



## Transportation Committee

November 27, 2013

### Policy Framework for MTP/SCS Update Process

**Issue:** Should the update process for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy be focused on implementing the plan?

**Recommendation:** That the Transportation Committee recommend that the Board adopt a policy framework for the 2016 MTP/SCS update that would focus time and resources on addressing implementation challenges of the plan.

**Discussion:** In August, staff presented an approach to the 2016 MTP/SCS update that focused on implementation challenges and commitments. The Board was open to this approach and provided additional comments and questions, which guided an issue identification and exploration period from August through November. Those comments are summarized as follows:

- Focus on issues of transportation maintenance, rehabilitation, and operations;
- Revisit revenue projections in light of changing economic conditions;
- Interest in developing ability to measure the economic effect of transportation investments to inform planning for maximum economic benefit;
- Pay attention to farm-to-market routes, which are increasingly important to rural areas;
- Floodplain legislation and regulations should be a focus particularly for transportation in rural areas;
- Examine what went well with the last MTP/SCS and what can be improved through the plan update, both in terms of process and in terms of plan substance;
- Provide adequate time for coordinating information with local agencies;
- Improve outreach by communicating to public when they can provide input and how the input will or will not be used; and
- Communicate to the Board as early as possible the expectations of staff work and schedule and decision points for the Board.

During the issue identification and exploration period, the Board received the following informational presentations in a combination of board workshops and committee presentations:

- An overview of statewide and local transportation funding challenges and needs (Board workshop);
- A review of the regional growth projections of the current MTP/SCS and a “trial balloon” proposal to carry those growth projections forward into the next plan;
- A briefing on the current housing market, plans, and funding in the SACOG region (Board workshop);
- An overview of the 2012 Regional Transportation Monitoring Report, which tracks regional data on travel behavior and demographics; and
- An overview of road maintenance challenges.

Staff also presented similar information to a diverse group of stakeholders in October. With each presentation, staff solicited Board and stakeholder input on their priority issues. The results of this work are assembled in the proposed policy framework (Attachment 1). As a framework, this document poses the general policy questions, or challenges, that would be addressed in an implementation-focused plan update. It also identifies as a foundational assumption the regional growth projections that will be used in the update. The framework also includes three appendices: A) a description of implementation commitments in the current plan, B) a schedule for the plan update and C) an outreach plan. The Board reviewed and commented on these documents during the last three months.

Attachment 2 is provided as background information only; it includes a summary of the input received during the October stakeholder workshop, the list of invited stakeholders, and the list of attending stakeholders.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:KL:gg  
Attachments

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Kacey Lizon, MTP/SCS Manager, (916) 340-6265

1400604

## Policy Framework for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update

November 19, 2013

The 2016 update to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 MTP/SCS) will focus on implementation challenges and commitments of the current plan with the goal of moving toward the transportation, air quality and quality of life outcomes set forth in the plan. These implementation challenges and commitments are broadly defined in the below *Implementation Themes* table, along with examples of the research and analysis that will be used to address these issues.

### Foundational Assumptions for the Update: *Regional Growth Projections*

The same regional growth projections of the 2012 MTP/SCS will be used for the 2016 MTP/SCS except that the growth is assumed to arrive one year later, 2036. This equates to 361,000 new jobs, 871,000 new people and 303,000 new housing units from 2008:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Jobs</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Housing Units</u>
2008	966,316	2,215,044	884,725
2036	1,327,424	3,086,213	1,187,744

### Implementation Themes for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update

<b>Implementation Question/Challenge</b>	<b>Examples of research and analysis to address question/challenge</b>
<b>Transportation Funding:</b> Can the region capture the revenues projected to come from all sources local, state and federal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update revenue projections for local, state and federal sources, considering long-term/historic and short-term/recent losses or revenue.</li> <li>Identify strategies for new revenue generation and cost-effective investments.</li> </ul>
<b>Investment Strategy:</b> Is there enough emphasis on system maintenance (“fix-it-first”) investments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and compare local and state system maintenance needs for different modes of travel.</li> <li>Identify tradeoffs between system maintenance and system expansion priorities.</li> <li>Identify unique challenges and opportunities in urban, suburban and rural communities, with particular attention to suburban economic challenges.</li> <li>Identify new strategies for SACOG planning and funding efforts that consider fix-it-first.</li> </ul>
<b>Investment Timing:</b> Should there be changes in the timing of transportation investments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine the cost effectiveness of moving certain projects forward or backward in the planning period.</li> <li>Analyze the effect of project phasing on performance of the regional transportation system, air quality, and land use pattern.</li> <li>Identify short-term strategies to improve regional travel patterns.</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use Forecast (allocation):</b> What is the economic viability of the projected greenfield and infill growth?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inventory adopted and proposed land use plans in the region.</li> <li>Analyze the effect of more greenfield versus more infill growth, and vice versa, on transportation system performance.</li> <li>Analyze recent market performance for greenfield and infill, residential and non-residential development.</li> <li>Determine if and how the estimated growth in Center/Corridor, Established, Developing, and Rural Residential Community Types should be changed or refined.</li> </ul>
<b>Plan Effects:</b> Follow through on the implementation commitments of the 2012 MTP/SCS to better measure the effects of the plan on different people and issue areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Track travel behavior, land development pattern, demographic, air quality and transportation project delivery trends to better understand how the MTP/SCS is being implemented over time.</li> <li>Develop additional performance metrics to assess the impact of the MTP/SCS on different groups of people and issues (e.g. environmental justice communities; health; access to jobs, services, and affordable housing).</li> <li>Develop decision-making support tools to support regional and local decision-making.</li> <li>Research the effect of our growing region on the agricultural economy and open space.</li> </ul> <p>(Appendix A contains more description of the Implementation Commitments in the MTP/SCS)</p>

