

Sustainable Communities Strategy  
**Regional Advisory Working Group**  
 Meeting Notes  
 March 1, 2011

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Staff Response
<p>“Current Regional Plans” Results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify how the new model reduces travel time.</li> <li>• Concerned the model assumes there is capacity on all transit lines to accept as many riders as desire to take it. Transit usage should be considered when making maintenance investment decisions.</li> <li>• Explain continued growth in in-commuting when SB 375 mandates the region to house all workers.</li> <li>• How will the unconstrained and the constrained visions be harmonized?</li> <li>• How is the amount of time spent walking or biking calculated?</li> <li>• What infrastructure is assumed in the “Current Regional Plans” scenario?</li> <li>• Will infrastructure strategies be analyzed as potential ways to meet the targets?</li> <li>• Why is there a reduction in jobs but not in households?</li> <li>• Where are MTC and ABAG staff recommendations for transportation investments originating from?</li> <li>• When the initial vision scenario is released, will the results be presented side by side with the “Current Regional Plans” results?</li> <li>• Will the success in reaching our targets be presented in the same manner as the “Current Regional Plans” results?</li> <li>• When will a revised forecast be presented?</li> <li>• Can the MTC model accurately measure non-infrastructure strategies?</li> <li>• Does “Current Regional Plans” reflect regional plans or general plans?</li> <li>• What does the model assume for changes in oil costs and the effect on transportation costs?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The model is more sensitive to all types of travel. Due to new considerations in the model, the model is better able to predict that people drive less.</li> <li>• MTC is looking into this constraint.</li> <li>• The Current Regional Plans scenario is based off of current general plans which do not have that constraint. Even if housing for workers is available, workers may still chose to live outside the region.</li> <li>• It is still unclear at this point.</li> <li>• All results are based on MTC’s model. It does not take into account any sources of exercise other than walking or biking for transportation purposes.</li> <li>• Assumes the investments in T2035 with a reduced HOT lane network.</li> <li>• Yes, however, additional funding to add large infrastructure projects is limited and infrastructure has not been shown to provide a significant GHG reductions in past analyses.</li> <li>• Relative job opportunities draw households to the region. With the economy being bad everywhere, the Bay Area still has a similar draw as before the recession. It is possible that a higher percentage of these new households will be unemployed and/or there will be a higher percentage of retirees.</li> <li>• The initial vision scenario will focus on land use changes, potentially with increased headways for transit but no other transportation changes. The transportation investment decisions will follow at a later date. Any changes in assumptions will be fully disclosed.</li> <li>• The results will not be presented side-by-side with the Current Regional Plans results to enable the discussion to focus on the vision rather than the current state of planning.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternate reporting for targets 6 and 9a is not consistent with the reasons for adopting the targets as worded. Time spent on transit should be considered since shorter trips/denser development is desired. <i>Amount</i> of land being developed outside of urban growth boundary is important, not the <i>number</i> of parcels.</li> <li>• Conduct model runs that consider the available funding for transit.</li> <li>• On average it takes 1.5 workers per household to purchase and live in a house in the Bay Area. Workers per household results should be reported.</li> <li>• How sensitive is the model to the cumulative effects of increases in interchange capacity?</li> <li>• The description of the initial vision scenario as strictly changes in land use is not what has been presented to elected officials. Memos to describe this should be prepared by MTC/ABAG in advance of the Initial Vision Scenario release.</li> <li>• Presented projections for GHG reductions change too many variables at once. Only true model runs should be presented. Present the difference in emissions from changing models without varying the demographic information at the same time.</li> <li>• The target that shows an increase in transit time is misleading. Improving transit to outlying area access should not be portrayed as a negative.</li> <li>• Transportation Demand Management strategies may have a larger role in this resource constrained plan.</li> <li>• Reconsider focusing growth along the Caltrain corridor due to funding shortfalls.</li> <li>• Recommend an analysis of the GHG reductions from each dollar invested in affordable housing.</li> <li>• Recommend presenting total increases in VMT and reductions in GHG emissions rather than/in addition to per capita changes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes.</li> <li>• When the preferred vision scenario is adopted.</li> <li>• It depends. It models parking pricing and telework very well. Strategies that are not accurately modeled have consultants looking at better ways to model them and ways to analyze them off-model.</li> <li>• In the near term (till 2015), these results reflect general plans. After that time frame, policy assumptions from the regional plans are used.</li> <li>• All MPOs in California are using the same DOE long-term forecasts for oil prices.</li> <li>• Noted that the extra information was a distraction.</li> <li>• MTC is conducting these runs. The results will be incorporated into the scenarios.</li> <li>• The high number of retirees is decreasing the number of workers per household without affecting the ability of homeowners to continue to live in the Bay Area.</li> <li>• The model cannot directly model this, but it can be represented by an increase in capacity on the roadway.</li> </ul>
Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Staff Response
Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is contained in the outreach tool kit?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tool kit will allow elected officials in each county to</li> </ul>

Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will special districts be treated the same as elected officials?</li> <li>• Was the response to the community based organization outreach RFP regionally representative?</li> <li>• Elected officials do not believe that the initial vision scenario is their vision. They feel this is a top-down process.</li> <li>• Marin is creating an SB 375 educational video. Will the regional agencies be creating a video?</li> <li>• Publicize public CMA meetings through flyers on buses or in newspapers to make them more accessible to the public.</li> <li>• When obtaining scenario feedback allow for open ended questions to ensure that the full range of implementation options are considered.</li> </ul>	<p>conduct their own meetings with the appropriate information on their county. For example, there will be video clips for each county and standardized forms for public comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special districts will be included in some meetings.</li> <li>• Yes, every county except for Napa was represented.</li> <li>• County leadership meetings were conducted in each county and officials were informed of the approach and were asked how they would like to be involved. This feedback was used to inform the initial vision scenario. Efforts will be made to continue to engage the elected officials.</li> <li>• A video can already be found on the OneBayArea website.</li> </ul>
Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Staff Response
Public Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit usage is declining due to service cuts, less efficient systems, and less comfortable buses. In a recession transit should be made a priority, not be cut. Consider the user experience.</li> </ul>	

J:\PROJECT\2013 RTP\_SCS\RAWG\2011\03\_March 2011\RAWG\_Summary\_Notes\_030111.doc