



Land Use & Natural Resources Committee

Item #14-8-3D
Information

July 31, 2014

2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Outreach Update

Issue: Staff is conducting outreach for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 MTP/SCS).

Recommendation: None, this is for information only.

Discussion: Three outreach efforts are underway in support of the 2016 MTP/SCS update: periodic cross-sectoral stakeholder meetings, public workshop planning, and development of a public opinion poll. These three sources of public input are for the Board to consider in development of a draft preferred scenario framework.

In 2013, at the request of Board members, staff developed a group of cross-sectoral and regionally representative stakeholders to serve as a “sounding board” to provide feedback to the Board and staff on research topics, policy considerations, plan implementation themes, and other 2016 MTP/SCS topics. The sounding board last met on June 9, 2014. The sounding board heard presentations and provided feedback on: staff work related to the transportation and land use scenario framework adopted by the Board in March; findings from transportation system maintenance and preservation research; the proposed approach for the transportation projects phasing analysis; and the approach for public workshops and polling. The meeting summary notes, agenda, and attendance list are in Attachment A.

Public workshops for the 2016 MTP/SCS will occur this October and November. SACOG must host eight public workshops: three in Sacramento County and one each in Placer, El Dorado, Yuba, Sutter and Yolo counties. Staff will work throughout August to confirm locations and finalize content for the workshops. Attachment B is a draft list of available locations for county workshops. Workshop locations will consider ADA accessibility, geographic dispersion, transit access, add-on opportunities for walk-in from other public events (e.g., fairs, grocery stores, malls, etc.), as well as meeting logistical needs to conduct the workshops.

The third source of public input, the public opinion poll, is discussed under a separate item.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MH:gg
Attachment A: Sounding Board Meeting Summary
Attachment B: DRAFT Workshop Locations

Key Staff: Sharon Sprowls, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235
Kacey Lizon, MTP/SCS Project Manager, (916) 340-6265
Monica Hernández, MTP/SCS Outreach Coordinator, (916) 340-6237

2016 MTP/SCS Sounding Board Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: June 9, 2014

Meeting Location: West Sacramento City Hall Galleria

Meeting Attendees:

Brookfield Residential	Resources for Independent Living
CA Rural Legal Assistance	Richland Communities
Cordova Hills/SMB Corporation	Sacramento Housing Alliance
Domus Development	Sacramento Metro Chamber
Environmental Council of Sacramento	Sacramento Tree Foundation
Health Education Council	Taylor-Wiley/Stonebridge Properties
League of Women Voters	Wade Associates
National Safe Routes to School Partnership	WALKSacramento
North State Building Industry Association	Yolo County Housing Authority

Meeting Agenda:

- Welcome & Introductions, Ms. Hernández
- Update on Board Actions, Ms. Hernández
- Transportation & Land Use Scenario Framework, Ms. Lizon
- Transportation System Maintenance & Preservation, Mr. Holtzen
- Transportation Projects Phasing Analysis, Mr. Griesenbeck
- Public Workshop Approach, Ms. Hernández

Meeting Summary:

Staff provided meeting participants with a summary of the board actions and informational presentations related to the 2016 MTP/SCS update that have occurred since the group last met in February 2014. Staff described how the input of the sounding board is part of three components of public input the Board will consider as they develop the draft preferred framework for the 2016 MTP/SCS. The additional two pieces of public input are the findings from the public workshops and public polling. Participants were encouraged to communicate to staff if there were any additional concerns or questions not addressed during the meeting. Meeting participants were provided a copy of this meeting summary and asked to review it in advance of staff's reporting to the SACOG policy committees.

Discussion Themes & Comments

Transportation & Land Use Scenarios Framework

THEME: New Growth and Projected Land Development

- Are there a lot of assumptions about land dedication vs in lieu fees and/or both? If SACOG is just looking at zoning for land uses allowed and not policies (like the MTP/SCS and others that influence where growth happens) then we're not getting a true picture.
- There is a market conflict between slow growth and/or phasing growth and developers needing to show the bank you can build it at once.

- How will SACOG articulate what you are doing with the land use forecast before getting to the end? We would like a very descriptive narrative explanation of the analysis, thought process, assumptions made, etc. before seeing the final plan.
- Are you talking to other developers to test/vette the scenarios and/or the framework, beyond the Building Industry Association (e.g., affordable housing developers, Infill Builders Association, etc.)?
- Is SACOG's parcel level data available to show developers which parcels are available for infill and what the MTP/SCS is assuming for those sites?

THEME: Demographics, Environmental Justice

- Where does demographic analysis fit into scenarios and how does RHNA fit?
- Did you use the work from UC Davis Center for Regional Change (opportunity index) and will Center for Regional Change be involved in the MTP/SCS again?
- Rural areas fall out of favor if you only plan transit around high density in TOD areas so not all planning should be for TODs. There is a need to look at rural areas where concentrations of poverty exist. Unintended consequence of SB 375 is rural areas are left out of smart growth incentives.
- Where does planning for affordable housing and other social equity issues fit into the scenarios?
- How can you make sure that new affordable housing goes in with the new bike and/or transit investments?
- It is important to remember that rural areas are often out of the state and/or federal investment strategies, they are not getting the infill benefits.
- A better linking of local housing elements to the SCS would make for better planning and outcomes.