### Update Schedule and Public Outreach

The greater part of 2014 will be focused on research, analysis and public engagement around implementation questions and challenges broadly defined in this policy framework. SACOG staff will conduct research and analysis in consultation with member jurisdictions, partner agencies and interested stakeholders. The SACOG Board will use the results of the research and public input to direct the update of the draft plan and technical assumptions in 2015. **Appendix B** contains the plan update schedule and **Appendix C** contains the outreach plan.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

1. **Performance Monitoring:** Track and strive to better understand how the 2012 MTP/SCS is being implemented over time in the areas of a) transportation trends, b) development pattern, c) demographics, d) transportation project delivery and e) air quality. Performance monitoring allows the agency to determine what kinds of adjustments to make to future MTP/SCS' and supports SACOG's strategic goal to maximize the quality of life benefits that the MTP/SCS contributes to the region (See Strategic Plan Goal 2, attached).

- a. Transportation trends: monitor how people are traveling in the region and the impacts of their travel on the transportation system.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Vehicle miles traveled;
- Congested travel;
- Travel by auto, transit, bicycling or walking (mode split);
- Transit passenger boardings.

- b. Development pattern: monitor how private and public sector influences are shaping growth in the region to compare to projected land use patterns in the 2012 MTP/SCS and inform the projected land use patterns for the 2016 MTP/SCS.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Residential construction in center and corridor, established, developing and rural residential communities;
- Construction of different types of housing (e.g., large lot single family, small lot single family, attached multi-family);
- Changes to federal, state and local policies and regulations that affect the rate and location of development;
- Financial incentives and tools such as funding for affordable housing or infill development;
- Viability of agriculture and open spaces.

- c. Demographics: monitor demographic characteristics that influence where people live, work and how they travel.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Household size, age and income;
- Auto ownership.

- d. Transportation Project Construction (Project Delivery): monitor construction of transportation projects and how those projects align with the policies of the 2012 MTP/SCS.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

- Efficient use of federal and state transportation dollars;
- Blueprint supportive projects;
- Projects supporting rural economies;
- Projects that support a variety of modes including transit, bicycle, pedestrian, roads, and highways;
- Condition of existing transit and road infrastructure.

e. Air Quality: monitor regional air quality.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Levels of ozone, particulate matter, and other air pollutants;
- Number of days per year with Spare the Air notifications.

2. **Impact Assessment:** Improve SACOG's ability to accurately estimate the impacts of the MTP/SCS on different people and issue areas. This supports SACOG's strategic goals of information-based decision making and serving as a source of high-quality information (See Strategic Plan Goals 1 and 3, attached). The 2012 MTP/SCS made great strides in measuring the impacts of the plan on travel, air quality, the environment, and low income and minority residents (environmental justice populations).

Examples of impact assessments to improve:

- a. Air quality related health impacts of locating housing near major roadways.
- b. Balance of jobs and housing within communities and across the region;
- c. Access to key services (e.g., medical, schools, colleges and universities, parks);
- d. Public safety and health;
- e. Effects on specific populations such as youth, the elderly, low income and minorities;
- f. Climate change.

3. **Decision-Making Support Tools:** Improve decision-making support tools for regional and local decisions so that member cities and counties, partner agencies, stakeholders and residents of the region have information about transportation investments, growth patterns, and policies that relate to the 2012 MTP/SCS. This will increase opportunities for member jurisdictions to utilize regional data, models and analysis to analyze impacts of their decisions on transportation, land use, air quality and other policy areas that affect quality of life. These tools support SACOG's strategic plan goal to sustain the agency's emphasis on information-based decision making (see Strategic Plan Goal 1, attached).

Examples of decision-making support tools:

- a. Software that models the economic effects of land use and transportation policies (PECAS);
- b. Bus and light rail inventory information readily available to emergency operations centers;
- c. Support changes to federal and state regulations that increase local flexibility and encourage use of existing streamlining options that will help implement the 2012 MTP/SCS.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

- d. Work to align federal natural resources, habitat and clean air policies and regulations with the goals of the 2012 MTP/SCS;
  - e. Quantify the importance of the rural economy within the region (Rural-Urban Connections Strategy).
4. **Financial Tools & Incentives:** Support financial tools and incentives to help implement the 2012 MTP/SCS to realize its performance. These tools and incentives will support the construction of projects critical to the MTP/SCS' performance and bring real quality of life benefits to the region (see Strategic Plan Goals 2 and 3, attached).

### Examples:

- a. Reestablish some tools that redevelopment agencies previously had such as tax-increment financing to promote infill and revitalization;
- b. Provide local governments more funding flexibility and options, particularly for transit operations and capital and road maintenance and rehabilitation, in both rural and urban areas;

Reform regulations to speed up review and approval of transportation and land use projects with low environmental impacts and positive benefits to state regional, and local goals.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

### Goals 1-3 from the SACOG Strategic Plan

**Goal 1: Sustain the agency's emphasis on information-based decision making by providing state-of-the-art data and tools to members, partners, stakeholders and residents to help them shape the futures of their communities and the region.**

#### Goal 1 Strategies:

1. Increase opportunities for member jurisdictions to utilize regional data, models and analysis to analyze impacts of their decisions on transportation, land use, air quality and other policy areas that affect quality of life.
2. Increase agency capacity to provide scientific information and analysis of transportation, land use, air quality and other matters of regional importance.

