

**Sustainable Communities Strategy
Regional Advisory Working Group
Meeting Notes
April 5, 2011**

Topic	Questions/Comments Heard	Staff Response
<p>Sustainable Communities Strategy & Initial Vision Scenario</p>	<p>Does the IVS meet the reasonable requirements that SB 375 put on us as being realistic land use, pricing and transportation assumptions that are suppose to occur?</p> <p>I request that staff prepare your view of what the federal reasonable requirements are and how you will apply them to the IVS.</p> <p>The IVS came out about the same time as we were to do the call for projects. We have not had an opportunity to respond to the IVS. How will you adjust your process on the RTP to give us a chance to address the IVS?</p> <p>I would like MTC to put forward a revised schedule that shows how we may influence the project list in relation to the SCS, so that we have a better idea of how these things come together. The RTP did not address getting money into the PDAs, which is critical, and I don't see how we can address that.</p> <p>Going forward, it is important to clarify the relationship between regional funding policy and land use policy? Our input on the IVS will depend on the answer to that question. We are interested in the distribution of affordable housing. We are interested in the quality of</p>	<p>There is work ongoing on that and as soon as we have an answer, we will present it.</p> <p>The call for projects is pretty wide open. We have asked the counties to stay within a generous budget and to leave it open enough so that people could submit a lot of creative ideas. If there are ideas that come up in the scenarios, there is a way to work them in. In May, there will be discussion about how MTC might make regional transportation dollars available.</p> <p>We can respond with some specifics and a more detailed look at the schedule.</p>

	<p>these growth areas. The discussions about how MTC might make transportation money available for PDAs is important.</p> <p>We want to see where the affordable housing is located. The equity working group for the SCS gave input on how these metrics should be amended. We want to request that these pages be amended to reflect that feedback.</p> <p>Would you assemble an order of magnitude with cost for implementation and provide feedback from local governments. I am concerned about the loss of process if something is coming in October and how useful would it be if you were iterating earlier in terms of alternative strategies.</p> <p>It sounds like the land use and transportation end are not talking to each other that much.</p> <p>To the extent that more of the growth is in PDAs, we support that. Regarding resources, we would advocate for more resources for transportation maintenance. Is the current slide representing the T35 investment plus something else? There are roadway projects that are not shown on the graph?</p> <p>It is the same transit network, but with more capacity?</p> <p>The connection between the IVS and the RHNA process is unclear. Are we going to be dealing with two different numbers. Greater clarity on the jobs numbers is needed. I want to understand the water and sewer capacity and infrastructure limitations and how they will be dealt with.</p>	<p>We are evaluating projects and defining and analyzing detailed scenarios between now and October. When that analysis comes together, we will start to put together the synthesis for the draft plan.</p> <p>You will see that in the alternative scenarios, the land use and transportation ends will talk to each other.</p> <p>This slide is about capacity of transit not about dollars invested. The light blue slide is what is in T35 and it would include interchange to the extent that they add capacity for vehicles that can carry people. The dark blue bar is the increase in transit capacity with more trains running.</p> <p>Yes, we didn't put in more trains.</p> <p>Our next discussion item will get to that. The employment is not location specific and we have not done that sort of analysis yet. Jobs/housing fit could potentially help achieve GHG emissions goals. There is more analysis that we still need to do.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Have you done enough analysis to find out how we can get the next three percent reduction in GHG emissions.</p> <p>We could use the IVF to determine how growth could be accommodated. We have been looking at 25% housing growth for Contra Costa County and the IVS says 40%. If we are doing 40%, it's probably a 50 year forecast. We are going to have to get back to economically feasible goals and the annual production rates for housing need to be grounded in some kind of reality.</p> <p>The great change in housing tax law in 1989 contributed to the drop in production of affordable housing. The tax law eliminated dollars for affordable housing. Absent some significant change in federal tax policy, I would not expect us to get back to historic housing production levels.</p> <p>We are trying to figure out what it means for the RHNA process to be consistent with the SCS and the distribution of the numbers for affordable housing. It is important to see what are the implications for the distribution of affordable housing and how it relates to some of the concerns around RHNA.</p> <p>I know that we are working with an unconstrained model. I am wondering what happens if we fail. Are you going to model interregional commuting as part of the region's responsibility?</p> <p>Are you looking for opportunities to locate sites for new housing?</p> <p>A discussion about the pattern of housing distribution is</p>	<p>If you have specific economic analysis about how we move to feasibility that is the type of information that we are looking for. Consequences of not meeting housing need and what it means for the economy are being studied. We need information on the difficulty it will take for our region to accommodate the housing that we need.</p> <p>We do model interregional commuting.</p> <p>Yes, we are looking for ideas at this point on how we have alternative scenarios for growth in the region.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>needed.</p> <p>New infrastructure is important to meet the demand within the IVS. How much will we grow in population vs. households?</p> <p>Resources are needed for areas that are willing and able to provide affordable housing. We should consider ways to leverage public health dollars.</p> <p>Has there been a sensitivity analysis done related to per capita GHG emissions increase and population increase?</p> <p>What is the impact of the increased housing growth? If you increase the growth of housing by 42 percent, what happens to the GHG emissions. TDM and pricing and distribution of housing and jobs will help achieve per capita reductions in GHG.</p> <p>What is missing from the IVS is a map that shows where the growth is taking place and the impact of the distribution of growth in the region. A regional map comparing growth and the distribution of growth in different parts of the region is needed. Map showing housing growth and distribution.</p> <p>The assumption in the IVS is that a lot of people are going to be using public transit?</p>	<p>If we continue to have the growth pattern that we currently have, then we would significantly increase GHG emissions.</p> <p>What the model shows is that people use transit at a higher rate because of where they are located.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Alternative Scenarios Brainstorming</p>	<p>We agree that Santa Clara may have substantial growth. It looks like it is ambitious to put growth in PDAs and there might be a carrying capacity issue. We should look at other growth opportunity areas near transit. We have other job growth areas that are not anticipated to be served by a major transit agency, but they are required to have a shuttle service to take a substantial number of employees to transit centers. I would explore additional opportunities for low cost feeder routes to transit stations.</p> <p>One way to link the RTP and SCS is to identify the transit improvements that are needed to meet the growth. This would help to prioritize and link land use and transportation.</p> <p>A presentation on the financial constraints would be useful for the committed projects and maintenance. If people have ideas about moving jobs to the suburbs, how do you avoid expanding the region. Because when you expand jobs, you end up moving housing further out.</p> <p>It would make sense to invite businesses to the table such as Google and E-Bay and find out what they are looking for. We have employers who are big players and we are trying to plan around them and we don't know a lot about them. Another group that we need to talk to are developers. We need to bring in a new funding source like bankers, otherwise, we are planning in a vacuum. We should invite those people to the table.</p> <p>I would like to see an alternative analysis that allows for some flexibility on the transportation side. Each county should see what that would look like on a county by</p>	
---	---	--

