



Item #14-3-6B

## Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee Information

February 27, 2014

### 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Outreach Update

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

**Recommendation:** None, this is for information only.

**Discussion:** In 2013, at the request of Board members, staff developed a group of cross-sectoral and regionally representative stakeholders and senior staff 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 as they arise. The sounding board met on February 19, 2014, for the second time. The group provided feedback on the initial findings of the Transit Maintenance Research, Inventory of Adopted and Proposed Greenfield Plans, and the draft approach to scenario development for the 2016 MTP/SCS. The meeting summary notes, agenda, participant evaluations, and attendance list is in Attachment A.

On February 18, 2014 staff from SACOG and Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) met with members of Tribal Council from the United Auburn Indian Community to discuss communications and engagement for the 2016 MTP/SCS and for PCTPA’s Regional Transportation Plan update. Attachment B contains a meeting summary and a list of meeting attendees. Staff is working to schedule a follow-up meeting in addition to meetings with the other two tribes in the SACOG region. Staff is required to work on a government-to-government basis with tribal governments on the development of the 2016 MTP/SCS.

Public workshops for the 2016 MTP/SCS will be conducted in the fall of 2014. Staff will bring forward a proposal for public workshops this spring to receive Board direction.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MH:gg  
Attachments

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Government Affairs Team Manager, (916) 340-6276  
Kacey Lizon, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6265  
Monica Hernández, Public Information Coordinator, (916) 340-6237

1400604

## 2016 MTP/SCS Sounding Board Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: Wednesday, February 19, 2014

Meeting Location: West Sacramento City Hall Galleria

### Meeting Attendees:

Alchemist CDC

American Institute of Architects

Brookfield Residential

CA Rural Legal Assistance

Community Link-Capital Region

Cooley & Associates

Domus Development

Environmental Council of Sacramento

Housing California

League of Women Voters

North State Building Industry Association

Resources for Independent Living

Richland Communities

Sacramento Co Ag Commissioner

Sacramento County Public Health

Sacramento Housing Alliance

Sacramento Tree Foundation

SMUD

WALKSacramento

Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation

Yolo Co Housing Authority

### Meeting Agenda:

-Welcome & Introductions, Monica Hernandez

-What's Happened Since We Last Met, Monica Hernández

-Transit State of Good-Repair Research Initial Findings, Sharon Sprowls

-Approach to 2016 MTP/SCS Scenario Development, Kacey Lizon & Mike McKeever

-Approach for Public Workshops\*, Monica Hernández

-Wrap up & Next Steps, Monica Hernández

*\*Due to extensive dialogue on earlier agenda items, this topic was not covered thoroughly and will be brought back to the sounding board in a subsequent meeting.*

### 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 happened since the group last met in October 2013. Staff explained how the information the sounding board provided was presented and considered prior to board actions. During the staff summary, participants were reminded of the purpose of the sounding board, the upcoming actions staff will be asking the Board to consider, and the timing of research updates relative to the next sounding board meeting. Participants were encouraged to communicate to staff, if there were any additional concerns or questions not addressed during the meeting.

### Transit State of Good-Repair Initial Findings

Staff presented the initial findings of Transit State of Good-Repair Research (presented to Board Policy Committees in March) to the sounding board. Meeting participants were encouraged to ask clarifying questions as needed during the presentation, and the intent of the presentation was to get feedback on issues of interest and concern to the participants.

### Discussion Themes & Comments

THEME: Fleet Expansion and Clean Fuel Requirements

- When discussing capital costs, are the statutory requirements for clean fuel vehicle replacement and the higher per vehicle cost included?
- A chart that shows what percentage of current fleets, by transit operator, that are clean fuel would be useful.
- Do you have the replacement of transit vehicles and/or additional demand broken out by Community Type—interested in the increased costs associated with new growth areas.
- Has anyone considered the possible diversion of transit (and other transportation) funds to water, water storage, energy for transport, in light of the current and potential future drought?
- When planning for vehicle replacement, is reducing vehicle size considered (shuttles vs. large buses) for lower ridership corridors?