#### Goal 1 Performance Indicators:

- A. Members and planning partners routinely use a combination of appropriate planning tools (e.g., I-PLACE<sup>3</sup>S and SACSIM) to conduct technical analysis of general plan updates, corridor plans, transportation circulation plans, and neighborhood and community plans, and use of such planning tools by stakeholders and residents to evaluate proposed development projects.
- B. Interactive, information-based citizen engagement practices are commonly used by members in support of general plan updates, development of neighborhood and community plans, and evaluation of the impacts of significant proposed development projects. The Agency has an effective and active process for sharing information about SACOG activities with staff in service to local government
- C. Appointment to the SACOG Board is viewed as an attractive opportunity for local elected officials and SACOG's Board members are actively engaged in pursuing the mission of the agency and the agency's local, state and national recognition for leadership in the implementation of information rich, consensus-driven regional efforts to improve the quality of life in the region continues to be enhanced. SACOG actively engages in providing information to all elected leaders about the role it plays in regional affairs and how this role contributes to an improved quality of life.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

**Goal 2: Maximize strategic influence for the region through developing and implementing integrated regional transportation plans that produce unique and significant quality of life benefits for residents of the region.**

### Goal 2 Strategies:

1. Consolidate, expand and maximize strategic advantage from the agency's state and national leadership role and access to the best tools and methods for preparing an outstanding MTP.
2. Maximize the benefits of comprehensive planning and project implementation in the Sacramento region.

### Goal 2 Performance Indicators:

- A. SACOG's MTP will remain a leader in the state in improving per capita VMT, congestion, air emissions and other performance measures that advance the quality of life.
- B. SACOG will leverage its high performing MTP to secure additional funding and policy support from federal, state and local sources to build key projects sooner than would otherwise be possible.
- C. SACOG and its member agencies continue to be leaders in the State in the timely delivery of projects.



## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

**Goal 3: Serve as a source of high quality information, convener, and/or advocate on a range of regional issues when the agency's involvement would provide unique, added value to promoting a sustainable future for the region.**

### Goal 3 Strategies:

1. Continue to expand SACOG's data and modeling capabilities to include topics that influence transportation behavior and planning (e.g., energy, climate change, land use economics and infrastructure).
2. Assist regional partners with the evaluation of functional service delivery opportunities and act upon the ones that will most assist the agencies.
3. Analyze options for increasing SACOG's financial analysis and capacity so that it is able to serve the region if and when new service needs are identified.

### Goal 3 Performance Indicators:

1. Deliver cost savings to local governments by building the capacity of the agency in areas of highest need to member jurisdictions, and/or leveraging new revenues in collaboration with local governments.
2. SACOG's member services program will increase coordination activities relating to assistance with policy development, joint project delivery, grant development, and requests for technical assistance as measured by increase in requests from member jurisdictions for assistance and resulting grant acquisition or more integrated policy making

## Appendix B: Schedule for 2016 MTP/SCS Update

November 19, 2013

Major Deliverables and Milestones	SACOG Action	Complete By
<b>FY13/14 – Focused on: Issue Identification, Policy Framework Development, Research and Analysis</b>		
Update Public Participation Plan	Board action	complete
Early public and stakeholder outreach on planning and policy issues; Board consideration and identification of policy issues	Board direction	complete
Develop draft regional growth projections	Board direction	complete
Adopt policy framework for 2016 MTP/SCS update; Adopt draft regional growth projections for use in plan update	Board action	December 2013
Technical work to refresh land use and transportation planning assumptions including inventorying of local land use plans and <i>Call for Review of Transportation Projects</i> <sup>1</sup>	Staff work with local agencies	Fall 2013 – Fall 2014
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	February 2014
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	June 2014
<b>FY 14/15 – Focused on: Public Workshops, Update of Planning Assumptions and Draft Plan Development</b>		
Conduct at least 8 public workshops on policy choices and issues related to the MTP/SCS	Board receive & consider	Summer/Fall 2014
Review public workshop results	Board direction	Summer/Fall 2014
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	September 2014
Create Framework for Draft 2016 MTP/SCS	Board action	December 2014
Release Notice of Preparation for Environmental Impact Report	Staff work	December 2014
Develop draft land use forecast and transportation project list assumptions	Staff work with local agencies	Dec. 2014 – Mar. 2014
Endorse draft land use forecast and transportation project list assumptions for use in development of Draft Plan, Draft EIR, and Draft Air Quality Conformity	Board action	March 2014
Direction on Draft Plan Policies and Strategies	Board action	Jan. 2015 – Mar. 2015
Draft Plan and Draft EIR development	Staff work	Mar. 2015 – Aug. 2015
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	June 2015
<b>FY 15/16 – Focused on: Draft Plan and Draft EIR Completion, Public Comment Period on Draft Plan, Adoption</b>		
Draft Plan and Draft EIR development	Staff work	Mar. 2015 - Aug. 2015
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	August 2015
<i>Adoption of RTPs/EIRs by El Dorado County Transportation Commission and Placer County Transportation Agency</i>	<i>Coordination</i> <sup>3</sup>	<i>Fall 2015</i>

<sup>1</sup> There are ongoing meetings with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to determine when CARB will revisit the SB 375 greenhouse gas targets for all California MPOs.

<sup>2</sup> Staff anticipates periodic check-ins with the Board in addition to major actions noted in the calendar. Some key check-ins with the Board during the 2012 MTP/SCS update included input on revenue forecast assumptions, updating policies and strategies, direction on CARB greenhouse gas target-setting scenarios, and coordination with the Regional Housing Needs process.

