

***Sacramento Transportation & Air Quality Collaborative***

***Final Report***

*Volume IV:  
Stakeholder Comments & Staff Summary of  
Unresolved Issues*

*December 2005*



## **SPONSORING AGENCIES**

City of Citrus Heights  
City of Elk Grove  
City of Folsom  
City of Rancho Cordova  
City of Sacramento  
County of Sacramento  
Sacramento Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)  
Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)  
Sacramento Regional Transit District (RTD)  
Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA)  
State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

## **FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES OR MORE INFORMATION**

### **Contact Us:**

Sacramento Transportation Authority  
901 F Street, Suite 210  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 323-0080

Website: <http://www.sactaqc.org>

E-Mail: [Info@sacta.org](mailto:Info@sacta.org)

***Sacramento Transportation & Air Quality Collaborative***

***Final Report***

*Volume IV:  
Stakeholder Comments & Staff Summary of  
Unresolved Issues*

*December 2005*

## READERS GUIDE TO THE FINAL REPORT

*Stakeholder Comments & Staff Summary of Unresolved Issues* is one volume of the Final Report. The Final Report consists of four volumes:

- *Volume I: Agreements and Recommendations*
- *Volume II: Transportation Best Practices*
  - *Best Practices for Complete Streets*
  - *Best Practices for Public Transportation*
  - *Best Practices for Bicycle Master Planning and Design*
  - *Best Practices for Pedestrian Master Planning and Design*
  - *Best Practices for Universal Design*
- *Volume III: Supplemental Text for Agreements*
- *Volume IV: Stakeholder Comments & Staff Summary of Unresolved Issues*

The reader is advised that the policy matters not addressed in Volumes I through III are likely to be as important to many Collaborative members as those that are addressed.

All of the Collaborative's products, from the early education phase through the Final Report, including those mentioned in this document, can be found on the Collaborative's website: <http://www.sactaqc.org>.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.....	v
Stakeholder Comments .....	1
Rick Bettis, League of Women Voters and LCP, City of Sacramento, Area 1 .....	2
Carol Borden, African American Transportation/Air Quality Advisory Committee.....	6
Mayor Ken Cooley, City of Rancho Cordova .....	8
Barney Donnelly, Senior Community.....	9
Larry Greene, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District.....	11
Judy Fong-Heary, Community Interest Group.....	12
Alan Hirsch, Sacramento Transportation Equity Network.....	14
Sarah Johnson, Local Community Participant, County of Sacramento, District 5 .....	15
Don Levy, Local Community Participant, City of Sacramento, Area 4 .....	16
Diane Nakano, City of Citrus Heights .....	17
Jan Sharpless, Environmental Interest Group.....	18
Unresolved Issues Summarized by Collaborative Staff	
Transportation .....	20
Air Quality.....	26
Land Use	
Urban Form, and Infill & Reurbanization .....	36
Location of Development & Location of Open Space .....	45
Funding .....	53

## **FOREWARD**

*Volume 4* consists of two sections.

First, Collaborative participants that endorsed the *Final Report* were provided the opportunity to prepare comments on one or more sections of the *Agreements and Recommendations* and/or other policy issues within the scope of the Collaborative's mission. These comment letters provide additional insight regarding the Collaborative's work, including issues that were discussed but that were unresolved.

Second, Collaborative staff prepared brief summaries of unresolved issues, including a recap of each issue and the diverging viewpoints that were offered. Briefly mentioned are additional issues that the Collaborative did not fully address, but that were within the scope of its mission. This section was prepared by Collaborative staff and should not be viewed, in any way, as a product of the Collaborative's participants.

# Stakeholder Comments

Rick Bettis, League of Women Voters & LCP, City of Sacramento, Area 1

Carol Borden, Community Interest Group

Mayor Ken Cooley, City of Rancho Cordova

Barney Donnelly, Senior Community

Larry Greene, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

Judy Fong-Heary, Community Interest Group

Alan Hirsch, Sacramento Transportation Equity Network

Sarah Johnson, Local Community Participant, County District 5

Don Levy, Local Community Participant, City of Sacramento, Area 4

Diane Nakano, City of Citrus Heights

Jan Sharpless, American Lung Association

## COMMENTS OF THE TRANSPORTATION/AIR QUALITY COLLABORATIVE PROCESS AND AGREEMENTS

By Rick Bettis

Community Interest Group- League of Women Voters of Sacramento County

Local Community Participants- City of Sacramento Service Area No. 1

November 9, 2005

### PROCESS AND GENERAL

I believe the consensus based or Collaborative process was not the most appropriate for the issues addressed in this effort. The requirement for 75% approval by all five interest groups virtually assures a “lowest common denominator” result. The groups were too diverse and the issues too complex and linked to achieve strong meaningful results.

The process used by SACOG for the Blueprint and to be used for the MTP update is superior since it broader public participation and has a voting process that ensures a decision in a reasonable length of time. This process was conducted, in most part, by planning professionals and the discussions were more results oriented.

The Collaborative used extensive time for orientation and education. The “getting to know you” exercises such as discussing your favorite food or music distressing since I felt they were rather immature. The education was probably of significant value for some. The case studies of other areas were interesting. However, based on the negotiation staged it appeared that the education may not have been effective since the discussions were still frequently general and ‘philosophical

The mediators for an extended time discouraged the discussion of substantive issues and solutions. Limiting the discussion to “underlying” broad interests.

The initial voting rules which gave double the per capita voting power to the small cities in the LCP group as compared to the City and County of Sacramento was unprecedented and in my opinion unjustified. I also believe the stakeholder members of the LCP group inappropriately included a prominent land development Attorneys and President of real estate development firm.

I believe the perhaps most meaningful element of the process were the “Visioning” effort. Where we developed and evaluated substantive land use and transportation alternative, working with highly qualified professionals, Elliot Allen and Mike McKeever, without the presence of a mediator.

The “Clicker Questions” also were of great value since they addressed specific policies and issues rather than generalities. I believe the results better reflect the sense of the stakeholders than does the later agreements.

### AIR QUALITY

I believe there was clear support for strong air quality policies. Unfortunately, the Building Industry Association blocked the proposed Indirect Source Rule, which, in effect, negated the air quality agreement.

