

**Sustainable Communities Strategy  
Regional Advisory Working Group  
Meeting Notes  
May 3, 2011**

Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<p><b>Alternative Scenarios Brainstorming</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The three alternative scenarios that were presented are satisfactory.</li> <li>● Are 267,000 additional housing units included?</li> <li>● So, you're carrying forward the IVS and trying to achieve that target? You are going to try to achieve the 900,000 units in the Sustainable Communities Strategy? What is the regional housing target?</li> <li>● The third land use scenario sounds like suburban sprawl. I think you can test that using capture ratio. There might be a hybrid where you take the best of all three land use scenarios to develop something that meets the overall objectives.</li> <li>● The Initial Vision Scenario did not meet the greenhouse gas target. We need to be looking at something else besides just land use patterns.</li> <li>● The three alternative scenarios seem like a good place to start.</li> <li>● At what point are you going to be doing outreach to the business community?</li> <li>● The time line that you have shown on the Alternative Scenario Timeline is different the timeline presented at the Housing Methodology Committee meeting.</li> <li>● I am confused about the housing need number. Will the plan attempt to achieve the 900,000 housing units that have been identified in the IVS? Will financial and other constraints be considered? How will that be reconciled and dealt with in the scenarios.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The SCS will include a scenario that meets the regional housing target for the Sustainable Communities Strategy. The housing target will need to be modified to account for the 2010 Census.</li> <li>● It is envisioned that the scenarios will consider significant employment centers that currently have very little housing and the relationship of communities along key transportation corridors relative to employment location.</li> <li>● We have started to work with a business community working group.</li> <li>● We will present the scenario results in the fall. Our aim is to present the preferred scenario in January. The schedule we presented today is correct.</li> <li>● The initial housing target was over 900,000 units. Some modification will occur. The SCS requires that we identify a land development pattern to accommodate housing. A forecasted development pattern that is more constrained also needs to be developed. It is the intent of the regional agencies to develop a forecast that is realistic given constraints and as close to</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● An additional scenario should be a hybrid of the three presented.</li> <li>● The second alternative scenario should look at jobs/housing fit. We have more tools for housing allocations and we should focus on how we are locating the housing growth.</li> <li>● There needs to be some consideration relative to historical growth. The first scenario is our closest fit. Jobs are good, housing is bad.</li> <li>● Not all areas that are served by transit are equally ready for growth.</li> <li>● How do you propose to do the jobs analysis and how detailed do you want this to be? How are you intending to frame this analysis? The PDAs around transit are going to encourage retail and service jobs. Will there be attempts to try to target different job sectors?</li> <li>● We would support whichever alternative reduces vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle trips.</li> <li>● How do you define jobs/housing fit? There needs to be a match between wage levels and the affordability of nearby housing. How is this different from job/housing balance?</li> <li>● With regard to the timeline, when do you envision engaging the federal agencies EPA and DTA? Where and when would a dialogue with CARB start about how things are shaping up.</li> <li>● I am not sure how different the transportation policies will be between the different land use scenarios.</li> <li>● Where are we going to model the road and transit system improvements that we can actually afford? In the financially constrained scenarios, is there a way to identify funding sources?</li> <li>● The suburban scenario should be considered with parking or road pricing.</li> <li>● The opposite of growth is not growing. Part of this should identify the areas where growth should not occur. We should provide incentives to not grow.</li> <li>● The suburban strategy needs to be considered in tandem with transit incentives.</li> </ul>	<p>the housing target as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● An employment sector analysis that considers key job sectors will be developed. The capacity of housing rich areas to increase employment will be considered. We will also try to gain a better understanding of what incentives would be needed to attract various employment types to different locations.</li> <li>● We will be conducting a jobs-housing fit analysis. The approach is under development.</li> <li>● It is an ongoing discussion with CARB.</li> <li>● We are starting a dialogue with the federal agencies. When we identify the preferred alternative, they will be involved.</li> <li>● The modified IVS will look at employment and more transportation policies and measures will be identified to help achieve targets. If we have to pull back somewhat on the land use, we will still have other measures to achieve the targets. We will look at a combination of inputs for all scenarios.