THEME: Transit Operations Cost and Service Differentials between Bus and Light Rail

- Can you compare the number of people being moved on light rail vs. bus in 2020 or 2035?
- What is the per capita cost of operations for light rail vs. bus—when thinking about trade-offs, this seems like an important consideration.
- When working within a constrained budget, an overall policy consideration should include whether investment in bus or light rail will move the plan closer to the 2020 and 2035 numbers.
- When thinking about investment, you have to consider that light rail reaches fewer people, and bus serves to connect to light rail and more destinations and the same when planning for service expansion.
- Can you compare farebox recovery rates for similar metro areas that have higher ridership than our area?
- Can you compare farebox recovery by different bus and light rail lines?

THEME: Transit System Expansion Planning

- Transit passengers need to be better engaged when planning for system expansion, planners need to better understand where people need and want to go—to be successful, transit routes should be like a web as opposed to linear.
- When you talk about the air quality improvements from increased transit ridership, can you talk in terms of public health benefits?
- What are the new technologies and services being adopted—in terms of planning and service delivery, e.g., consideration of electric vehicles, driverless cars?
- When planning for a truly regional transit system, partnerships and collaboration are key—and should not be only the transit agencies, but large employment centers, hospitals, and other desirable/needed destinations.
- Housing Authorities need to be engaged in the rollout of the ConnectCard.

THEME: Transit System Needs in Rural, Suburban and Urban Communities

- When considering fleet replacement needs, is there a way to assess the needs and costs for different community types?
- Will there be more neighborhood shuttles?

## **Approach to 2016 MTP/SCS Scenario Development and Land Use Inventory**

Staff discussed the state and federal requirements associated with the land use inventory, the process collecting the data, and how the land use inventory is used to create scenarios for the Environmental Impact Report for the 2016 MTP/SCS. After the initial process description, staff walked participants through the regional land use inventory map and data used to develop the map. Staff explained to the meeting participants, that this was part one of two land use inventory reports, and that staff would be asking the board to take action in March on the proposed approach to develop scenarios.

### THEME: Addressing Current and Future Housing Capacity

- If you look at the table of approved and planned housing a critical factor is affordability, and it isn't factored—if you don't factor in affordability, your assumptions will be wrong—you will overestimate.
- Does this information create a perception of an over-supply, so that it appears there isn't a need to plan for more housing—how you talk about that is very important.
- Be critical of the information from different segments of the development community and the local jurisdictions, they may not give good information for fear of being excluded in the plan, or dropped from the map.
- Rather than picking 'winners and losers' could you consider an approach that allocates market share to an area and essentially allows rules, standards, and/or policies to pick the winners and losers?
- You may be able to demonstrate significant capacity, but it may not be capacity for the people who are here, or will be here—you need to better match the new housing with the need today and in the future.
- Do you look at the regional percentage of growth per community type over time?
- When preparing your land use inventory, across community type, how do you adjust to include, or exclude at different points of time in the plan? This map shows projects that have been approved and/or planned since the early 2000s—but they are not currently being built, and may not be.
- Do you have a sense about how the supply and demand (capacity to 2035) line up in terms of multi-family and single family? For example, do you maybe only have 10 years of multi-family capacity beyond 2035 (or less) while 60 years of single-family products?

### THEME: Addressing Current and Future Housing Market Demand

- When you forecast where growth is most likely to occur, how heavily do you weigh how projects are planned (i.e. type of housing, growth pattern, cost to consumer, etc.) compared to current and future market trends and demands? Projects designed and sited in the 1990s don't match the current demand but are still reflected in the map as future growth. They don't seem like viable projects today.
- Addressing the issues of current and future demand is key, with a focus on meeting the current need which may continue to be the needs in the future—related to affordability.
- Is there a way to assess quality education and housing patterns?
- A policy discussion around need and land availability should occur as part of the planning process.

THEME: Current and Future Housing Affordability and Access

- The homeless are not factored into the market segment growth segments.
- There is an equity issue underlying this map, you may need a disproportionate investment in housing for low income/underserved people and seniors.
- Policy considerations beyond affordability need to be given to issues of race, ethnicity, family size, unit size, and income—there is potential to allow/force certain inequitable growth patterns to continue.
- How does the future size and affordability address existing need?

THEME: Regulatory Barriers

- The regulatory environment is “truthing out” greenfield and infill project viability and will continue to do so for the next decade.
- AB 32 and SB 375 have changed how greenfield patterns will happen in the near term.
- When conducting your market tests for potential of greenfield and infill projects, you need to realistically look at the regulatory and infrastructure hurdles they will have to overcome.