The Collaborative negotiations focused on the implementation of currently adopted 8-hour ozone standard. However, there are additional health related air quality issues that were not addressed.

Studies at UC Davis and elsewhere have demonstrated the serious potential health impacts of small particulate matter that is not currently regulated. These include cancer, heart disease, asthma, bronchitis, and general loss of lung function. This has resulted in the publishing of the report “Air Quality and Land Use Handbook, A Community Health Perspective” by California Air Resources Board in April 2005. This report clearly links land use, transportations. and health.

Developmental pediatric studies at the UC Davis Medical Center and at other medical research centers in the US and Europe have identified a link between nitric oxide emission and autism in children. NO<sub>x</sub> readily enters the expectant mother’s bloodstream. This effects the Nitric Oxide Synthase in the fetus and alters the spatial and temporal distribution of NO<sub>x</sub> in the brain can impair its’ normal development resulting in an autistic condition.

There were 24 Clicker Questions that received substantial support of more than 70% of the stakeholders. However, these questions not discussed during the negotiations and I do not feel have been adequately documented in the Agreements report. These are:

- AQ-1 strategies which reduce overall vehicle emissions.
- AQ-2 need to focus on land use forms that reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- AQ-3 focus on building designs that promote “cool communities”
- AQ-4 investment to fund measures to reach attainment of air quality standards.
- AQ-5 allocating new funding to the most cost effective measures.
- AQ-8 new revenues to support implementations of air quality measures.
- AQ-15 new program to restrict idling of trucks, construction equipment, and locomotives.
- AQ-16 program to establish clean fleets for public agencies.
- AQ-22 expand heavy duty vehicle inspections and add NO<sub>x</sub> screening.
- AQ-23 end Smog Check exemption for motorcycles.
- AQ-26 new program to facilitate broader use of zero-emission and neighborhood electric vehicles.
- AQ- 27 program to promote energy efficient technologies for heating and cooling.
- AQ-28 implement urban heat island prevention by planting tree and use light colored roofs and pavements.
- AQ-29 building design standards that reduce energy requirement.
- AQ-30 Encourage use of electric or low emissions lawn and garden equipment.
- AQ-31 program to provide on site amenities for all modes of travel including transit, bike, pedestrian, and alternative fuels vehicles.

- AQ-32 Expand “spare the air” programs.
- AQ-33 expand availability of real time traffic information.
- AQ- 36 program to provide public education on the link between air quality and health.
- AQ-37 program to provide public education to encourage walking and biking to schools.
- AQ-38 increase employer incentive for use of transit and telework.
- AQ-40 encourage voluntary curtailment of portable engines on Spare the Air Days
- AQ-44 establish requirements for buffers between freeways and sensitive receptors (schools, etc) to reduce expose to fine particulates.

## FUNDING

This section identified 12 alternative funding mechanisms but did not prioritize them. The highest priority should be given the use-based alternative. The general sales tax has been acknowledged to be regressive immature and should only be used for financing programs or projects that benefit the communities of need.

Many studies have indicated that cost of highway projects and fuel do not adequately reflect the total cost to society. Externalities such as public health and safety, environmental degradation and security in the form of military and police costs should be reflected in taxes on fuels. This is done in Europe where fuel taxes are as much as \$4 to \$5 per gallon, resulting in total fuel costs of \$6 to \$7 per gallon.

The increase in weight fees for large truck should be included. The large trucks do not pay their fair share of road costs. These trucks govern the design and cost of highways including horizontal and vertical alignments, lane width, bridge and pavement designs, and often ate the reason for repaving and other structural repairs. The Federal Highway Administrations’ “1997 Federal Highway Cost Allocation Study” indicates that such heavy trucks pay only 50% to 80% of their share of costs. Other studies indicate an even wider gap.

Carbon emission based fuel tax should be considered. I believe that scientific studies clearly demonstrate the link between potentially destructive global warming and carbon dioxide emissions. The signing of the Kyoto treaty by the majority of developed nations have demonstrated the support for this concern. The State of California has passed the Pavley bill requiring reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by automobiles, and many cities, including Sacramento, have adopted sustainability policies that include commitments to reduce these emissions.

Even the private sector energy companies have recognized the problem. Duke Energy has pledged to reduce carbon emissions, and British Petroleum is conducting research on the reduction of the carbon content in its fuels.

## TRANSPORTATION AGREEMENT

This agreement includes several Best Practices comprehensive papers that could be valuable references for future planning efforts. However, it does not prioritize the mode alternatives except for an endorsement of the Blueprint mode split estimates.

It should be noted that the Blueprint focused on land use and did not attempt to optimize the transportation mode split. This will be done by SACOG as part of the MTP update next year. I believe that combinations of transit oriented land use with an optimized system for transit, bike, and pedestrian use, along with an aggressive pricing and funding policies could substantially reduce the automobile use in Sacramento County.

## REMOVING BARRIERS AND CREATING INCENTIVES FOR INFILL AND REURBANIZATION

This section provides a good overview of the issue and describes potential approaches to solutions. I believe that as was demonstrated in Alternative D of the Blueprint an even more aggressive mixed use based infill and reurbanization policy is possible. Form based zoning will help to alleviate the aesthetic based objections to infill.

Infill and reurbanization should include affordable housing and should be diverse and integrated economically and socially. Respect for existing communities should be reflected, however I believe that diversity will, in the long term, will strengthen our social fabric.

In providing certainty for development a certainty of results should also be required of the developer. Too often projects have been changed after the planning process that included community involvement.

## URBAN FORM

A clear hard edge such as the current County Urban Services Boundary is necessary to insure that transit supportive compact development is realized. Premature softening of this constraint will lead to potential leapfrog development that would undermine the goal of less automobile dominated and healthier communities.

## CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

This paper provides a good foundation for strong public input to the project planning processes. It is hoped that these recommendations can be implemented along with a needed consideration of the 'big picture' so that county wide and regional factors are reflected in local decisions.

Rick Bettis, November 9, 2005

**Carol Borden**  
**Representative for the African American Community/STAQC/CIG**  
**Coordinator, African American Transportation/Air Quality Advisory Committee**

**Stakeholder Comment**

The Sacramento Transportation/Air Quality Collaborative (STAQC) began with a titillating inducement to stakeholders: Come be a part of creating a grand, energetic and visionary plan for our community's future. The anticipated six-seven year process would include an education component to raise the knowledge base of all participants; dialogue on the issues and interests of stakeholder groups; facilitated, interest-based negotiations; and, finally, a visionary plan with assurances that addresses Sacramento County's challenges and opportunities in transportation, air quality and related topics through the year 2050.