	<p>county basis.</p> <p>On the slide about the three scenarios – if you take that approach, you are not going to know which variable caused what. You should show what happens when you isolate variables with the tour based model. Before we start mixing different variable, what happens to VMT and GHG reductions. Go back to the matrix you had, so we can see.</p> <p>Of the 10 performance measures, GHG is king. Our three alternatives have to be way different, not just a little different. This will help us narrow things down. It would be helpful to have a scenario of how the region has grown over the last 20 years and use this as a predictor of what may happen in the future. What carrots or sticks can we use to maximize our preservation of public transit. Also, transit does not just include public transit. There are a number of people that use vanpools or carpools that don't get counted. We need to make sure that we capture that. We should examine the economic strategy and types of jobs that we will attract.</p> <p>Where do we stand on committed project that the commission is considering?</p> <p>People change jobs more frequently than they change housing, so you end up increasing the suburb to suburb commute. The problem that I see with the third scenario is how far do we have to go and how effective would this be. Look at transit iteratively because not all transit performs the same and we should look at its performance.</p>	<p>It is where it was before, except for the sales tax portion.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>I agree with the point about engaging the employer and how they locate jobs. It is also important to look at where operators have the option to add to their routes. We should look at what are the factors that improve transit use and transit mode share.</p> <p>There needs to be a scenario that is focused on reducing car trips and a lot more emphasis on travel demand share including pricing and development around transit nodes.</p> <p>On land use, I am having difficulty visualizing the IVS. Is it possible to map the housing growth numbers so we can see where the growth is occurring. It would be helpful to see graphically what these scenarios imply with land use and transit overlays.</p> <p>Moving towards a transit oriented world is way off in the distance to some people. There should be at least three different scenarios and they should be significantly different from each other. We should definitely look at a scenario like the suburban jobs/housing balance. Looking at this alternative would allow us to determine why that doesn't work. Jobs/housing subsidies would be critical. There isn't going to be one solution to reach GHG. Vanpools and carpools and shorter trips should be looked at and developing the political will to make that happen.</p> <p>The private sector is providing vanpools to meet gaps in service. Can the level of growth change? We need to weave in the financial resources with the three scenarios, including fiscal or tax policy related to development and business formation. Economic development best practices would be of interest. We should look at varying levels of growth based on the ability of the region to</p>	<p>We are starting to have some of those conversations with employers.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>create new revenue streams. On the TSP, we would like to see more on that and CMAs would like to be involved.</p> <p>We should define urban and suburban and jobs/housing fit and urban core. The distinction between places is important. Jobs/housing fit makes the assumption that people live where they work, but people change jobs more than they change housing. We should look at employment distribution around a regional transit network. Commute shed mapping would be useful to see how interregional commute patterns are impacted. We should have both trend based and very distinct scenarios.</p> <p>We should have a sensitivity analysis where you only include the transit that you have the money to maintain.</p> <p>I support the idea of distinct scenarios and ones that are trends based. We should look at the potential audience for TOD. The TOD study is useful. How do we make suburbs use less GHG?</p> <p>The scenarios didn't speak to matching jobs to transit and that is a separate strategy. To what extent are our projects increasing GHG emissions. It would be desirable to study an alternative that didn't increase GHG.</p>	
--	--	--