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<p><b>Project Performance Assessment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● If you tripled transit, how much would VMT be impacted? You need to isolate the variables and evaluate the changes on the margin. Variables include land use, transit, and pricing. Separating the variables using the new model would be helpful to meet the 15 percent reduction.</li> <li>● Policy at the local level will continue to control land use. Revenue generating uses are important at the local level and this should be the reality that informs our scenarios.</li> <li>● How do we equalize revenues with tax sharing? This should come into the mix in the financially feasible stage. There are numerous tools that localities can use to incentivize housing production. I would like staff to consider if localities would consider linkage fees and inclusionary zoning and devoting general funds towards housing.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● It is important to consider the health costs with respect to air emissions and respiratory diseases.</li> <li>● I like the PDA assessment and it is very simple to read. I would encourage you to identify how well the assessment would achieve jobs/housing fit.</li> <li>● The benefit cost analysis needs a gross regional product assessment.</li> <li>● Are projects all made up in the analysis?</li> <li>● The slide that says \$50 million and regional impacts – how do you define a regional impact?</li> <li>● We would like to see transit demand and multimodal options showing up more clearly as the type of thing that would be considered favorably. Look at how it impacts mode-share and travel options. I like the benefit cost analysis.</li> <li>● How are smaller projects going to be assessed?</li> <li>● Would replacing bridges be assessed on its own or as a project?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Emissions will be looked at and we will assess those benefits based on the health facts and impacts of those emissions.</li> <li>● We proposed doing the maintenance impacts iteratively. We don't have the Gross Regional Product estimates for the scenarios yet. We are hoping to have that ready for the alternative scenarios later this year.</li> <li>● Yes, the projects are made up.</li> <li>● The idea is to capture projects that can be analyzed and referenced in the travel model. We have examples of plans and we can make that available. The regional impact has to do more with the scale of the impacts than the geography.</li> </ul>
--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The land use pattern is not meaningful unless we put our money towards it. I would encourage significant consideration for the PDA support criteria as we look at the performance assessment.</li> <li>● I like the adequate housing assessment criteria. I think we can use open space criteria specifics that are quantitative to quantify the open space benefits or impacts of future projects.</li> <li>● How does this assessment quantify location efficiency?</li> <li>● I don't see anything that is getting at the displacement issue. I am wondering if you are planning to capture displacement data. There are some things you could look at, such as deed restricted housing.</li> <li>● When the targets are being developed, we could do more as a region by focusing on serious injuries and facilities. With walking and biking increases, speed management will be important to reduce accidents.</li> <li>● If you do a mode shift from automobile to biking and walking -- more time would be spent traveling, so it is a benefit rather than a cost.</li> <li>● The lack of economic development is a large hole for sustainability in the region.</li> <li>● Are you looking at the percentage of time that is represented for the different types of travel modes?</li> <li>● I suggest that you add to street improvement and complete streets investment. Consider the increase in bicycles and pedestrians. Also, consider state of good repair.</li> <li>● Is the goal of this to tie into the SCS final scenario?</li> <li>● How do you measure transportation improvements that are not PDAs if the cost benefit approach does not take that into account?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Smaller projects will be taken through the targets assessment on a qualitative basis.</li> <li>● A cost-benefit analysis for those large projects will not be done, but we will also be doing a targets analysis. Most of the projects that are going through benefits analysis are things that increase transportation capacity in some way.</li> <li>● Transportation projects that are a good match with land uses will tend to reduce travel times and that will show up in your cost-benefit analysis. To the extent you can reduce VMT, you are going to reduce collisions and particulate matter emissions. This should show up on both the targets and the cost-benefit analysis.</li> <li>● Displacement and other equity considerations will be considered as part of the alternatives analysis.</li> <li>● Yes, we would include these results in the final scenario.</li> <li>● The cost-benefit analysis is not exclusive to PDAs.</li> <li>● We are trying to focus our resources wisely, because we can't do it all in the time that we have. We rely on our travel demand model to evaluate the impact of a project. An off-model analysis of regional projects will be conducted. The projects on the regional impact's list can be provided.</li> </ul>
--	--	--