It was an ambitious mission with a disparate, unwieldy crew, tentative leadership and uncertain fuel supply. The combination could only be successful to the extent that those involved remembered the original inducement and had a commitment to the mission. Prevailing winds, however, shifted the mission and they lost their way, aborting the mission.

Certainly there are accomplishments to be lauded. The five-year involvement of almost 100 participants representing every facet of citizenry and government was unprecedented. The legacy is a cadre of better-informed, battle-tested citizens both in the collaborative and on the related advisory boards. Hopefully, they will remain engaged. The various tool kits developed provide doable, practical, off the shelf strategies to address, in the near and far term, the most pressing transportation, air quality, land use and funding challenges in the county and region. The Civic Engagement Plan is a standalone proposal capable of immediate implementation and widespread impact on civic involvement in public policymaking. Lastly, the statements of unresolved issues bring clarity and focus to the most contentious issues and interests of the stakeholders. They are the starting points for the next round of engagement.

There are also "lost opportunity" costs to be acknowledged. For the African American Transportation/Air Quality Advisory Committee, pressing issues were not resolved. Sacramento County needs:

1. A life-spanning adequate, accessible, affordable, timely, connected and safe countywide public transportation system that moves the transit dependent to jobs, services, recreation and housing;
2. Air quality relief measures that address the disproportionate degree of air polluting sources in low income neighborhoods and the resulting respiratory ailments;
3. A range of affordable housing types and locations situated throughout the county and accessible to emerging job centers;
4. Focused priority development incentives for infill projects in existing neighborhoods;

5. Strategies that optimize smart growth principles and sufficiently mitigate foreseeable negatives; and
6. A visionary plan that addresses the region's anticipated population explosion, the accompanying strain on existing infrastructure and the limited public dollars available.

It was no surprise that there were significant issues that would challenge each stakeholder group to reassess its positions, if the most intransigent were to be resolved.

Unfortunately, the "low hanging" fruit of every contentious tree was favored over the initially promised interest-based negotiation of the difficult. Some feel that the STAQC's success can be measured by the movement/passage of related transportation, air quality, land use processes. Was that the reason for the STAQC? The aborted process begs the question of whether there was ever any intention to do more than play on the fringes of the hard issues. Perhaps Sacramento is simply not sufficiently in the crisis mode necessary to make these largely governance decisions.

Leadership matters. To have supported the process, to have said to the 100 stakeholders that this assemblage was too valuable to short circuit its work, to have provided the courage, conviction and leadership to "lock the door" would have sent a powerful message to all citizens about the power of civic engagement in public policymaking. Regrettably, we settled for the lowest common denominators and stakeholder comments that finish off a process tired of its own lack of power and direction.

A great deal of public time and money was spent on the STAQC. We are left to ponder how the county and environs have been improved by the expenditure.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Borden



**Ken Cooley**  
Mayor

**Robert McGarvey**  
Vice Mayor

**Linda Budge**  
Council Member

**David Sander**  
Council Member

**Dan Skoglund**  
Council Member

December 1, 2005

To: Tonight's Celebratees  
The Members of the Sacramento Transportation and Air Quality Collaborative

As we honor you this evening for your 5 years of work as part of the Transportation and Air Quality Collaborative, I want to add my voice to the chorus of well-earned and emphatic "Thank You's".

For institutions of "representative government" to work, it is axiomatic that we in elected office must diligently seek "representative ideas", which is to say ideas that foster beneficial outcomes for the broadest array of our citizens.

Viewed this way, it is clear why the Collaborative's work, melding the varied and at times fundamentally clashing viewpoints was so important. The labor of hearing diverse voices, and working through differences, fosters the alchemy of democracy – the slow transformation of the dross of warring viewpoints into the inestimable value of balanced and thus reconciled concerns.

Tonight, therefore, we honor the Collaborative's five years of work as a venture in giving our County a kind of "philosopher's stone" to advance critically needed public work. By your commitment to this enterprise, each of you gave visibility to this strategy and bought the entire region time during which the soundness of collaborative approaches could manifest itself. Thank you.

I recognize that all here tonight may feel regret that there is work that has been left undone. But to you I would offer the wise counsel of a man named Jacob Neusner who once advised as follows:

*Do not expect the success that comes from easy accomplishment and ready recognition. What will justify the effort if all there is before you is defeat and renewed struggle? You must not learn to expect success in order to justify your efforts. You must learn to need only to think the effort necessary, whatever the outcome. Great things are not accomplished by the shouters but by the workers.*

Tonight we honor you for your role as workers in a long, long labor that all the region's leaders saw as necessary. You have advanced our region's capacity to govern itself well and the relationships you've forged, and the capacity for dialogue you've demonstrated, constitutes a sturdy platform for the further work that remains to be done.

Thank you for your good work of service.

Onward and Upward,

Ken Cooley  
Mayor  
City of Rancho Cordova

October 27, 2005

After representing Sacramento seniors on the Collaborative for the last four years, I feel obligated to comment on a report which I believe does not serve their interests--or those of the disabled, ethnic minorities, and lower income residents--very well. That outcome was due at least partly to broader problems in the collaborative process.

Two topics were singled out in the title of the Collaborative--transportation and air quality. It seemed evident to me that our task was to develop a vision of the kind of transportation system and the air quality conditions which Sacramento should be striving to reach by 2050. In the body of this report, however (as the draft stood on October 19), there are barely two pages on transportation and none on air quality. After years of effort, these topics were declared too contentious to reach ~~an~~ agreement and were set aside. So much for collaboration.

Absent an agreed vision of the future, stakeholders who brought relatively specialized interests to the table had little incentive to limit those interests to their impact on transportation and air quality. Yet bringing order out of chaos is central to long-range planning. A SACOG Regional Report (September 2005, p.1), for example, says that "Fundamental to SACOG's core mission is connecting the dots between air quality, land use and transportation planning." It does not seem to me that this report does a very good job of "connecting the dots."

