goals that we layout here? These are the policies that we are going to put in place to support our selected scenario. Regarding including a fair share housing in the SCS -- the SCS is distinct from

the RHNA, there are resources tied to the SCS. As we know, the RHNA affordable housing rarely gets built, only 30 percent of it gets build. So by including it as an SCS target explicitly, we offer an opportunity to use the policy levers and resources that are available through the RTP to further a fair-share distribution of affordable housing. Furthering fair-share housing is not only a RHNA goal; it is a mandate for all federal funding. It is passing the buck to wait to handle this in the RHNA. We need to consider this in our allocation of all federal resources.

I want to suggest that these targets be made flexible per the findings of the equity analysis given the fact that not very many equity targets are included. These targets should be made flexible given the equity concerns.

Response

These performance measures, which are a list of 10, are responsive to what our potential modeling capabilities are in terms of being able to demonstrate something through our data sets that would respond to a set of policies. But it is the set of policies that will be the most meaningful to the process – policies for how land will be developed, policies for how transportation funding should be programmed. There are many issues left to be resolved, even with the adoption of these performance measures and you will see that the application of various policies will affect the performance measures. But these performance measures do not dictate how the SCS or the RTP will be built.

With performance measure 9, the efficiency of the entire transportation system is included in this target. There are many policies that have yet to be decided with respect to how to achieve that goal. All of that analysis has yet to be done and they all have to be analyzed over the course of the next two years. We are going to try to make the link with jobs housing fit and economic growth.

This is not dispositive of a lot of issues that are being raised, it is just a milestone in the process and it is our best attempt to use some of our modeling tools to be able to assist us.

This is going to go to the joint committee on January 14. The agenda packet will be out this Friday. You can look for it on the MTC website.

Question/Comments

How does MTC and ABAG staff intend to frame this? Will there be a deeper discussion in terms of policies and other components of the SCS and RTP. It is going to be important for stakeholders to understand what additional levers are involved in this process.

Response

Yes

Question/Comments

Will the staff continue with the recommendations that it brought in without taking into account the discussion today?

Response

What we brought in today is our draft recommendations. We have until Friday, January 14th to finalize them. We take into consideration the comments we heard today and the comments we've heard over the last several months from all stakeholders. I can't say for sure that there are no changes and I can't say for sure what the changes will be. We will have a revised recommendation by Friday.

Question/Comments

I am trying to find out if this process had a potential to change the staff's recommendation.

Response

This process has been going on over the course of a year and it has had a significant influence on what the proposed final targets look like. There will continue to be some influence and there will be some in depth discussion at the committee meeting.

Section II: School Performance**Question/Comments**

Given regional agencies lack of jurisdiction over school, we see California schools ranking 48 out of 50. We as planning agencies want to influence process related to schools. Can we have planners and these overlapping agencies participate in the schools governance. If we can get that jurisdiction, I think its one way to start.

Question/Comments

Regarding yield by product type -- this is the most important from a planning stand point. How do we incentivize multifamily housing developers to build larger units for families? The multifamily housing is usually one and two bedrooms. What types of policies did jurisdictions put in place to encourage larger units in multifamily housing?

Question/Comments

I found it interesting that you did not use the word segregation. Has there been a challenge with regards to segregation and desegregation of schools. What is necessary for bringing school planning as part of healthy community that can be a model in the Bay Area for many other communities?

Response

Schools are more segregated now than when they were desegregated by law because of how people have arranged themselves in a land use pattern. That is probably one of the critical issues at the core of this analysis, but we have not discussed it previously.

Question/Comments

I would recommend that when we move forward with the regional equity working group that this be made a priority and also looking at the relationship between schools and housing opportunity as an important nexus.

The role of school planning in relationship to producing healthy land use and housing patterns – I am wondering if you have thoughts on how that dynamic could take place.

Response

We are working with Center for Cities and Schools to do case studies of places where there has been an effort to focus on school districts and strengthening their connections to the neighborhood. School quality is related to what happens within the schools, but also to what happens outside the schools. To the extent that the SCS is successful in creating sustainable mixed income neighborhoods, we would expect improvements in the schools as well. We might want to name areas with lower school quality as one of the obstacles to creating sustainable mixed income neighborhoods. Some of the areas with lower school quality have seen recent improvement. At this point we wanted to present to you our findings and hear from you.

Question/Comments

I was pleased to see many of the findings. Our city was able to successfully protect a challenge to our rent stabilization ordinance by a very wealthy developer because removing the ordinance would have impacted the school population significantly in those areas. As you refine the analysis, is there an API difference between charter schools and noncharter schools. Are there any impacts that you've seen in areas with rent stabilization ordinances? Is there any significance in impacting the yield? What type of partnerships or models are available that we could learn from?

Question/Comments

School access is a key issue. Is there private data coming and have you run into obstacles getting private data. Since San Francisco's private school population is higher than average, we are very interested in that data.

Have you had any information on quality of safety of trip access to schools, such as sidewalks availability and the security of transit to schools?

Response

We haven't gone through the private schools data to the level of detail that we have gone through the public schools.

We were not talking about the safety of the walk as part of the schools assessment, but we were looking at the ability to walk (the JS analysis). We were looking at safety as an indicator for the SCS in terms of violent crimes or property crimes in an area because that would be a predictor of rather or not children or adults felt comfortable walking or taking public transit. We haven't connected it to the schools piece. We have only suggested that maybe it would make a good indicator.

Question/Comments

It is hard to underestimate how important education is to the local and national economy. Collaboration and using best practices should be apart of PDA development and social economic and social cultural development. Education is the foundation of good region and a good community.

Question/Comments

The single most important thing that can be done to increase housing in Oakland would be to improve schools. This may be an issue of using transportation money to help budgets work in schools that have limited resources.

Question/Comments

In Oakland we have six PDAs, five of which are centered around BART stations and these are very transit accessible, located centrally in the region and have good proximity to jobs. Student achievement and financial resources is one of the major things that inhibit new development. Is there potential for a formal process in the SCS process to direct school funding to schools in PDAs, as much as transportation funding?

Question/Comments

We spent time thinking about tradeoffs between transportation and housing relationships, but for people with children, schools and housing is an important relationship. People trade off housing cost in areas where they are able to afford private schools, in areas with poor performing schools.

In transit accessibility to schools, there should be some disaggregation between primary and high schools. The issue of transit accessibility and safety becomes more of an issue with high schools than primary school kids.

Question/Comments

Regarding a study of International Boulevard, TOD potential in relation to Bus Rapid Transit, the results were stark for how much development is planned for the International corridor.

Comment about the presentation – rather than call the presentation study *School Performance* – call it *School Outcome*. The study should point to structural causes of poor performing schools. Schools with poor test scores don't necessarily have bad teachers or poor administrators, but the schools have a lot more challenges.

Question/Comments

The half mile transit circumference of transit and schools for walking is very important. In terms of safety indicators, it's not really sidewalks, its crossings. So, if you track injuries and fatalities at crossings, this is where injuries usually occur. You can increase family housing units to be a square footage requirement instead of a unit requirement, because it currently favors studios.

Question/Comments

Improving school quality is a long process and if we want to break generational poverty, we can offer them an opportunity to move into a better school district. This is at odds with the goals of gentrification and I want to acknowledge that there is an imperative in terms of addressing equity issues.