THEME: Water Supply & Agriculture

- Placer and Regional Water agencies are going to hire a consultant for some supply/inventory work; this could be an opportunity to share consultant costs if interests/needs align.
- SACOG should look at Sacramento County's Water Supply Management Plan for information on potential water availability.
- It is unclear how agriculture is addressed in the scenarios. Agriculture should be considered in the scenarios as part of the water topic— water needed for agricultural land should be a constraint for new development needing the same water.

Transportation System Maintenance & Preservation

THEME: Fix-it-First Investment Strategy/State of Good Repair

- One thing mentioned in a recent NPR report is there is continued and growing demand for walkable and bikeable streets. It discussed how changing the way your streets are designed is an economic development strategy.
- It seems like there is more opportunity in a State of Good Repair strategy for adding in bike lanes and sidewalks when resurfacing or doing other maintenance.
- Complete streets are an economic development strategy and when you maintain/rehabilitate roads you have the opportunity to add bike lanes, pedestrian crossings, etc. at very minimal costs so it's a win-win.
- Can you assume future Cap & Trade dollars in the revenue side?

THEME: Technology and Innovation

- How much influence do future innovations have on what SACOG is assuming?
- It feels like we are taking an as-is condition (for roads and travel mode) and just projecting it out versus assuming some big changes in innovation. Is SACOG thinking about this?
- What we assume now won't necessarily be what is 10 years from now. What if gas was at \$6 per gallon? Instead of adding more roads, there may be more transit need. What other possibilities are in the universe that might have bearing?

THEME: Project List

- Is the universe of projects provided by different jurisdictions included in your land use inventory? Since we're looking at a 20-year time frame, how much influence does future innovation have on the assumptions you're making?
- In the universe of transportation projects SACOG is considering, are they all jurisdiction-submitted projects?
- Will you look at the vehicle miles traveled effects of these different scenarios?

Transportation Projects Phasing Analysis

- How do you know when projects are scheduled?
- Is the hypothesis of the phasing analysis that if you advance and/or delay projects there could be GHG reductions or other benefits?
- Is there ability to do back and forth with the jurisdictions on project phasing? If they have 12 projects you could suggest to them an opportunity for the best outcome?
- On a per unit basis the big projects look more cost effective; do the other investments on parallel corridors have as much or more impact?
- If you have good info on an ongoing basis on vehicle miles traveled, and recognizing these projects have long lead times, it might be possible for local jurisdictions to make minor decisions to push out and pull forward projects?
- Aside from VMT can you factor safety aspects into the phasing analysis?
- Is the McKinley Village build-out in the plan?

Public Workshop Approach

THEME: General Approach and Framing Topics for Public Workshops

- Many public workshops are very abstract and if you want to hear what's important to people, consider asking personal and relatable questions. Not too simple that they are unusable, but try to draw out information about how people live and not so much about whether the plan does this or that.
- A lot of government workshops tend to be too abstract. You're looking for people's visions of how they want to live and what's important to them.
- Residents need to understand longer term consequences vis à vis air quality and greenhouse gas emissions when you ask questions. Frame questions to make residents think more long term and not just in their backyard.
- Lay out the plan's underlying assumptions (or planning realities) very clearly. Explain why there is a connection between land use and transportation and what that does to vehicle miles traveled, greenhouse gas emissions, etc. It will help people to understand the materials and questions if they understand the underlying information.

- It is important to frame questions in terms of not just either/or. Avoid framing questions as either/or because that's not usually the case. Most things are not black and white like that so try to ask trade-off questions that are more realistic and not extremes of this vs. that.
- Ask participants, "Where would you like to see more housing near transit planned?"
- Ask workshop participants, "What do you want streets (in your neighborhood) to look like?"
- Focusing on people's preference for the future can be hard for people to think about, consider addressing their needs today and focusing questions on the present.

THEME: Scientific Polling

- The idea of a survey to reach more people is good, but would like to see additional effort engaging low income and minority residents.
- It is important to frame questions in terms of not just either/or. Avoid framing questions as either/or because that's not usually the case. Most things are not black and white like that so try to ask trade-off questions that are more realistic and not extremes of this versus that.

THEME: Environmental Justice

- A more present orientation for low income people is more appropriate, keep choices appropriate for low literacy levels.
- When you're constructing scientific survey, include some extra effort to reach out to people impacted by the plan but who don't get engaged because they can't afford to or are just disengaged, especially low-income and minority populations.
- You have to ask your questions differently for low-income and minority communities.
- Ask participants, "Where would you like to see more housing near transit planned?"
- Ask workshop participants, "What do you want streets (in your neighborhood) to look like?"
- Focusing on people's preference for the future can be hard for people to think about, consider addressing their needs today and focusing questions on the present.