<sup>3</sup> This milestone is included in the Work Plan for reference. The SACOG Board does not act on the RTPs of either PCTPA or EDCTC. SACOG coordinates with PCTPA and EDCTC to incorporate their adopted plans into the SACOG MTP/SCS.

## Appendix B: Schedule for 2016 MTP/SCS Update

November 19, 2013

*(continued)*

<b>Major Deliverables and Milestones</b>	<b>SACOG Action</b>	<b>Complete By</b>
<b>FY 15/16 – Focused on: Draft Plan and Draft EIR Completion, Public Comment Period on Draft Plan, Adoption</b>		
Release Draft 2016 MTP/SCS for 30-day public comment period	Board action	September 2015
Release Draft EIR for public comment (60-day comment period)	Staff work	September 2015
Hold at least 6 information meetings with local elected officials	Board receive & consider	Sept. 2015 – Dec. 2015
Hold 3 public hearings on Draft 2016 MTP/SCS	Board receive & consider	Sept. 2015 – Dec. 2015
Review public comments and recommendations on Final Draft Plan and Final EIR	Board direction	January 2016
Certify Final EIR Adopt 2016 MTP/SCS Adopt Air Quality Conformity Determination	Board action	February 2016

## Appendix C: Outreach Plan for 2016 MTP/SCS

November 19, 2013

**Working document that can be added to throughout the engagement process**

### **BOARD MEMBER, JURISDICTION STAFF & PUBLIC AGENCY COMMUNICATIONS**

- Regular communication and updates will occur at all SACOG board committee meetings and at board meetings as needed
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Regular communication and opportunity for feedback from the Planners Committee, Transit Coordinating Committee, Regional Planning Partnership, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, with membership drawn from member jurisdictions and partner agencies
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Meetings with and communications to member jurisdiction staff on the process, requesting information, providing information for review and feedback
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Regional Managers Meetings
  - Timing: Quarterly
- Meetings with state and federal agencies
  - Timing: As needed to align with planning calendar and as dictated by statutory requirements
- Presentations to various public agency staff and boards in the region.
  - Timing: As coordinated by SACOG staff or by request

### **STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH**

In addition to ongoing communications outlined above, staff will use methods such as those listed below to engage communities across the region about the 2016 MTP/SCS update:

- A comprehensive stakeholder list including stakeholders who participated in the previous MTP/SCS process will be updated and utilized.
  - Timing: Ongoing
- A one-stop request for information on the 2016 MTP/SCS update will be on the SACOG website for access to key input and feedback points for the public, key decision points for the Board, technical information, and meeting/workshop information.
  - Timing: Winter 2013/2014, dependent on board adoption of 2016 MTP/SCS Framework
- Early engagement of a cross-sectoral stakeholder group
  - Timing: complete
- To maintain a consistent message, a PowerPoint presentation will be prepared to highlight both background on the MTP/SCS and the process for the update. The presentation will be used by various staff at presentations throughout the region coordinated by staff and/or by request from stakeholders and board members.
  - Timing: March 2014
- Stakeholder meetings, member and partner agency coordination, and public communications on policy issues and areas of research for the 2016 MTP/SCS
  - Timing: 2013-2015
- Staff will collaborate with key partners to publicize and present a greenhouse gas target-setting public workshop (contingent on actions of the California Air Resources Board).
- Staff will provide updates and gather feedback from SACOG advisory groups
- Public Workshops
  - Timing: Summer/Fall 2014
  - Staff will conduct at least eight public workshops in the region
  - Workshops held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.

## Appendix C: Outreach Plan for 2016 MTP/SCS

November 19, 2013

- Stakeholder meetings, member and partner agency coordination, and public communications on development of draft plan and next steps
  - Timing: Summer 2014-Fall 2015
- Elected Official Information Meetings on draft Sustainable Communities Strategy
  - Staff will conduct at least six elected official information meetings on the draft Sustainable Communities Strategy/Alternative Planning Strategy (SCS/APS) in the update, one in each county with representatives of the county board of supervisors and city councils that represent a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population in the incorporated areas of that county. Meetings held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.
  - Timing: Fall/Winter 2015
- At least three public hearings on the draft SCS/APS. Any meetings held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.
  - Timing: Fall/Winter 2015
- Tribal consultation will occur in alignment with the outreach and communication principles, and as guided by the adopted Public Participation Plan. Outreach will occur on a government-to-government basis. For the Tribal Governments with land within Placer and El Dorado counties, tribal consultation will occur through collaboration with the Regional Transportation Planning agencies (RTPAs) in those counties.
  - Timing: Ongoing and in coordination with PCTPA and EDCTC

### MASS COMMUNICATIONS

To supplement the ongoing routine media coverage of transportation issues, the following strategies will be used to inform and engage interested stakeholders

- A series of articles in the electronic newsletter *Regional Report* on the content of the current MTP/SCS, what projects have begun or been completed in the interim, and an overview of the planning process with opportunities for feedback noticed in a timely manner
  - Timing: Beginning September 2013
- On the MTP/SCS website general information and a timeline for the update, including but not limited to why the update is taking place, contact information, meeting locations. The website will be easily accessible and updated as needed. The link to the MTP/SCS website will be prominent on the SACOG homepage.
  - Timing: September 2013
- Press releases and media outreach as needed.
- White papers and issue briefs may be developed on specific policy issues as the MTP/SCS Update process evolves, or new information or technical analysis needs to be communicated
- Staff will continue to reach out to community newsletters, social media, blogs and other similar publications outside of traditional media that work with SACOG in its media outreach.
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Staff will develop and place op-ed pieces by board members as appropriate.