Had we asked probing questions, however, the results might have been different. If the cost of achieving environmental goals was the continued isolation of many senior and disabled residents, would that achievement constitute progress? If we moved goods more efficiently through the region but did not improve transportation for people to get to where those goods were sold, what would we have accomplished? What priority should we attach to bicycle/pedestrian improvements when the largest population growth in coming decades will be among residents 85 years of age and older? These kinds of questions were neither asked nor answered during the course of the Collaborative.

The needs and interests of Sacramento seniors were addressed by the Community Interest Group (CIG), one of five sub-groups within the Collaborative. CIG included representatives of major ethnic groups, the disabled, young people, Paratransit, the League of Women Voters, neighborhood activists, and lower income housing advocates. Despite the varied perspectives within the group, by the middle of the Collaborative process we had developed an extensive but cohesive statement of our common goals and interests. The unifying thread within the group was its focus on the consumer--those residents who are most dependent on public transportation to participate fully in community life. That statement was given scant attention by the rest of the Collaborative and its contents are not evident in the body of the report.

What might the Collaborative have done? We could have debated the merits of an AARP research report<sup>1/</sup> suggesting that "The overarching goal for transportation policy is to keep people mobile and thus able to access the goods, services, work, and social opportunities of their communities." We could have envisioned an integrated transportation system that looks more like a spider's web than a series of straight lines that occasionally intersect. We could have considered the wisdom of continuing to underserve those rapidly growing segments of the population who most depend on public transportation, not merely as a choice, but a lifeline. Unfortunately we did not.

I fear this report may prove more useful as a reference tool to be kept on a shelf than a guide for action to be kept close at hand.

Barney Donnelly

1/ Understanding Senior Transportation: Report and Analysis of a Survey of Consumers Age 50+, AARP Public Policy Institute, Washington, D.C., 2002.

SACRAMENTO METROPOLITAN

Larry Greene  
AIR POLLUTION CONTROL OFFICER

October 31, 2005

Mr. Matt Boyer  
Executive Director  
Sacramento Transportation Collaborative  
8950 Cal Center Drive, Building 3, Suite 115  
Sacramento, CA 95826

Dear Mr. Boyer:

The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) submits the following comments regarding the Transportation/Air Quality Collaborative's final agreement. It is obviously regrettable that the Collaborative could not come to any agreement on the air quality issues facing this region that were discussed in detail over the last five years. This is undoubtedly embarrassing to Collaborative staff as well as to Collaborative participants.

That said, the SMAQMD's comments fall into two broad categories: process and substance.

The process undertaken by the Collaborative to reach agreements is at least partially at fault for this regrettable situation. The education phase of this effort preceded the decision making phase by many months, during which time participation varied and changed, leaving those making the decisions with little or no recollection of the applicable background educational information. Additionally, the ability of Interest Groups to veto agreements reached by topic specific teams, made up of representatives of all Interest Groups, further doomed the process to failure. An agreement supported by a majority of the Collaborative membership could be vetoed by a few individuals who happened to attend a given Interest Group meeting. We spent years in the education and negotiating phases establishing a basic understanding of the need for local measures to reduce mobile source emissions. The process allowed this to be removed for the common understandings at the last moment.

We must however move forward. The Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District is in the initial stages of preparing a plan to meet the new 8-hour health-based ozone air quality standard. Meeting this standard and maintaining it will be a significant challenge for this community. Without question, local air quality measures to reduce mobile source emissions will be necessary for us to demonstrate attainment of the new standard. Within the next year, difficult decisions will need to be made; they can no longer be deferred, as has happened in this effort.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Larry Greene".

Larry Greene  
Air Pollution Control Officer/Executive Director

## Reflections from a CIG member

As a participant who started out serving as an alternate representative of member organizations of the Council of Asian and Pacific Islanders Together for Advocacy and Leadership (CAPITAL) a few years ago, it has been quite a journey. Serving on the Sacramento Transportation and Air Quality Collaborative was a way to reconnect with a past interest of mine – how to integrate the needs of human beings with the needs of the environment. Working on the Collaborative, brought me memories of my undergraduate years at U.C. Berkeley centered on Cultural Geography.

The first year was truly an educational and intellectually stimulating time – trying to absorb all the technical aspects and yet keep human, social and cultural priorities in mind at the same time. Serving on the Community Interest Group assisted me in understanding the varied needs of different groups. From there, we started to build bridges of understanding with the other four interest groups. Even if we didn't always agree, we listened and often even understood one another. Engaging in an open dialogue and a community conversation with a group of diverse participants from many interests, areas of expertise and backgrounds was valuable. We may not have come up with a plan with many different solutions for the many complex problems before us; however, it is a beginning.

Truly we are in the midst of educating citizens and building a common social agenda to deal with the multiple issues and concerns related to air quality, transportation, and land use. As the Collaborative members became more knowledgeable and understood complexity of the issues and their relationships and impacts on people, we realized compromises and tradeoffs were necessary. Despite our joint efforts, we came to agreement to make a limited number of recommendations; i.e., need for more funding for sustaining existing transit infrastructure, higher density, infill re-urbanization, and encourage higher use of alternative means of travel other than automobiles (biking, walking, public transit). However, we did not achieve significant progress on improving air quality and transportation.

No one can question the validity of the Collaborative values of economic vitality, social equity, safe, healthy and livable communities, and environmental preservation and sustainability. Yet, making decisions on the agreements and recommendations required much dialog. We had to consider balancing the needs to provide housing choice, transit choice and alternative modes of travel with meeting the diverse needs of the low-income, limited English-proficient, people with disabilities and growing senior population, and with the need to preserve neighborhoods, open space and greenfields. At the same time, we had to consider ensure there were fiscal rewards to encourage private and public investment in transportation infrastructure, urban infrastructure and rural infrastructure. It was a daunting task!

Nonetheless, although some of us feel frustration that we didn't achieve more, we made a huge contribution in our recommendation for civic engagement and education. We recognized it is hard work and takes lots of time to engage and educate people so they can assist with improving their local community. Yet, it is only when each citizen invest him/herself that we can change the world, one neighborhood at a time. After all, the Collaborative was a start!

