



# ECOS

ENVIRONMENTAL  
♦ COUNCIL ♦  
OF SACRAMENTO

## ECOS Transportation, Air Quality & Climate Change Committee

Thursday, December 1st, 2016, 6:00 pm

Mogavero Architects, 2012 K Street, Sacramento

### Meeting Notes

**Attendance:** Rebecca Parker (Caltrans), Robert Coplin (DOGFITE), Jim Cathcart (STAR), Lynne Goldsmith (AARP), Delphine Cathcard (STAR), Greg Thompson (STAR/EOS), James Drake (Sac RT), Kristin Peck (Caltrans), Nancy Kitz, Guy Hall (Sac. EV Assoc.), Alex Reagan (ECOS staff), Brandon Rose (ECOS President), Ralph Propper (designated co-chair, 2017), Jon Ellison (co-chair), John Deeter (co-chair).

6:00 p.m. – Welcome, Introductions, Check-Ins, and Changes to Agenda

6:05 p.m. -- Implications of the defeat of Measure B on the future of Sacramento  
Regional Transit -- **John Deeter** (TAQCC co-chair); all

**Deeter:** Summary of recent history of Sacramento RT. Prior to recession of 2008, RT had been expanding the light rail system (Gold line to Folsom and Sac Valley Station, Blue line to Meadowview), and slowly reducing bus service. (**Drake** explained that this was deliberate, as RT converted from a primarily radial bus system centered on downtown Sacramento to a transfer oriented system with light rail providing the major trunk service.) Overall ridership steadily increased, reaching a high of 35 million boardings in FY 2009. With the onset of the 2008 recession, the state drastically curtailed support for transit and RT lost about 20% of its operating revenue. In response to the loss of support, RT in 2009 raised the base fare from \$2.00 to \$2.25 and then to \$2.50, and eliminated transfers. The action RT took in mid 2010 was even more drastic, cutting bus service by 21% and rail service by 5% (mainly reductions in evening and weekend service). Ridership fell rapidly for both bus and rail services, to about 26 million total (reduction of 21%) and remained stagnant through FY 2015. The recent fare increase apparently saw a further fall in ridership in FY 2016.

**Drake (RT planner):** Service levels increased 4% in 2012, have been stagnant since. RT has recently put a lot of money into security and cleaning for light rail, but still losing a lot of off peak riders. Peak riders less sensitive to price of fares. Blue line got a boost from opening south to CRC. There were one-time reasons for pre-2010 increase in ridership including 2008 gas prices hitting \$4, and "Fix I-5" pushing folks into transit. Getting rid of transfers was a mistake. RT would like to increase weekend bus service -- half hourly service on ten routes instead of two currently. Many people work on weekends. RT looking at fewer routes with higher frequency.

***Deeter:** The Transit 101 workshop yesterday evening (Nov.30th) was mainly concerned with how to conduct a successful grassroots campaign for local tax measures -- primarily sales taxes, such as Measure B in Sacramento County. At this workshop Dave Campbell (Bike East Bay) reviewed his experiences with transportation taxes in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. He worked with a coalition of advocates for non-auto oriented transportation. They had to negotiate with road interests to get a transportation measure on the ballot, and got good earmarks for bike-ped (about 5%) but transit fared no better than Sac (about 30%). (BART provides rail service in East Bay communities, and it is mainly funded outside of the local county transportation measures.) Some of his suggestions:*

- *Get into the process for planning transportation tax measure early*
- *Form a strong coalition among non-auto proponents*
- *Propose a measure that includes everything you want*
- *Be tough and threaten to oppose any measure that shortchanges your interests*

*We'll start the discussion with a couple of questions. What would it take for RT to return to the service level prior to the 2010 cuts? Would restoration of service actually induce a recovery of ridership lost from the 2010 cuts? My estimate is that RT would need about \$25 million per year to restore service (**Drake** concurred with this estimate, and added that \$25 M would allow RT to run 25 more all-day bus routes). It is very unlikely that the state will restore its transit support to pre-2008 levels, so that money would have to be raised through local taxes. One failing of Measure B was that it did not explicitly provide for additional funding for RT operations to fill in this gap.*

*There will almost certainly be a follow-up transportation measure on the ballot in 2020 (possibly 2018), and we need to have a plan for making sure that it is less auto oriented than Measure B. Who should lead this effort -- Transit 101 (350 Sacramento) or someone else. ECOS should be involved in this effort.*

**Discussion:**

- *Currently no strong advocacy group for alternative transportation in Sacramento -- earlier Modern Transit Association was instrumental in bringing light rail to Sacto*
- *There was no consensus among non-auto groups about Measure B -- some supported it, some opposed*
- *There is likely to continue to be a lack of consensus for future measures as well*
- *We need to understand why RT is failing before we put together a ballot proposal*
- *RT is probably headed in the direction of mainly trunk line service and reduced number of low ridership local routes. RT is studying a reconstruction of the bus system (Drake)*
- *RT needs change in governance to be more responsive to public interest*
- *Transit service must be clean, safe, and convenient to attract riders*
- *RT has made some bad financial decision such as farebox guaranteed revenue bonds*
- *RT does not have a strategic plan to increase ridership*
- *RT needs to be analyzing the barriers to ridership*
- *Regional transit is more than just RT -- integrated system or better coordination?*
- *How should transit be provided overall to the region?*
- *Wrong to retrench transit to just Sacramento city*
- *Remind developers, builders and trades unions that there are jobs in constructing transit and bike-ped facilities, and get them on board to provide funding for the election campaign*
- *Need comprehensive plan that minimizes opposition*
- *Look at other taxes besides sales tax*
- *Proposal has to be something people could swallow*