THEME: Scenario Development and Performance Metrics

- Will the issues being discussed (affordability, market realities, regulations, infrastructure needs, water availability, etc.) be addressed in the scenarios?
- Will a fix-it-first (maintenance) model self-direct a more compact growth pattern?
- We know that many factors will continue to change, but water availability, energy cost, social equity, and public health will continue to be real issues, Scenario 3 doesn’t go far enough to address these.
- Will you be adding new inputs into performance metrics for the 2016 MTP/SCS update?
- Have you looked at Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Equity Scenario and compared it to yours?

## MTP/SCS Sounding Board Meeting Participant Evaluation

February 19, 2014

### Ranking

5. Strongly Agree

4. Agree

3. Neutral

2. Disagree

1. Strongly Disagree

---

This meeting was well organized: **4.4**

The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material: **3.8**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the Land Use Inventory and approach to scenario development: **4.5**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the initial findings of the Transit Maintenance Research: **4.2**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the draft approaches for conducting public workshops: **3.7**

The meeting was beneficial to me: **4.2**

I have a good understanding of the 2016 MTP/SCS process, and how my input is being considered: **4.2**

### Were there any parts of the meeting that should be avoided in the future?

- I wished Kacey's presentation had more charts to give a better articulation of her dialog. Some of the dialogue was repetitious.

### What should be done next time to make the presentations more effective?

- Average daily VMT would be a good chart. Per Capita was a little bit different. The population density in rural areas would be low so the absolute magnitude is misrepresented. Average VMT/vehicle would be useful.
- Allow more time
- Some supplemental information—emphasizing the benefit of different options
- While I appreciate the free-conversation during presentations, I felt it got away from the presentations a little too much
- Better outline— One overview presentation + workgroups with a final wrap up
- Find ways to be sure everyone participates

### Additional Comments:

- I believe we need to incrementally move more in the direction of Scenario 3
- Meeting could have been longer
- Having the list ahead of time of the questions you'd like our feedback on would be helpful
- Need to discuss Climate Change—droughts and floods do have a lasting effect

**United Auburn Indian Community, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency,  
and SACOG Meeting Summary**

Meeting Date: February 18, 2014, 2 PM

Meeting Location: Thunder Valley Casino, Hotel Board Room  
1200 Athens Ave, Lincoln, 95648

**Meeting Attendees:**

Brenda Adams, Tribal Treasurer, UAIC Tribal Council  
Alison Harvey, Governmental Affairs Director, UAIC  
Calvin Moman, Tribal Council Member, UAIC Tribal Council  
Arlen Opper, Advisor, UAIC  
Danny Rey, Secretary, UAIC Tribal Council  
Gene Whitehouse, Tribal Chairperson, UAIC Tribal Council  
John Williams, Tribal Vice Chairperson, UAIC Tribal Council  
Celia McAdam, Executive Director, PCTPA  
Luke McNeel-Caird, Senior Planner, PCTPA  
Monica Hernández, Public Information Coordinator, SACOG  
Kacey Lizon, Senior Planner, SACOG  
Mike McKeever, Executive Director, SACOG

**Agenda:**

Introductions, All  
Meeting Outcomes, Monica Hernandez & Luke McNeel-Caird  
How PCTPA & SACOG Work Together, Celia McAdam & Mike McKeever  
2036 Regional Transportation Plan Process, Celia McAdam & Luke McNeel-Caird  
2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Update, Kacey Lizon  
Tribal Engagement & Communications, All  
Wrap Up and Next Steps, Monica Hernandez & Luke McNeel-Caird

**Meeting Summary:**

Due to unforeseen timing constraints, the group was not able to meet for the original time intended.

Summary overviews of PCTPA's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update and SACOG's 2016 MTP/SCS were presented. An update on significant transportation projects in Placer County was given, the subsequent conversations focused on questions and answers on the timing and financing needs for local transportation projects. There was emphasis on the unique roles PCTPA and SACOG play related to the delivery and financing of transportation projects of Tribal interest. Alison Harvey was identified by Tribal Council as the point of contact for both SACOG and PCTPA, staff from both agencies will continue to work with Ms. Harvey to provide timely information and input opportunities on the RTP and MTP/SCS update processes.