There is still more work to be done. Sacramento region residents must come to realize that their personal decisions about housing, choices of transportation modes, work/home commutes and other lifestyle choices affect the region's air quality, transportation infrastructure and options. We, Sacramento residents, need to realize that we must be willing to pay for the kind of livable community we want. We, the community, need to be willing to make conscious decisions, compromises and tradeoffs, for the greater benefit of the whole community rather than a few individuals, organizations, or neighborhoods. After all, everyone's long-term health as well as our environment's health is at stake.

Members of the Collaborative are now more aware and informed. Hopefully, all of us will take the lessons we learned and the relationships we built into other community processes, especially those related to improving air quality, transportation, land use and relating public policy to people's lives. Some of the "unresolved issues" were never discussed in great enough detail to arrive at agreements. With a bit more time, some of those issues could have been resolved for the mutual benefit of all stakeholders. Despite the fact that we Collaborative members could not complete our work, the recommendations we offer are a starting point for future planning and public engagement efforts.

This Collaborative's public discussion of air quality, transportation and land use needs to continue in some form. We need to share what we learned as a Collaborative with other citizens so that more progress can be made. The anticipated influx of new residents challenges us to create integrated solutions that use limited resources to balance the needs for adequate affordable housing, air quality and transportation, yet improve quality of life. If we continue doing as we have been, nothing changes, and we will only have more of what we have now.

Change will come if citizens decide together that as a collective society, we are willing to work together for the common good and public benefit. We may need to reconsider the public sense of "entitlement" for all kinds of services without the will to pay for those services. Elected officials may need to take risky actions – provide leadership in making difficult decisions, including increasing taxes as a means to investment in the future. Government will need to provide a vision and commitment to effect policies that reflect shared values and common social agenda of Sacramento Region residents. It is an intimidating endeavor.

It has been an honor to serve on the Collaborative. Thank you!

Judy Fong Heary  
Community Interest Group

# Comments on the Transportation - Air Quality Collaborative Agreement

For the Sacramento Transportation Equity Network (SACTEN).

1. Social Equity is about Who pays and Who Benefits. This agreement fails to address the gross inequities of the cost of growth forces on existing Sacramentans by the current arrangements. Developers and greenfield land speculators do not pay for regional impacts of their projects, i.e. mitigation of freeway and regional arterial roads, increased air pollution, or demand for water, sewer or transit infrastructure. This burden is left to current residents. Land speculators are in the mean time reaping billions in windfall profits from passive buying and holding of land. The alleged benefits for residents of growth via trickle down “job growth” is largely illusional: cross-regional studies show there is little correlation between either unemployment rates and wages compared to a region’s growth rate.
2. SACOG forecasts show a gross shortage in affordable homes for working class individuals, yet the agreement fails to address this in any substantive way, other than implicitly assume crowding multiple families into older existing single-family investor owned rental homes, to the detriment of neighbors and the infrastructure -- particularly our transportation infrastructure inadequate to handle this.
3. The plan, particularly the funding plan, has failed to find funding mechanisms to address maintenance of our existing infrastructure. We are increasingly seeing million-dollar homes on pot holed streets our governments do not have funds to maintain. We also have inadequate funding to maintain the existing, substandard service level of transit to keep up with population growth, much less expand this mode as energy costs rise and the percentage of our population that are seniors, and poor transit dependent increase.
4. It is important to memorialize that a substantive agreement to address in air quality impacts of growth was affirmed by over 80% of the parties at the table but was largely vetoed by the Building Industry Association. It should be noted the BIA is made up of Wall Street Firms who are driven by balance sheet growth and profit, not quality of life in the Sacramento region.

**NET:** After 5 years effort, this collaborative agreement is inadequate in forestalling the dystopia our region is headed for as even under the best 2050 SACOG Scenario. The premature termination of this project is unwise and is an opportunity lost.

**OUR HOPE:** We hope in the near future, the electorate faced with growing reality of what we building in the Sacramento Valley, combined with higher fuel costs, will change our collective worldview so to reawaken the idea that Sacramento is a Commonwealth, not competing interests.

**We hope** it will reawaken the idea that taxes are not evil or economically harmful, but our investment in the future.

**We hope** Government will one day not be seen as a problem, but the only possible solution to collective problem solving and to reflecting our best values, values that can not be reflected in a competitive market place.

**We also maintain hope** that the relationships formed during the truncated collaborative process, so skillfully nurtured by the Collaborative’s Staff, may yet yield positive ends.

Alan Hirsch, SACTEN Coordinator 10-31-05

October 24, 2005

## Stakeholder Comments on Final Report of the Sacramento Transportation & Air Quality Collaborative

After 5 ½ years of work and determination, we have produced our Final Report. It is important that future readers of the report have some understanding of the process and the issues.

A big one is that we did not reach agreement on most of the Air Quality elements, but to simply say that does not deliver the important fact that we were, in many cases, very, very close to agreement. The exercise has contributed to a much better comprehension of the concerns that divide us and, in my opinion, the door is still open for future deliberations.

It is vital that those attempting to implement these recommendations undertake it with a sense of our intentions. I have long been skeptical about how it will be implemented, because no matter how hard we worked, how many hours of meeting after meeting we put in, it will be implemented at some future time by unknown individuals, and finally, there will undoubtedly be a certain amount of politics involved.

All I ask is that you, yes you who are reading this, respect the effort and carry on in the spirit we pass on to you as we hand this over. There are so many challenges and obstacles to overcome, but just think of what can be accomplished if everyone comes to the table, rolls up their sleeves, and makes a commitment to do the work to realize a better world to pass on to future generations. Remember that no matter whose interests we represent, all of us are finally residents of a neighborhood, we have common needs in order to live our lives and provide for our families and that is what should be kept in focus as we go forward.

History will eventually judge what you do. Make history be kind to you.

Sarah Johnson  
Local Community Participant  
Representing Sacramento County, District Five

# Air Quality Comments

Drafted by Don Levy, Local Community Participant, City of Sacramento, Area 4

The Sacramento Transportation and Air Quality Collaborative reached agreement in several key areas in that air quality is a major issue that needs to be addressed, and that the primary reason for our poor air quality is vehicle emissions in the Sacramento Valley.

