



Regional Planning Partnership

Item #2

Action Summary February 26, 2014

Attendees:

Binu Abraham, SACOG	Aaron Hoyt, PCTPA
Charles Anderson, SMAQMD	Crystal Jacobson, PCTPA
Cari Anderson, ARB	Matt Jones, Yolo-Solano AQMD
Matt Baker, ECOS	David Kemp, City of Davis
Jerry Barton, El Dorado County Transportation Commission	Amy Lee, SACOG
Veronica Beaty, Sacramento Housing Alliance	Luke McNeel-Caird, PCTPA
Tom Brinkhouse, State Department of Housing	Marilee Mortenson, Caltrans
José Luis Cáceres, SACOG	Andrew Phillips, Region Builders
Scott Carson, FHWA	Terry Preston, WALKS
Jeff Damon, Regional Transit	Sacramento
Renée DeVere-Okie, SACOG	Tim Raney, City of Wheatland
John Deeter, ECOS	Refugio Razo, City of Sacramento
Chris Dougherty, City of West Sacramento	Judy Robinson, County of Sacramento
Mike Dour, City of Roseville	Larry Robinson, SMAQMD
Teri Duarte, WALKS	Deborah Schrimmer, SACOG
Sacramento	Angela Shepard, Caltrans District 3
Adrian Engel, Echelon Transportation Group	Sondra Spaethe, Feather River Air Quality Management District
Mitch Gaskey, SBM	Elizabeth Sparkman, City of Rancho Cordova
Carol Gregory, County of Sacramento	Mark Thomas, City of Rancho Cordova
Jennifer Hargrove, SACOG	Barbara Vaughn Bechtold, SACOG
Clint Holtzen, SACOG	Darlene Wolf, Caltrans District 3

1. **Introductions & Information Sharing.** Ms. Anderson shared that Jason Crow has moved the freight division of ARB and that the agency will be taking over the first air quality conformity working group.
2. **Approve December 4, 2013, Action Summary.** Mr. Robinson moved to approve the action summary of the December 4 meeting; Mr. McNeel-Caird seconded the motion. The Partnership voted in favor of approving the action summary and the motion carried.
3. **Update on Eastern Solano Projects of Air Quality Concern.** Mr. Jones explained that part of eastern Solano County falls into the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Sacramento regional non-attainment area. As such, he reports to the RPP any projects of air quality concern that are proposed in eastern Solano County. He reported that there have been no POAQC's since he last updated the RPP three months ago.
4. **Project Level Conformity Working Group Update.** Mr. Cáceres explained that the Project Level Conformity Working Group decides if projects are of air quality concern and,

if so, require a hot spot analysis. There have been no actions of this working group since May 2013. Mr. Cáceres clarified that the working group does not meet regularly but rather stands as an email body that meets as needed.

5. **2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Update**

A. **2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy**

Outreach Update. Ms. Hargrove explained that the SACOG Board has indicated that it wants stakeholder feedback early and often throughout the current MTP/SCS process. It therefore created a “sounding board” of stakeholders that receives the same information at the same time as the Board and/or committees in order to solicit feedback. The first meeting was in the fall of 2013, the information from which was brought to the December Board meeting. The most recent meeting was last week when it heard about and discussed transit maintenance. The comments received will be taken to the next Board meeting in advance of its adoption of scenario decisions. Comments from the sounding board will also be brought to public forums such as the RPP and Planners’ Committee in order to inform local government staff.

SACOG staff will be meeting with the region’s tribes in the near future, and the more formal, statutorily required workshops will take place in fall 2014.

B. **Inventory of Adopted and Proposed Land Use Plans (Initial Focus on New**

Greenfield Plans). Ms. Hargrove informed the RPP that the horizon for this MTP/SCS is 2036. SACOG staff has collected local land use plans and has met with local jurisdiction staff in order to predict the pattern and timing of growth in the region. Staff will then evaluate market and regulatory forces such as infrastructure issues, water supply, floodplain designations, market demand, supply, et cetera, and work with local experts and stakeholder groups to identify and analyze these constraints. Staff’s first area of analysis and the staff report focus on proposed greenfield developments (developing communities).

Ms. Hargrove explained that the current plans, even greenfield plans alone, show an excess of supply for the housing demand estimated in the current MTP/SCS. The next step will be to predict where growth will go in order to write the transportation plan. The phasing of development can depend on market and regulatory forces such as environmental permits, wetland permits, water supply, water infrastructure, et cetera. Staff will collect and analyze data on these regulatory forces and present recommendations about phasing of projects to the Board.

