



**ECOS Transportation, Air Quality & Climate Change Committee
Thursday, March 1st, 2018, 6:00 p.m.
Mogavero Architects, 2012 K Street, Sacramento**

Meeting Notes

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

Attendance: Richard Lentz (350 Sac), Delphine Cathcart (STAR), Dan Allison (STAR), Karen Jacques (STAR), Maya Pelagio (Sierra Club), Oscar Balaguer (350 Sac), Matt Baker (ECOS staff), Ralph Propper (ECOS Pres.), John Deeter (Chair).

Guest: Clint Holtzen (SACOG).

6:05 p.m. – Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

- Policy framework -- Clint Holtzen (SACOG)

Holtzen: Project manager for 2020 MTP/SCS. It has four elements: Policy, Action, Financial, and SCS. It is financially constrained by projected transportation funding. The SCS is based on growth forecasts for the next 20 years for population, employment and housing. The MTP/SCS is based on plans developed by the cities and counties. Seven underlying principles:

- Transportation Choice
- Compact Development
- Mixed-Use Development
- Housing Choice and Diversity
- Natural Resource Conservation
- Quality Design
- Use of Existing Assets.

AB 375 was inspired by Sacramento Blueprint (2004), and mandates greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions through reduced vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Levers for reducing VMT are land use and provision of alternatives to driving. ARB previously set a target of 16% per capita reduction in GHG by 2030 for the 2016 MTP, and has proposed to increase that to 19% reduction for the 2020 version, Discussion of relationship between GHG emissions and VMT. Need to identify principles and policies to meet GHG reduction target. What are short term actions? SACOG controls only 6% of transportation spending in region.. For instance, SACOG doesn't dole out SBI money, but CTC and SacTA do this. SACOG provides grant application assistance, such as how to supply right data and right story.

***Q:** Who provides the leadership and vision? **Holtzen:** SACOG can bring some vision, not just status quo. MTP is not just a sum of all jurisdictional plans, but proposes a shift towards infill development and non-auto modes. Goals of the MTP include: preserve agricultural land, double transit and triple bike/ped by 2040, and reduce VMT growth below the rate of population goal. But the plan is not being implemented so as to achieve increased transit usage and reduced VMT. Not enough housing is not being built, just four*

thousand units per year instead of the needed 18 thousand. More greenfield and less affordable housing than planned.. James Corless (CEO) wants SACOG to be more transparent about where SACOG is failing.

Transportation funding is affected by new, disruptive changes, such as electric and autonomous vehicles. Box stores and retail sales are going away, resulting in decreased sales tax revenue. Fuel taxes have not kept up with costs of maintaining roadways – SBI generates less than 30% of that. Transit is heavily dependent on diesel and sales taxes. Wage gap after the recession -- only recovered lower paying jobs., not the kind of jobs that support a family. Low income workers are disadvantaged if they have to rely on transit, since twice the access to jobs using a car than transit. Demographic change from 2010 to 2016 is drastic in Sacramento. City is working on TOD grant proposal involving climate change. It plans to invest \$35M in infrastructure.

Q: Where is displacement / gentrification occurring? Would repeal of Costa Hawkins help in allowing stricter restrictions on rent increases? **Holtzen:** AB 827 would encourage higher density around transit where it hasn't occurred before. State has eliminated local development agencies, which has changed housing subsidies. There are infrastructure constraints for infill, easier to build in greenfields. Many vacant parcels have significant obstacles to building affordable housing. What are the easier places for infill? Supervisor Susan Peters doesn't have much greenfield in her district, serves Carmichael and El Camiino, with small motels and hotels. She has questioned whether some infill is possible, and estimates may be overly optimistic. Infill on suburban corridors is hard because infrastructure is aging, but that is where poverty is happening. County doesn't have a plan for maintaining infrastructures. Housing in greenfields is only delivering the most expensive product. Current strategy is to build housing for people coming in from more expensive areas. There is demand for smaller, walkable communities. Need to make infill more affordable by relaxing parking requirement.

SACOG has been saddled with Region Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) to distribute low income housing among jurisdictions, which is done every 8 years. Allocation based on population -- it must plan to accommodate all, but no requirement to build it. Are we actually building affordable housing in the quantities we need?

Q: MTP and SCS don't seem to be connected. We shouldn't be adding new road capacity for things that will be built in 20 years. **Holtzen:** Projects get nominated by jurisdictional public works departments, who propose 2,000 projects to SACOG but these projects are not directly concerned about transit. SACOG does performance analysis based on land use allocation for housing and employment. MTP must meet air quality and GHG goals, which constrains which project get in. For instance, the middle portion of the SE Connector is not eligible for federal or state funding because it is not in the MTP. Skeptical about Green Line to the Airport -- Truxel alignment through Natomas abuts sound wall so no one can get to proposed light rail. BRT line might be considered.

Baker: ECOS endorsed the 2016 MTP as generally meeting our goals. We would like to see SACOG explore a wider range of alternatives, from an all-infill scenario to a business-as-usual, primarily focused on greenfield development. **Holtzen:** MTP is an ambitious compromise between jurisdictional general plans and what ECOS would like to see. Jurisdictions want 900 thousand new jobs but region can only support one-third of those. Who gets that growth? Some specific plan areas need to come out, or others take less. Land use drives transportation, and the capital

improvement plan is tied to developer impact fees. There's regional planning for transportation, but no regional planning for land use.

Q: *How are we forecasting the lifecycle costs of building greenfields? **Holtzen:** In short term, greenfield development gives more money to jurisdictions through impact fees. Online sales tax does not go to local jurisdictions. How to collect sales tax from online retail has not caught up. Corless wants Sacramento to lead with jobs, not housing.*

Action: *TAQCC chair will schedule follow-up discussions about the 2020 MTP, including possible supplemental meetings devoted to this topic that involve the ECOS Land Use committee.*

7:00 p.m. -- TAQCC member survey

Deferred.

7:15 p.m. -- Updates and reports

- Electric & Autonomous Vehicles
- Transit advocacy, transportation coalition & Measure B
- Regional Transit issues (route optimization, etc)
- CapCity freeway & other freeway expansions
- Sacramento County Climate Action Plan
- Sacramento Valley Station Master Plan & station design
- Repeal of SB1

7:40 p.m. – Other business and announcements / Possible topics for future meetings

7:45 p.m. (approx.) – Adjourn

Next TAQCC meeting: Thurs, April 5th, 6:00 p.m., Mogavero Architects, 2012 K St.

Other upcoming events of interest:

March 3, 10 am -- Sacramento Transit Advocates & Riders, 1714 Broadway

March 7, 6 pm -- Vision for North 16th Street Community Workshop, 116 N 16th St.

March 10, 1 pm -- Sacramento Transit Riders Union, 1714 Broadway

March 27, 6 pm -- ECOS Board, 909 12th St. (reception at 5:30)

Printable TAQCC agendas and minutes are available on the ECOS [Web site](#).