Our preliminary agreements included:

- **75% or More Support from All Interest Groups for:**
  - Air quality strategies that **reduce overall vehicle emissions** (AQ-1)
  - Improving Air Quality by focusing on **land use that reduces VMT** (AQ-2)
  - Using combination of **incentive-based and regulatory programs** to achieve standards (AQ-6)

The STAQC did not reach total agreement with our trial balloon Air Quality Agreement. There were some issues that affected economic vitality as well as environmental equity.

Four-fifths of the Interest Groups did reach agreement with the draft, with the Business Group dissenting over several key issues. As a result, there is no Air Quality Agreement. Four-fifths of the Interest Groups supported the September 7<sup>th</sup> version of the Air Quality Summary document which included:

- ◆ Support for the Construction Mitigation Rule
- ◆ Support for the Development Mitigation Rule
- ◆ Support for fully funding up to \$600 million for measures to attain the 8-hour ozone standard

Keeping in mind, that air quality standards are determined at government levels higher than those affected by the Collaborative, the Business Interest Group could not come to the 75% agreement threshold to include the Construction and Development Mitigation Rules, due to fees that would have been assessed for non-compliance, thus resulting in an economic adversity.

In addition, the Community Interest Group felt there were three issues that were not included in the Draft Agreement.

- ◆ The increasing number of studies demonstrating direct links between vehicle emissions and health problems.
- ◆ Toxic air pollutant concentrations linked to cancer are especially high within 500 feet of freeways and arterials carrying high traffic flows.
- ◆ Toxic Hot Spots: In general, low-income communities are more likely to be located adjacent to the freeways system and access roads, creating continuous and prolonged exposure to poor air quality with negative impact the health of area residents.

The (LCP) Collaborative felt that the Air Quality Issue was of key importance, and that it was necessary to include as much agreement as possible, with accompanying statements where the Collaborative could not reach consensus. These unresolved issues are included in this document.



# CITY OF CITRUS HEIGHTS

6237 Fountain Square Drive • Citrus Heights, CA 95621-5577 • (916) 725-2448  
TDD (916) 725-6185 • Fax (916) 725-5799 • [www.citrusheights.net](http://www.citrusheights.net)

*The City of Citrus Heights is committed to providing high quality economical, responsive services to our community.*

November 2, 2005

Matt Boyer  
Sacramento Transportation & Air Quality Collaborative

RE: Citrus Heights Staff and Community Concerns

Dear Matt:

Citrus Heights believes that goals and objectives of the Sacramento Transportation and Air Quality Collaborative (Collaborative) are worthy of the City's commitment of monetary support and dedication of staff time. We were also fortunate to have a number of residents volunteer their time to participate in the Collaborative efforts.

As a community, Citrus Heights' demographics, geography and development opportunities vary significantly from unincorporated Sacramento County (County) and the other cities with the county. One issue that differentiates Citrus Heights from other Sacramento County jurisdictions seems to be that the primary concern of the others with potential for Greenfield development is related to land use policies and the definition or lack thereof of boundaries for development. This issue is of little interest to Citrus Heights at this time, inasmuch as we are 95%+ developed with little opportunity for new large-scale development. Citrus Heights is focused on in-fill developments and redevelopment consistent with the Blueprint efforts developed by SACOG.

On occasion, our concerns align more with Roseville, Rocklin and/or Placer County. We recognize that that the efforts of the Collaborative are focused within the Sacramento County. However, we cannot satisfy our concern that unless Roseville, Rocklin, Placer County and other neighboring jurisdictions 'buy-in' to the Agreements developed through our efforts that any measure of success can be claimed. One example relates to the air quality issue. The activities within the Union Pacific Rail Yard located in Roseville and travel of Roseville/Placer County residents through Citrus Heights have a very high potential to affect Citrus Heights' air quality. A secondary effect of Roseville/Placer County traffic is congestion on the City's arterials which leads to cut-through traffic in our residential neighborhoods.

We would urge the Collaborative to support efforts in bringing the Agreements developed through this effort before the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Board for consideration by all agencies in the region. A number of the work products developed as a part of this process could have a significantly more positive impact on the region as a whole if embraced by all of our neighbors.

Sincerely,

Diane Nakano  
City Engineer  
General Service Department

October 31, 2005

To the funding agencies of the Transportation and Air Quality Collaborative:

As a member of the Environmental Interest Group, I have participated in the collaborative process since its inception. I was persuaded to join the process because I believed that participating in such a stakeholder process held great promise in building a public consensus to solve some of the underlying problems that for sometime have eluded single purpose agencies dealing with transportation and air quality issues in our region. I applaud the funding agencies in engaging the community stakeholders in this effort even though it was not as successful as some of us in the Collaborative would have hoped. Had we had more time, it is my opinion that we would have been able to come to agreement on some of the more controversial issues involving growth. It is difficult to gage what the cost of this lost opportunity might be as groups will once again return to fight their battles one by one in the various political venues.

Those areas where the majority in each interest group were able to agree show small progress in some important areas. An urban form with greater density that is combined with good architectural design and best practices for development of streets, pedestrian walkways and bike paths are some of the positive aspects of the agreements. Another important feature is the civic engagement piece which should be taken seriously and implemented by every decision making jurisdiction whose job it is to carry out public policy in such a way that it serves the greatest public interest.

There were major disappointments in both the air quality and transportation areas. The most obvious problem in the air quality area is that there is no agreement at least on the issues that were identified as being important to bring forward from the Collaborative process. We all know that it is going to be a challenge for this area to meet the new Federal eight hour air quality standard. Projected growth in the region over the next decade is going to make the air district's task even more difficult. Without adequate financial resources and strategic approaches that allow mitigation of growth inducing projects, this region will have a difficult time demonstrating conformity with Federal Law and in the process jeopardize its Federal funding for important transportation projects.

One of the great advantages of the Collaborative was to have been the ability to take the long view in developing a transportation system that would meet the needs of the future. The opportunity was squandered by refusing to look beyond today's needs. If ever there is a need to rethink the paradigm on which today's system is built, now is that time. A system that encourages single occupancy vehicles primarily dependent on fossil fuel is not a system that is sustainable from an economic, environmental or public health standpoint. As the United States competes with emerging industrial countries for shrinking oil reserves, price volatility and supply shortages will produce a greater strain on area economies that do not have alternatives. Sacramento can either continue to go

down its current path-- focussing on the policy debate on whether public transportation is cost effective and how best to build more roads to alleviate congestion or it can recast the debate to focus on a new bold initiative to design an integrated transportation system for a sustainable future which builds communities rather than separates them and reduces their dependency on fossil fuel. There is no process that is currently doing this not even the SACOG Blueprint process. While the SACOG Blueprint has made important strides in recognizing the connection between land use decisions and demands on transportation systems, it does not directly deal with the issues of our dependency on fossil fuels or meeting the global climate change goals adopted by a significant portion of mayors in July of this year and by the Governor of the State of California.