Ms. Hargrove continued to explain that the scenarios developed for the 2016 MTP/SCS will project the same amount of growth as the 2012 MTP/SCS, but the location of growth will vary by scenario. To emphasize the Board’s direction of an implementation-focused plan, the scenarios will focus on refining and improving the existing plan. The current plan will be made “Scenario 2”; Scenario 1 will put more growth in developing communities, and Scenario 3 will put more growth in existing communities. These scenarios will also act as scenarios for the environmental impact report.

Mr. Robinson inquired about the proposal in the last MTP/SCS cycle to consider a “4th Scenario” that included implementation of bicycle and pedestrian master plans. Ms. Hargrove said that this was also a clear interest of the sounding board and that the SACOG Board will hear the interest in a bigger active transportation focus.

6. **Review of Regional Freight and Weight Restricted Routes.** Mr. Holtzen informed the RPP of an inventory of trucking routes that will lead into the MTP/SCS and the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy. The analysis looks for gaps in the trucking network, vets the existing network, and identifies areas to prioritize route improvements. Mr. Holtzen explained that this is the first time that this analysis has been shared publicly and requested submission of any comments to him by March 7.
7. **Input Solicited for ATP MPO Program Guidelines.** Ms. DeVere-Oki explained details of the types of monies that would be available, the criteria for funding, and the timeline for application and project delivery under the new statewide Active Transportation Program. She explained that MPOs are able to adopt the same criteria as the statewide program or create their own, subject to approval by the California Transportation Commission. The input being solicited from the RPP is how SACOG’s ATP should mirror or differ from the statewide funding program. The points of input can include guidelines, scoring criteria, weighting of criteria, et cetera. Ms. DeVere-Oki emphasized that there is a very tight timeline for the call for projects at the state and MPO level.

Input received from the RPP is summarized by theme in the following table:

THEME	INPUT FROM RPP
Match	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No match should be required for Safe Routes to School projects. ▪ No match should be required for infrastructure projects. ▪ No match should be required for non-infrastructure projects including, but not limited to, Safe Routes to School. ▪ No match requirement makes the funding process more equitable for jurisdictions without Measure A funds. ▪ Match will stretch the pot of funding farther.
Minimum/ Maximum Project Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Smaller projects should be allowed. ▪ \$150,000 minimum is consistent with SACOG’s Bicycle/Pedestrian Funding Program. Administrative overhead for projects smaller than \$150,000 is usually too large. ▪ Look at applications from last round of the Bike/Ped Funding Program to get a sense of what the average project size was; use this to set a maximum dollar ask.
Designation of Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Create separate funding pots for infrastructure and programmatic projects. ▪ Create a separate pot for Safe Routes to School projects. ▪ Do not create separate pots of funds, per the spirit of MAP-21’s de-siloed funds.
Scoring Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increasing walking and biking: This should be the highest scoring and most important criterion. ▪ Reducing bike/pedestrian fatalities and injuries: Also a very important criterion. This is the main reason that keeps people from walking and biking. Could create a designated pot of funding for safety projects. ▪ Public participation and planning: Could use the project’s inclusion in a bike/pedestrian plan as a screening criterion but not assign points for it. There is a dollar amount threshold for being in a plan that shouldn’t affect these projects. ▪ Cost effectiveness: Applicants should be encouraged to use the criteria and metrics from SACOG’s Bike/Pedestrian Funding Program. ▪ Improve public health: Should be included as a priority. ▪ Benefit disadvantaged communities: This uses the funding to create equity of bicycle and pedestrian resources that doesn’t exist otherwise; therefore, this criterion should be maintained. It seems duplicative to have a 25% set-aside for projects benefitting disadvantaged communities and award points for it. The 25% set-aside should be maintained. ▪ Using the California Conservation Corps: SACOG staff will check if this is necessary to keep at the MPO level. Do not think that it is important to keep at the MPO level. ▪ Performance on past grants: Important to keep as an accounting mechanism. ▪ Any other criteria? Consistency with the Blueprint, MTP/SCS and the principles of the Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plan.

8. **Other Matters.** No other matters were discussed.

9. **Adjournment.** Mr. McNeel-Caird moved to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Dougherty seconded the motion. The Partnership voted in favor of adjournment and the motion carried.