Staff contacts:

Kacey Lizon, Project Manager, [klizon@sacog.org](mailto:klizon@sacog.org) (916) 340-6265

Monica Hernández, Communications Coordinator, [mhernandez@sacog.org](mailto:mhernandez@sacog.org), (916) 340-6237

Jennifer Hargrove, Land Use Coordinator, [jhargrove@sacog.org](mailto:jhargrove@sacog.org), (916) 340-6216

Clint Holtzen, Transportation Coordinator, [choltzen@sacog.org](mailto:choltzen@sacog.org), (916) 340-6246

## **Background Information: MTP/SCS Stakeholder Meeting Summary Report**

---

On Friday, October 18, 2013 staff met for 5 hours with stakeholders representing agriculture, active transportation, affordable and market rate developers, the environment, social equity, rural communities, public health, air quality, and economic development. The day consisted of topic-specific presentations followed by prompted discussions on each topic. As staff presented the meeting outcomes for the day, participants were encouraged to ask questions during the presentations for clarification and share their opinions, concerns, and ideas during the discussions.

### **Meeting Desired Outcomes:**

- Hear participant perspectives on issues the SACOG Board will consider when adopting a framework for the development of the 2016 MTP/SCS
  - This includes issues around growth projections, investing more into fix-it-first projects, and the infrastructure and economic challenges of infill and Greenfield development.
- Create a shared base of knowledge of the state and federal requirements for developing the MTP/SCS
- Create a shared understanding of the Blueprint and the 2012 MTP/SCS
- Create opportunity for cross-sectoral conversations
  - Build a cross-sectoral sounding board that staff can tap into during the plan update to provide the SAOCG Board with feedback throughout the process.
  - As a sounding board, participants are critical in presenting the interests of your constituents, and helping staff understand the impacts of our work on your constituents in the near- and long-term.

Below are the prompt questions used to start the stakeholder discussions. For each question, themes are teased out with the supporting comments made by meeting participants.

### **Question 1: Is the direction of the Blueprint consistent with the mission/goals of your work? Of the information presented, what are priority issues for you?**

*This discussion varied from table to table but the conversations were primarily about challenges and opportunities related to the implementation of the Blueprint. The conversations also identified issues related both to the Blueprint and the 2012 and 2016 MTP/SCS.*

Theme: There are Blueprint implementation challenges that should be addressed at the local and regional level.

- Barriers to infill need to be removed; infill is far more difficult without subsidies.
- SACOG should work to get a form of Redevelopment back.
- There is a challenge with people or groups thinking growth is growth. There are differences in how to plan for economic growth in rural settings while maintaining the rural character. There is no cookie cutter for growth.
- Agricultural lands need to be preserved, spheres of influence are moving into agricultural lands.
- Local plans i.e. general plans/specific plans need to better align with the Blueprint and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)

Theme: There are no local incentives to implement the Blueprint.

- There are fewer or no incentives for infill/smart growth in rural communities where there is already a lack of water/sewer infrastructure increasing costs to developers.
- Blueprint is only a plan with no teeth, there are no carrots or sticks-how do you keep people interested? There should be some incentives to implementation. If not financial then some policy related levers/incentives.
- SB 375 CEQA streamlining is not enough, local governments need to make infrastructure improvements.

Theme: What are unintended positive and negative consequences of the Blueprint?

- There are other issues besides transportation that have an effect on communities such as education, job training, and access to other areas.
- There needs to be more emphasis on rural land (ag/open space/habitat) planning.
- A strategy to build affordable housing not just plan for it across the region.
- Blueprint implementation is important in the downward trend of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in the region.
- Where are the jobs going in the Blueprint, regional planning should support neighborhood planning.
- Need to identify the unintended consequences to rural areas because of the urban infill focus, rural towns and cities need their own infill.
- The lack of planned public investment in rural areas can lead to more segregation.

Theme: Blueprint (and MTP/SCS) should do more.

- Additional work on how the road/transit systems and other transportation modes affect public health.
- There should be more emphasis on bringing/linking destinations closer to existing and planned transit, biking and walking.
- Good infill needs better transit.
- Air quality should be considered at the base of the Blueprint.
- How do we begin to frame and plan for growth and sustainability that is appropriate for rural areas? Centers of development and public investment are needed to support local rural economies.

**Question 2: How do you see the transportation and land use elements of the MTP/SCS affecting your work? What are your thoughts on updating the current MTP/SCS with a focus on addressing challenges to implementation?**

*Some of the issues described below came naturally from the first group discussion about the Blueprint presentation, but are separated out to align with the topic they most relate to.*

Theme: More incentives are needed to implement the SCS, and there are challenges to implementing the SCS at the regional, local, and neighborhood scales.

- There is a need for incentives/planning to make the SCS more meaningful at the neighborhood level.
- There are challenges with implementation at the local level, and very little resident capacity in certain areas to drive the implementation investments from the local government.
- There are no local incentives to implement the SCS.
- There needs to be planning to prevent displacement when gentrification occurs in transit priority areas.
- General Plans are not consistent with the MTP/SCS.
- CEQA streamlining is not enough to support infill and SCS implementation; would like to see some type of streamlined public review process.
- The MTP/SCS should consider and identify new funding to make up for the loss of Redevelopment and other lost revenue.
- There are analytical gaps due to limitations of the regional travel model. There is need to better understand neighborhood/local travel to understand the needs of the community i.e. the underserved by affordable housing and transit.

Theme: The current SCS does not adequately address the growth of rural areas.