It is my sincere hope that you begin this public debate now and that the process once again include the wide range of stakeholder interests.

Jan Sharpless  
Environmental Interest Group

## **TRANSPORTATION**

### **STAFF SUMMARY OF UNRESOLVED ISSUES**

#### **PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION**

The purpose of this section is to document the Collaborative participants' unresolved issues regarding transportation policies for the countywide area.

#### **MAJOR DIFFERENCES OF OPINION WITHIN THE COLLABORATIVE**

The differing perspectives among Collaborative members on transportation policies generally arise from the seven issues listed below. Each of these issue areas is briefly discussed below. This section concludes with a listing of transportation topics that were not sufficiently discussed to determine the level of support or disagreement.

- Assumptions about Amount of Future Automobile Trips
- Multi-Modal Transportation System
- Congestion
- Transportation and Land Use
- Allocation of Resources
- Transportation Infrastructure and Facilities
- Transit

#### **ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE AMOUNT OF FUTURE AUTOMOBILE TRIPS**

This disagreement stems from different assessments of the extent to which single occupancy automobile trips will increase in the long-term future.

The business and government interests look to the SACOG model to project the rate at which automobile trips will increase in the future, thus providing the assumptions for the design of the area's future transportation system. Based on the model, they believe that an overall shift in travel mode from the single occupant to walking, biking, transit and carpooling is possible and desirable. However, they believe that, even with aggressive measures, the net demand for automobile trips will likely be substantially greater in 2050 because population increases will out pace reductions in individual travel. Today, single occupant vehicles make approximately 82% of all trips. SACOG's most robust land use scenario for their 2050 blueprint (not their preferred scenario) resulted in approximately 70% of all trips being made by single-occupant vehicles. Under these assumptions, the overall absolute numbers of auto trips is increasing while per capita numbers of auto vehicle trips is decreasing. (See SACOG's website at [www.sacregionblueprint.org](http://www.sacregionblueprint.org) for more information on the Blueprint Preferred scenario.)

The environmental interests look to the scenario modeling conducted by Professor Robert Johnston, University of California, Davis. Although these scenarios also found that the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) will increase in the future due to overall population growth, the rate of this increase is lower than the SACOG projections. This is especially true for the particular scenario modeled that expands transit rather than roads and concurrently supports this transit with land use intensification around light rail stations, urban growth boundaries, fuel taxes, and parking charges. This particular scenario resulted in 61% of the 2050 total trips being made by automobile (defined as single occupancy and high occupancy vehicles combined). This scenario leads to different assumptions about the design of the area's future transportation system. Based on the model, the environmental representatives believe that an overall shift in travel mode from the single occupant to walking, biking, transit can be much more significant than the SACOG projections. (For more information, see *Modeling Long-Range Transportation and Land Use Scenarios for the Sacramento Region, Using Citizen-Generated Policies*, Robert A. Johnston, May 2005. Website: <http://transweb.sjsu.edu/pubs.htm>)

The Community Interests and Local Community Participants did not formally weigh in on the amount of future automobile vehicle trips in the future.

## **MULTI-MODAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM**

There is Collaborative-wide support for a multi-modal system of transportation. Although multi-modal as a concept is supported, the emphasis of mode split differs.

The business and government members of the Collaborative believe that the area needs to significantly increase capacity for all modes of transportation, including expanding and widening specific roads and corridors. Although supportive of increased non-auto modes as well as transit-oriented development, many in the business and government interests question what percentage of resources should be devoted to non-auto modes of travel that they believe will not meet the mobility demands of the future population. They believe that there should be some correlation between the proportion of the population that is anticipated to use a form of transportation and the public resources dedicated to supporting that mode. Of particular concern is the historically low ridership on transit, not just in Sacramento, but also across the nation even where densities are considerably higher than Sacramento.

In contrast, others, particularly environmentalists believe that we have not invested adequate resources and creativity into non-auto modes, including transit, biking and walking (see above reference to scenario modeling conducted by Professor Robert Johnston). For example, the environmentalists believe that if we placed more emphasis on a transit system that provides people with a choice competitive with the automobile, transit ridership would increase and thereby reduce the need for vehicular infrastructure. This includes a transit system that is safe, predictable, convenient, runs with a higher frequency and has timely and available connections between transit routes. Also, the environmentalist believe that aggressive actions to promote transit-supportive

development, which is now in their opinion more of a concept than reality, would support transit ridership as well as increase walking and biking trips.

The Community Interests Group actively supports placing a much higher priority on transit. This grows from the importance they place on providing basic transportation service to all people, regardless of income or ability to drive. For the Community Interest Group, this is especially important as transit is often the only way many people can have the opportunity to meet critical needs such as employment, education, and access to medical care and grocery stores.

There are differences in perspective within the Collaborative as whether a transit system should be designed to provide adequate basic service to the broadest geographic area possible including non-commute hour service, or designed to provide higher and much more frequent service to attract choice riders, particularly in areas of higher densities. The Community Interest Group is more supportive of the broader-based strategy, whereas the business community would be more interested in appealing to choice riders in areas where transit use would be at a higher level. There are some in the Collaborative that believe that if transit is designed for the choice rider, this would be helpful to underserved populations because of the support for transit expansions among the larger populations.

The members of the Collaborative's Local Community Participants group, drawn from the leadership of various geographic areas, had a diversity of opinions on the multi-modal policy issue.

## **CONGESTION**

Business and many local government representatives believe that, for the majority of the population that needs to or chooses to drive, the road and highway system needs to be sufficiently free from congestion to facilitate normal daily activities and business operations. They believe that our standard of living is dependent on adequate vehicle mobility that provides for economic development and job creation. Congestion, they explain, interferes with the transportation of goods and services and business and individual productivity, suppressing the economic vitality of the area. They note that buses also travel on roads and are subject to unacceptable congestions as well.