- *Base funding plan on Metropolitan Transportation Plan developed by SACOG*
- *MTP has to meet federal air quality standards and state mandated reductions in GHGs*
- *Building more roads just increases air pollution*
- *Principles underlying the MTP (less reliance on autos) ignored by jurisdictions in developing Measure B*
- *Measure B could have come out of the 80s -- envisioned more roads and less busses*
- *Need to be talking about connectivity, not about projects like light rail to the airport*
- *Measure B was a deal worked out around a table by developers*
- *Have to appeal to people that are voting --suburbs voted against Measure B*
- *Funding for public transit needs to appeal to people who don't care about it to get them to vote for it.*
- *Suburbs might care enough about environment and air quality to vote for taxes for RT*
- *EOS did not like Measure B -- 30 year plan too long, no reform in RT governance*
- *Ballot measures that passed in CA in 2016 were based on transit*
- *What capital projects would every alternatives group support? Luke-warm support and outright opposition to Green line to Airport, for instance*
- *"Fix it first and Complete Streets --" could be the nucleus for the new measure in 2018)*
- *Base a coalition on the core group (STAR, LWV, SABA, Sierra Club, WalkSacramento, Breathe CA, ECOS) involved in Transit 101 workshops*

*Transit 101 has been invited to tour of RT operations facilities sometime in January. TAQCC should be invited as well. Tour would be limited to a maximum of 20 people.*

**Action:** *We are a long way from agreeing on an alternative transportation measure. TAQCC co-chairs will work with Transit 101 and other groups to set up further meetings starting in January 2017.*

## 6:30 p.m. -- Sacramento County's Climate Action Plan

**Ralph Propper** (CA Air Resources Board, ret.)

**Propper:** *California cities and counties are required to develop CAPs, based on SB 379 (adopted 2015 calls for Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Strategies) and CEQA. Sacramento County staff is developing a Climate Action Plan (CAP). Their kick-off meeting was held 8/24/16, with follow-up meetings in north and south Sacramento County in November. The County's CAP applies to unincorporated areas. Staff plans to issue a draft CAP in spring 2017, and have it adopted in the summer or fall, 2017. The county had developed a County Operations Plan in 2012, calling for cleaner county vehicle fleet building energy retrofits, LED streetlights/signals, solar energy at SMF, landfill waste to energy, financing clean energy for property (PACE), preserving and planting trees, and low impact development standard (LID).*

*The County staff intends to: (1) update GHG emissions inventory, (2) forecast demissions, (3) develop GHG emissions reduction targets and measures, (4) adopt the plan, and (5) implement it. The county now has a 2015 GHG emissions inventory: 34% on-road vehicles, 25% residential energy, 18% commercial/industrial energy, 7% solid waste, and 5% each from off-road vehicles, agriculture, and high GWP gases. About 2.5% of that total is from county operations: 315 employee commute, 24% vehicle fleet, 23% buildings & facilities, 15% airports. The target is 15% below 2005 emissions by 2020. This will require local measures to reduce emissions in the following categories:*

1. *Transportation: electric vehicles, bike share, complete streets transit, bike lanes.*
2. *Energy: More efficient home appliances and lighting (LED, CFC), more renewable energy.*
3. *Other: Drought-tolerant landscaping, trees, composting, local food.*

A "Capital Region Climate Readiness Collaborative" would involve SMUD, PG&E, SACOG, Water Agencies.

*Ideas presented at November workshops:*

1. *Reduce VMT: - coordinate with land use and transportation planning; expanded transit, TODs, complete streets; change parking requirements, ride-share.*
2. *Low Emission Vehicles - incentives and tax credits.*
3. *Low-carbon fuels - ethanol, CNG, biodiesel, electric and hydrogen stations.*

*Energy strategies include: update HVAC and weatherize existing homes; new buildings using less energy (LEED, CalGreen), more renewable energy (solar, wind, organics); water and waste-water efficiency, solid waste reduction, less HFCs used by industry. A major concern is the whether the county (and other jurisdictions, such as Sacramento City) will follow through on their Climate Action Plans, or if they will be put on shelves. This will require citizen involvement.*

**Hall:** *CA state government is requiring all new parking structures to be 6% prewired for electric vehicles when structures is being built. The Sac. EV Assoc. would like to bump this up to 10% and also include requirement for new multiresident housing in the County's building code, and requests ECOS's support for this recommendation. He added that autonomous vehicles could help energize transit, and the time line for this to become reality is as short as five years.*

**Action:** *TAQCC (by consensus) recommended that the ECOS Board or Exec. Cmte adopt a resolution along these lines, and Hall agreed to supply language for this resolution.*

7:20 p.m. -- Other Business and Announcements / Possible topics for future meetings  
SMUD 59th St. planned development project (air pollution from US 50),  
Caltrans plans for expansion/improvement of Capital City freeway and  
US 50, Downtown Sacramento Transportation Plan (Grid 3.0), City of  
Sacramento Bicycle Master Plan, Tri-city proposed bike-share program

**Deeter:** *The TAQCC Google group is provided to keep cmte members informed about TAQCC topics between meetings. Co-chairs will strive to keep the Google group membership up-to-date.*

7:30 p.m. -- Adjourn

Next TAQCC meeting: Thurs., Jan. 5th, 2017, 6:00 pm, at Mogavero Architects, 2012 K St.

Other upcoming events of interest:

Nov 30th, 6:30 pm, 6000 Lemon Hill Ave. -- Transit 101 workshop (Refreshments at 6 pm).