- Transit does not serve the rural areas of the region well; it is infrequent and unaffordable.
- What are the unintended consequences of the emphasis of investment and planning in the transit priority areas (TPA)? Particularly, what will be the effect on rural areas?
- The next MTP should include information on what rural investment looks like with rural centers helping to reduce commutes and support smart planning.
- The SCS has little impact on what greenfield developers will do.

Theme: Additional or enhanced analysis of low income and minority populations should be included in the next plan.

- Better environmental justice analysis that looks at people in place, housing + transportation cost burden and access to education and jobs.
- TOD investment in low income areas is hard because of the market demand, how do you support the low income areas rather than maintaining areas of poverty?
- There needs to be ways to encourage job growth that will meet the needs of all economic levels. Is it prescriptive or market based?
- There are many unmet needs in transportation and housing.
- Public transit fares are too high and should be part of the discussions.
- There are historic and unintended bad decisions. We have to make sure growth and investment meet the needs of low income people, we cannot only think of the future markets.
- How do you link public transportation investment in building more affordable housing? Create trade-offs and incentives.

Theme: Better understanding of the health impacts of the MTP/SCS should be developed. Health impacts include the traditional issues around air quality, chronic disease, but in the growing practice of research on health and the built environment, also includes access to: affordable health care, affordable housing, affordable food, affordable transportation, affordable education/training, employment opportunities, and parks and open space.



- People don't understand the link of transportation and jobs. There is a need to provide information on the implications of jobs and housing getting further separated.
- If you have a strong SCS you should have a strong Regional Housing Needs Plan.
- There should be emphasis on the health impacts (positive/negative) of the transportation system.
- There should be consideration/research done on the health impacts of transit-oriented development (TOD).

**Question 3: What do you think about the current proposed approach to updating the growth projections for the 2016 MTP/SCS (i.e., using the same projected amounts of growth in the current MTP/SCS and extending the end year from 2035 to 2036?)**

*This conversation also included comments on new approaches or issues for implementing the MTP/SCS.*

Theme: An approach that considers only minor refinements to the growth projections for the 2016 is a strategic move that will better allocate resources to focus on the implementation issues with the current MTP/SCS.

- It seems like a sound approach; there is still the same growth speed projected; better to use available resource for research on implementation issues.
- Are there other innovative lower-cost ways, besides public transit, to move people efficiently such as pay-as-you-go or private transportation opportunities that are not being considered in the MTP/SCS?
- When considering the growth projection approach, consider what the goal is and that the best use of resources may be spent on implementation.
- Not enough time has passed to re-do growth projections; four years in planning is no time at all.
- Better use of resources is to work on the current financial/performance monitoring implementation commitments presented in the current plan. Help local governments get and use the data.
- The growth projections should stay the same; they may already be too aggressive.
- Jobs drive population increases, not housing. It's not clear yet what the economy will look like in the future, so there is no basis for updating the projections.
- Given the past few years, the reliability of the growth forecast is questionable and updating it wouldn't spur a policy change.
- There could be issues with redoing the growth assumptions given the uncertainty of the current economic climate.
- Implementation should include plans for station planning, with a look at displacement issues associated with TOD, develop impact assessments. Provide more assessment information to policy makers and provide funding for project implementation.
- The MTP/SCS should focus on researching and addressing implementation challenges. It is a reasonable approach and it's best to keep the projections where they are so that they don't decrease.
- Are we so focused on the status of the current transit system that we aren't innovating new transit ideas?

**Question 4: What do you think of the trade-off issues presented associated with a transportation system maintenance strategy?**

Theme: Better data and tools are needed to understand the near- and short-term trade-offs of different types of investment.

- Provide us with more tools/analyses are needed to better weigh projects. For example, comprehensive return on investment.
- Need a clearer understanding of the colors of money, and eligible projects in order to weigh in.
- What are equivalent measures for different types of measures?
- What type of road lifecycle should we target, what is long term payoff?
- Should we reconsider pavement types and the overlay/patch maintenance model? What are the cost tradeoffs over time?
- There needs to be more information to understand road system efficiencies.

Theme: A maintenance approach should be context sensitive.

- It is difficult to determine where to put transportation monies because there are so many competing needs.
- You should maintain roads that transport tourists to farms and other agricultural-related travel, especially in areas where the economy is dependent on these sectors (e.g. El Dorado County).
- A maintenance plan should also focus on where we want to concentrate growth.
- There needs to be balance in maintaining the transportation needs in rural areas.
- Since maintenance of existing roads is key to avoid spending more money later, the real wiggle room in transportation funding is in developing new roads. More money should be shifted from new roads to transit and other modes of transportation. Plus new roads also have an air quality component and may generate more use, thus increasing the need for maintenance funds in the future.

Theme: There needs to be more clarity in the process of how projects get funded.

- The MTIP list of improvements is a black box to the public. It's difficult to know what projects have the most impact. The public depends on SACOG staff to do that analysis.
- Clarity in the process (MTP/SCS and local road investment) is important.
- It is important to know the specific trade-offs and amounts of grant/discretionary funds to make good decisions.

Theme: Additional funding should be secured for the 2016 MTP/SCS.

- We should look into financing mechanisms and funding sources that do not require us to tap into funding for other modes (e.g., maintenance). We need new compelling financing models and we need to change public's opinion that they shouldn't pay more for something they already get. We could consider road tolls as a revenue source, but would need to weigh the impacts on tourists. Mode shifts also means less revenue from the gas tax.
- There needs to be plans to increase resources for system maintenance.

