

**Sustainable Communities Strategy  
Regional Advisory Working Group  
Meeting Notes  
June 7, 2011**

Topic	Comment	Staff Response
<b>Plan Bay Area: Proposed Alternative Scenarios</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Need Clarity on graphics for 10 &amp; 11. Is the only target you are trying to show the GHG target? Is everything else just conceptual</li>   <li>● The plan has 10 targets. Maintenance -- Framing of scenarios is 80-85% of the RTP dollars on maintenance. Does 80% meet the target? Will it make a difference on how you can measure it in your target?</li> <li>● The bars set a line where the target is but you don't really know what the target is. Saying if you will meet the targets is premature. Define assumptions and variables carefully. Policy levers need to be clear. Look at all constraints – not just housing. See where all the differences are between the two options.</li> <li>● Graphics prejudice analysis. Graphics are not telling the story you're putting across. Gives wrong impression. Scenario 4 – ran out of room for climate. What is the urban core? Is there a map?</li>   <li>● Would like to see a scenario that meets RHNA &amp; Fair Housing Requirements. More information about why the Housing Methodology Committee and the RAWG appear to be so disjointed would be helpful.</li> <li>● On land use option #5, The Outer Bay Area Growth Model, would help to modify this so that it would center on housing and job growth around or next to regional transit opportunities.</li> <li>● On Process; when planning committee votes, staff will flush out the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For Scenario 1 &amp; 2 it's both GHG &amp; Housing targets. For 1 we didn't meet the GHG and for 2 we are trying to meet both.</li> <li>● On the next set of alternatives we will be trying to meet the 15% GHG target but we may not meet the housing target.</li> <li>● 80% does not meet that target. It will make a difference. Probably will not meet the maintenance target but will move us closer.</li>   <li>● Good points. While there are 5 options where we end up will be iterative</li>   <li>● Graphic was intended to be illustrative of the intent to meet specific goals. Good comment on the urban core. No clear definition with ABAG &amp; MTC. Alternative 4 looks to the inner core and Alternative 5 looks to the outer Bay Area.</li> <li>● The Plan is actually to release the details in October.</li> </ul>

	<p>details. What is the timeline for the public to comment / discuss the details?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● If we don't meet housing target, how do we meet GHG target? How far off are we from meeting GHG target? It would be helpful to see this in terms of percentages.</li> <li>● Alternative #5 appears business as usual.</li> <li>● Core concentration seems to be an urban utopia.</li> </ul> <p>General comment: TDM and parking pricing? Nervous when seeing yellow which suggest a lot of changes in social habit. Suggests getting further away from public's comfort zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Slide 11: We don't really know until the modeling is done if options will meet the targets. Graphic should be changed to say it is a goal.</li> <li>● Analytic tools to find ways on how RHNA to preferred scenario. We need another scenario which brings in the RHNA process or they won't match. Telecommuting, parking and TDM should be considered.</li> <li>● All of the work being done in the Housing Methodology Committee (HMC) on affordable housing needs to be brought back into how the scenarios are being developed. Either making that process explicitly part of #2 or creating another alternative which explicitly takes what were doing in the HMC and asks what that would look like as an SCS.</li> <li>● What does it mean to have an alternative with a housing target that doesn't meet RHNA? How can we have an SCS Preferred Scenario that doesn't meeting the housing target and yet have a RHNA that's consistent with the SCS which <i>has</i> to meet the housing target?</li> </ul> <p>● Can we please get a GIS map of the Initial Vision Scenario that shows where the growth is distributed graphically so that we can look at the regional footprint?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Analysis needs to be done – as we move Rollout to public is in October. RHNA: agency staff would agree that there is a deliberate effort to sync up with this. Bring back in future to connect the dots.</li> </ul> <p>● It really is a goal. Substantial amount of folks in the region that want it looked at.</p> <p>● There will be coordination RHNA and SCS. Looking at bar graphs – blue/green/yellow are unclear. What are constrains for affordable housing? Roughly half requires a subsidy. Region doesn't have subsidy in place. Want approach aggressive enough to determine funding. Forecast needs to be based on reality. Haven't defined distributions in SCS in categories of income. How does it compare to outer bay area and its markets? Information and feedback we'll need on approaches to inform analysis.</p> <p>● Maps are currently being produced</p>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scenarios and transportation options: Recommend that you not include transportation option #5. Pair option for Outer Bay Area Growth with Investment Option 3. On Policy Initiative where “other” is noted – take out “other” and explicitly state what the scale up of TDM, Parking Policy or Climate Initiatives would be.