**Question 5: Does the information presented reflect your understanding of the current economic, housing, and transportation climate? Are we missing anything? (Full Group Discussion)**

Theme: Additional reporting that breaks out the current conditions in low income and minority communities and by income and age.

- The report could use more demographic breakdowns by race, income and other factors against the trends we're seeing.
- Can you break down the report by different communities?
- There should be more detail on the economic reporting that includes breakdown by race, ethnicity, household size, and age.
- The type of data reported at the regional level would be useful at the community/neighborhood level, to better understand local needs.
- More information on Generation Y/Millennials would be good to have and consider. They are still doing many of the same things as Generation X and Baby Boomers, just later in life, and their early choices are different than previous generations.

Theme: Better understanding of the job market is needed.

- Jobs are a driving factor to growth in the region. The report shows job loss; is there information about corresponding higher education enrollments, retraining etc?
- Types of jobs are changing.

Theme: More housing information is needed.

- SACOG can make assumptions about jobs and transportation but it needs to include housing and the types that we need.
- There could be more information on housing costs trends.
- You are missing a housing piece, on the trend of new housing and preference, current vacancy rates for different housing types and economic factors related to housing.
- This should include housing cost information, this is an important market factor to understand.
- Do we expect a housing market comeback? Generation Y is a big market – bigger than the Baby Boomers, and they are getting married and having kids later and buying their first house later. They will also drive the housing type demand differently than previous generations.

Theme: Additional comments.

- The information is helping to quantify what we are observing.
- "The Lost Decade" of economic growth (2008-2018) is an interesting observation, does this hold true for education and other areas?

**Question 6: Which of the performance measures presented are the most important to you/your work? Which additional performance measures would you be interested in seeing? (full group discussion)**

*A deeper presentation and conversation on performance measure will occur at the next meeting of this group. Participants, expressed interest in more detail on current performance measures, and what types*

*of data are needed to create new measure to better address their questions. As such, staff committed to the topic for the next meeting in early 2014.*

Theme: Additional transportation measures.

- The report could measure proximity to medical services and the relationship between transportation and housing costs.
- Is there a metric for connectivity, such as density of intersections in an area?
- Is there a way to show how we performed as a region (looking backwards) versus what we projected it to be (looking forward)?
- Jobs are not equitably distributed throughout the region. Jobs that require work at night are not conducive to transit and they don't go into the neighborhoods that need them.

Theme: Additional measure for environmental justice communities is needed.

- One request is that we measure EJ areas versus non-EJ areas for transportation performance. We need to look at the age and condition of housing in those areas.
- The problem with the federal poverty data is that it doesn't including the cost of housing.
- The relationship between displacement and community development should be examined.
- Are local governments meeting the goals of RHNA?
- How do you assess, especially in environmental justice areas, that you are increasing opportunity?

Theme: Measures associated with quality of life.

- The Human Impact Partners has quality of life performance metrics that we should consider using.
- We should consider coverage of green trees as a metric, and housing units per acre. We could also include access to parks and open space.
- It would be good to share what innovations are working at the local government level.

### October 18, 2013 Stakeholder Representation

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Sector</b>
WALKSacramento	Active Trans
California League of Women Voters	Active Transportation/Transit
Sacramento Housing Alliance	Affordable Housing Advocate
Housing California	Affordable Housing Advocate
El Dorado County	Agriculture
Sacramento County	Agriculture
BREATHE CA	Air Quality
Resources for Independent Living	Disabled Residents
El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce	Economic Development
Sacramento Metro Chamber	Economic Development
Environmental Council of Sacramento	Environment
The Nature Conservancy	Environment
Sacramento Tree Foundation	Environment/Trees
Domus Development	For-Profit Affordable Housing Developer
California Endowment	Health Foundation
Sierra Health Foundation	Health Foundation
Cordova Hills, LLC	Market Rate Developer
Taylor-Wiley Law	Market Rate Development
North State Building Industry Association	Market Rate Development
StoneBridge Properties	Market Rate Development
Sacramento County	Public Health
California Rural League Assistance, Inc.	Rural Social Equity/Housing
UC Davis	Social Equity/Equitable SB 375 Implementation

### MTP/SCS Cross-Sectoral Sounding Board List

<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency/Organization</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Sector</b>
Executive Director	WALKSacramento	Sacramento	Region	Active Transportation
Program Director	Woodland Bike Campaign	Woodland	Yolo	Active Transportation/Biking
Advocate	CA League of Womens Voters	Sacramento	Region	Active Transportation/Transit/Seniors
Board Member	Sac Housing Alliance	Sacramento	Region	Affordable Housing
Policy Director	Housing California	Sacramento	State	Affordable Housing
District Director	US Department Housing & Urban Development	Sacramento	Region	Affordable Housing
Deputy Director of Housing Policy	CA Department of Housing & Community Development	Sacramento	State	Affordable Housing
President/CEO	Nehemiah Corp	Sacramento	Region	Affordable Housing Developer
Agricultural Commissioner	El Dorado County	Placerville	El Dorado	Agriculture
Agricultural Commissioner	Sacramento County	Sacramento	Sacramento County	Agriculture
Executive Director	Capay Valley Vision	Esparto	Capay Valley	Agriculture
Agricultural Commissioner	Yolo County	Woodland	Yolo County	Agriculture
Agricultural Commissioner	Placer County	Auburn	Placer County	Agriculture
Agricultural Commissioner	Yuba County	Marysville	Yuba County	Agriculture
Ag Commissioner	Sutter County	Yuba City	Sutter County	Agriculture
Executive Director	BREATHE CA	Sacramento	Region	Air Quality
President/CEO	Valley Vision	Sacramento	Region	Community Based Organization
Executive Director	Ubuntu Green	Sacramento	Sacramento City	Community Based Organization
Executive Director	Mutual Assistance Network	Sacramento	Sacramento City	Community Based Organization
Executive Director	Asian Resources	Sacramento	Sacramento City	Community Based Organization