</li> <li>● At BAPDA when the question came up about what “Housing target may not be met” meant, several of the directors said something like unrealistic numbers will disappear. Is there any control on how low the numbers may go when putting together scenarios?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● If it goes to 80-90 % Explain housing that will be displaced.</li> <li>● Concerned that proposed scenarios are not based on assumptions which everyone understands. Seems there should be 4 scenarios and the constraints should be applied to each of the 4. Thought comment about taking 80-85% investment – if there is not a realistic assumption it looks like a guess. Reiterated the need for maps.</li> <li>● Define what urban core and inner bay mean. Assumptions in general are something that we all need to see. Can’t make broad based assumption that putting jobs in the outer bay is a bad idea.</li> <li>● Important that scenario 5 shows growth happening in PDAs and supporting transit. Putting jobs in Solano county would mean that commutes are shorting which contributes to improvements in GHG.</li> <li>● Appreciates that staff recognize we won’t meet housing target. But, to get closer to the housing target, we will need to do better on the other targets as well.</li> </ul> <p>Requests to see it made explicit what suite of policy options tools are planned to bridge the gap to 15%. The combination of policy tools and resources you can put into the mix will change what target we can attain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scenarios – Option 3 – hoping there would be guidance on how much we can adjust past FOCUS initiative. Would there be limitations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Probably not as low as ½. Feedback is not sending us that way. Some numbers work – depending on resources. The attempt is to really show where the region needs to go and also have a forecast which is connected. Direct relationship with forecast that is understood by people in the region.</li> <li>● It will have to be modeled.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

	<p>if a community wants to change their focus (i.e., from jobs to housing)? Needs to be a limit on regressing from past FOCUS work. Interested in looking at ways to manage the lane capacity in the Bay Bridge corridor to encourage HOVs. Interested in working in pedestrian improvements in some transportation option bundles. FPI – SF has put forth an idea around a transit performance initiative. They have put together a TPI version of the FPI and propose it be included conceptually in as many of the alternatives as possible, especially #4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● #5 noticed there is inclusion of expansion beyond Resolution 3434. Main concern transit expansion policy discussion is needed at the regional level. Have planning work while looking at TSP – reopening and expanding Resolution 3434 what projects and policies will look like.</li> <li>● Policy initiatives – road pricing – favor exploring that before electric vehicle opportunities. What might that look like. Seeking clarity.</li> <li>● Concerned about decision makers looking at chart and saying they will use just the yellow. Hold it constant and not make it look like we can expand it. Communities who have not PDAs/GOAs will want to grow. Should be back-up to say if you grow jobs and housing must grow transit as well.</li> <li>● Slide 10 – disappointed only 1 scenario achieves both housing and GHG targets. IVS met one target. Can we add policies to that? Consider the full suite of policy options to meet housing target. Support that land use patterns follow the same methodology as HMC before the RHNA process. Whichever the total number is, the pattern of distribution in at least one of the scenarios, should meet the pattern of distribution being discussed in the HMC that takes into account both the sustainability and the equity and fair share pieces. Having good conversation on the big picture of the scenarios – is it possible to have an opportunity to get into some of the details over the coming months?</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Will each scenario incorporate RHNA land use distribution by Population distribution by income?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Yes</li> </ul>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● For Ashley – When you run the model, will you explain how you will modify the transit network to take out the transit routes or reduce frequency or considering the impact to riders if maintenance issues occur?</li> <li>.</li> <li>● For Ken: Do you think sb375 allows an SCS that uses one land use assumption to meet the housing target and uses a different land use assumption to meet the GHG target?</li> </ul> <p>● –If we don’t meet the hourly target we should be doing an APS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Scenario 1 - why not add yellow bars policies and see where you get. In the policy initiative it seems the only way to get to GHG targets with land use scenario 5 is with an aggressive road and parking policy. On slide nine there used to be another bullet called Other pricing, which included road pricing. Where did it go? Request: put GIS data out on the website.</li> <li>● Slide 6 – Option 2 – suggests to involve people is to use a PDA as an example. Suggests the Roseland Sebastopol Road PDA. Won’t get political will without visual with maps ext. Slide 8 – #3 &amp; 4 – asks us to drop #5. Infrastructure is bad – fix what you can and you’ll get more support. Involve the public!! Put examples out there!