<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency/Organization</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Sector</b>
Advocate/Community Organizer	Resources for Independent Living	Sacramento	Region	Disabled Community
Branch Manager	FREED-Center for Independent Living	Marysville	Yuba & Sutter Counties	Disabled Community
President	Rainbow Chamber	Sacramento	Region	Economic Development
Executive Director	Greater Sacramento Urban League	Sacramento	Region	Economic Development
President/CEO	Sacramento Asian-Pacific Chamber of Commerce	Sacramento	Region	Economic Development
President/CEO	El Dorado County Chamber of Commerce	Placerville	El Dorado County	Economic Development
President/CEO	El Dorado Hills Chamber of Commerce	El Dorado Hills	El Dorado Hills	Economic Development
Senior Vice President, Public Policy & Economic Development	Sac Metro Chamber of Commerce	Sacramento	Region	Economic Development
Senior Vice President	SACTO	Sacramento	Region	Economic Development
President/CEO	Sacramento Hispanic Chamber of Commerce	Sacramento	Region	Economic Development
President/CEO	Sacramento Black Chamber of Commerce	Sacramento	Region	Economic Development
Director	Center for Strategic Economic Research	Sacramento	Region	Economic Development/Regional Data
Supervisor, Electric Transportation	SMUD	Sacramento	Region	Energy
Economic Development Executive, Greater Sacramento Region	PG & E	Sacramento	Region	Energy
Executive Director	Sac Tree Foundation	Sacramento	Region	Environment
Executive Director	ECOS	Sacramento	Region	Environment
External Affairs Manager	The Nature Conservancy	Sacramento	Region	Environment

<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency/Organization</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Sector</b>
Conservation Program Coordinator	Sierra Club	Sacramento	Region	Environment
Public Information Officer	Sacramento Metro Fire	Sacramento	Sacramento County	Fire
President/Co-founder	Domus Development	Sacramento	State	For-Profit Affordable Housing Developer/Infill Developer
Manager of Environmental Policy	CA Trucking Assn	Sacramento	State	Goods/Freight
Manager of Environmental Policy	CA Trucking Assn			Goods/Freight
Project Director	Cordova Hills, LLC	Sacramento	Sacramento	Greenfield Developer
Health in All Policies Coordinator	CA Department of Public Health	Sacramento	State	Health & Built Environment/Active Transportation
Community Benefits Director	Sutter Health	Sacramento	Region	Health Care Provider
Program Manager	The CA Endowment	Sacramento	State/So Sacramento & County	Health Foundation
Program Manager	Sierra Health Foundation	Sacramento	Region	Health Foundation
Director, Local Government Affairs	UC Davis	Davis	Region	Higher Education
Associate Vice Chancellor: Workforce & Economic Development	Los Rios CC District	Sacramento	Sacramento County	Higher Education/TOD
President/CEO	Community Link	Sacramento	Sacramento County	Human Services
Executive Director	Capitol Health Network	Sacramento	Sacramento County	Human Services
Public Information Officer	CA Highway Patrol	West Sacramento	Region	Law Enforcement
Principal & President	MacKay & Soms	Roseville	Region	Market Rate Development
Executive Director	Region Builders	Sacramento	Region	Market Rate Development
Capitol Area Development Manager	CADA	Sacramento	Sacramento	Infill Development



<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency/Organization</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Sector</b>
President	StoneBridge	Sacramento	Sacramento	Market Rate Developer
Vice President	Richland Homes	Roseville	Region	Market Rate Developer
Managing Principal	Economic & Planning Systems	Sacramento	Region	Market Rate Developer
Director of Governmental & Legislative Affairs	North State Building Industry Association	Roseville	Region	Market Rate Development
Founding Partner/Legal Counsel	Taylor Wiley	Sacramento	Sacramento	Market Rate Development Attorney
Executive Director	Mutual Housing California	Sacramento	Yolo & Sacramento Counties	Non-profit Affordable Housing Developer
Public Health Officer	Sacramento County	Sacramento	Sacramento County	public health
Director of Litigation, Advocacy & Training	CA Rural League Assistance, Inc.	Marysville	Yuba, Sutter, El Dorado counties	Rural Social Equity
Senior Planner	Area 4 Agency on Aging	Sacramento	Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo & Yuba counties	Seniors/Aging
Professor	Community & Regional Development	Davis	Region	Social Equity
Counsel	Western Poverty Law Center	Sacramento	State	Social Equity
Deputy Director	Opening Doors	Sacramento	Region	Social Equity
Director	UCD Center for Regional Change	Davis	Region	Social Equity
President	CA Capital/CDFI	Sacramento	Region	Social Equity/Economic Development
Associate Professor	UC Davis	Davis	Region	Social Equity/Equitable SB 375 Investment
Tribal Liaison	Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation	Brooks	Sovereign Nation	Tribal Government
Government Affairs	United Auburn Indian Community	Auburn	Sovereign Nation	Tribal Government
Legal Counsel	Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians	Shingle Springs	Sovereign Nation	Tribal Government

<b>Title</b>	<b>Agency/Organization</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Sector</b>
Executive Director	Regional Water Authority	Sacramento	Region	Water
Executive Director	Yolo Children's Alliance	Davis	Yolo	Youth Services