</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● First we will get land use development patterns for each scenario and will then work (in august) with consultants and transit operators who participate on the service tax, to get vision. Make sure we are in line with what they are doing when they do service planning.</li> <li>● Created in the first two scenarios the Initial Vision and the “Unconstrained Core Concentration” with the intent of saying, “How could the region identify areas that would house all the population in accordance with the calculation based on housing need.” In order to attain an adopted RTP and forecasted land pattern, we need to do a constraints overlay on both the housing and the transportation sectors. The components of this will be measured for GHG emissions. It is important when we identify the gap between our housing need and what we will forecast for housing that we are clear in our diagnosis of the reason for that and what the policy options might be to move that situation to a healthier condition.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Proposed scenario 2 don't put constraints on parking – just make the folks who drive, pay for the parking. People who ride transit shouldn't have to pay for parking through their taxes. Concerned about housing element as well.</li> <li>● When the analysis on the Alternative Scenarios is created and then presented, when / how will the public or the decision makers know what effect the outcomes will have toward a Preferred Scenario?</li>   <li>● Will the land use scenarios look at what would happen if there were more growth outside of the PDA/GOA areas; focused growth in a way that takes advantage of regional transit investments and other regional resources?</li>   <li>● Would it be Scenario 2 pushing that; and only in the urban core?</li>   <li>● You said that 60% of the TFC regional revenues would be considered committed and that the local would be considered discretionary but the memo said they would be considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● We will try to separate identified variables and assumptions as clearly as possible. We will be bringing key issues to this committee as well as key issues to policy makers and through public meetings onsite. Broad public meetings throughout the region will be scheduled after the release of the Alternative Scenario results in October. There will be opportunity for public input until the approval of the Preferred Scenario in February.</li> <li>● The core concentration will look at that as well as the input and feedback we are getting on the Initial Vision Scenario. We don't currently know what that will look like, however we will be looking at what the land use development options are in order to progress on land use, relative to the GHG target and with the housing target.</li> <li>● What is confusing people is looking at the range of approaches in the scenario concepts. The scenarios are distinct but are really a spectrum. i.e., Scenario 2 conceptually, will encompass growth in PDAs and Growth Opportunity Areas and other areas in other parts of the region. The Out Bay Area approach will include growth in the core of the region as well. It's only a question of the levels and the effect of those levels of growth.</li>   <li>● TFC Local (40%) is in committed; TFC Regional (60%); The Committed is .3 and discretionary is .1. This is based on input from the Air District.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<p><b>Plan Bay Area: Draft Revenue Projections</b></p>	<p>discretionary. Please clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Inflation rate; averaging 2 separate historical periods. Why wasn't a shift-shared approach as used in other forecasts. Page 1 of memo.</li> <li>● If assuming counties reauthorize sales tax are you also assuming that funding stays in those counties? How do you assume those funds will be spent?</li> <li>● Trying to tie it back to alternative scenarios. Scenarios will effect VMT, which affects gasoline consumption, which affects how much money you have to spend alternatives transportation investment plan.</li> <li>● Fuel prices – this assumes fuel prices increase of 8% over next decade and then drops to 3 %. What is the rationale? It seems that price inflation would accelerate.</li> <li>● Presumably this is required for RTP – Is there something similar required about housing in order to satisfy fiscal constraints for the SCS. Would like to see something similar on funding needs for affordable housing construction.</li> <li>● Assumptions – peak oil rising at an exponential rate. Worry about federal deficit – what affect might that have on federal discretionary spending.</li> </ul> <p>● Do you have somewhere, a compilation of fund sources shown on the summary slide, the amount for each fund source, committed or discretionary, what restrictions there are on the fund source and what expenditures that fund source was assigned to cover in Transportation 2035?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Request to see the materials for the RAWG meetings ASAP.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Trying to land between Bay Area and National Average.</li> <li>● Using the words committed and discretionary. There is regional discretion. Voters of each county will make decision.</li> <li>● Will take into consideration as to how we spend committed funds.</li> </ul> <p>● Forecast state revenue portion for RTPs. Based on available ratios out there. Based on information – from NPOs throughout the state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Yes. It is available as part of the Planning Commission packet at the MTC website.</li> </ul>
--	---	--