The environmentalists believe that, even when additional roads and highways are constructed, the congestion projected into the future is significant by any measure. They believe that the construction of roads and highways cannot solve the congestion problem. They believe the emphasis on congestion is misplaced and that the area cannot build itself out of congestion over the mid or long-term. They offer that the expansion of roads and highways induces automobile travel demand thereby interfering with the needed shift to non-auto modes.

As expressed by the Collaborative's Local Community Participants, residential neighborhoods do not want congestion and related noise, localized air pollution, and cut-

through traffic that diminish their quality of life near where they live. On the other hand, most of the Local Community participants support higher overall county residential densities, which can bring localized congestion. The conclusion of a number of Collaborative members have drawn is that we need to accept localized congestion in areas of high activity. However, this could be very difficult for the particular neighborhood experiencing the local impacts of congestion. Since the Sacramento countywide area relies extensively on arterial corridors near neighborhoods for many of our key transportation and commerce thoroughfares, this issue is particularly challenging. The Local Community Participants believe that, with more time, they could have developed policies that would have begun to resolve this dilemma.

## **TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE**

“If” and “where” to place regional transportation facilities brings up strong disagreements about the long-term countywide location of development and location of permanent open space. Collaborative participants agree that knowing where the countywide area is likely to will grow, the likely timing of that growth, and where open spaces will be located greatly influences the planning and programming decisions of our public transportation agencies. The disagreements about location of development and open space, as discussed in another section of this document, have precluded more in-depth deliberations on countywide transportation facilities.

These disagreements also relate to differences regarding how much growth can be served within existing infill and reurbanization areas and how much in greenfield development. One’s assumptions regarding the proportion of growth occurring in the existing urban and suburban footprint and that occurring in greenfield areas influences the design of transportation facilities.

## **ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES**

Although limited dollars is itself a fundamental and particularly vexing problem for our region, the differing and strongly held opinion on priorities for transportation expenditures relate most directly to the various policy differences explained above, including assumptions about the amount of future automobile trips; the mode split of the future multi-modal transportation system; current and future congestion; and transportation and land use linkages.

In other words, the contentiousness around expenditures is not always about money per se. For example, if financial resources were not an issue, reaching agreement about walking, biking and transit facilities would be much less difficult because there is strong support among all interests for these modes. On the other hand, the philosophical differences about the future use of the automobile and the associated VMT (vehicle miles traveled) would remain regardless of the financial resources available.

The tensions regarding the allocation of transportation resources are usually between business and government with one set of perspectives and the environmentalists and community interests with another. It is interesting to note the Local Community Participants Interests within the Collaborative is the group most likely to play a bridging role among the other four interests. The Local Community Participant Interest Group is comprised of leaders from geographical areas and neighborhood.

## **TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE AND FACILITIES**

The differing worldviews above have precluded productive discussions on road and transit transportation infrastructure, especially in the following areas.

- Connections between North and South of the American River
- Connections between South and East Sides of the county
- Connections between North and South of UPRR and I-80 in North county.
- Arterial widenings throughout the county

## **TRANSIT**

There was Collaborative-wide support for transit; all agree that transit is an essential part of the solution. As discussed above in the Resource Allocation section, most of the conflict about transit relates to the allocation of scarce resources, not about the need for or value of transit. Many in the Collaborative also believe that the lack of an agreed-upon vision for transit has been the most significant obstacle to developing a transit system for the future.

Given the reality of limited dollars, there were differences in perspective within the Collaborative as whether a transit system should be designed to provide adequate basic service to the broadest geographic area possible including non-commute hour service, or designed to provide higher and much more frequent service to attract choice riders, particularly in areas of higher densities. The Community Interest Group is more supportive of the broader-based strategy, whereas the business community would be more interested in appealing to choice riders in areas where transit use would be at a higher level. There are some in the Collaborative that believe that if transit is designed for the choice rider, this would be helpful to underserved populations because of the support for transit expansions among the larger populations.

## AREAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY DISCUSSED IN THE COLLABORATIVE

The following areas are topics that were not sufficiently discussed to determine level of support or level of disagreement. (See footnotes for definitions for the following terms.)

- 1. Light Rail<sup>1</sup> / Bus Rapid Transit<sup>2</sup>:** What should be the relative proportion of transit investment in light rail as compared to bus rapid transit?
- 2. Neighborhood Shuttles<sup>3</sup>:** 4 Although not discussed in any sufficient detail, we do know that many in the Collaborative wanted to better understand the role neighborhood shuttles could play in the transportation of particularly the elderly, the disabled and those who do not drive. The Collaborative also wanted to better understand the cost-effectiveness of neighborhood shuttles.
- 3. Trucking:** There is awareness by all interests in the Collaborative of the importance of trucking in the movement of good, especially as it relates to commerce. Since we did not discuss this topic fully, we do not have a full understanding of the various interests' perspectives on trucking. However, we do know that the diesel fuel associated with trucking presents air and toxic pollutant problems of concern to many in the Collaborative.
- 4. Protection of Rights of Ways for All Modes:** Although the Collaborative understood the importance of protecting rights of ways for future transportation facilities, time precluded the Collaborative from in-depth discussion on this topic.
- 5. Demand Management:** All forms of demand management, including Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), are supported by the Collaborative. Time precluded in-depth discussion of specific strategies for expanding demand management in the countywide area.

---

<sup>1</sup> Light Rail Service: Light rail service generally operates at street level, traveling on bridges to cross major intersections and other obstacles such as railroads and bodies of water. The upfront infrastructure and rolling stock costs are considerably cheaper than heavy rail service. Operates seven days a week at some level. Links with bus routes. Accessible via stations where bicycles and vehicles can be parked.

<sup>2</sup> Bus Rapid Transit Services: Bus Rapid Transit systems are typically characterized by systems having most or all of the following: Exclusive, transit-only travel lanes; traffic management systems that improve traffic flow, such as signal priority systems; frequent service operating at least 16 hours each day, with midday headways of 15 minutes or less and peak headways of 10 minutes or less; prepaid and other advanced ticketing options to minimize on-board fare collection times; low-floor, high-capacity buses with wide doors and aisles; quality transit stops.

<sup>3</sup> Neighborhood Shuttle Buses: Neighborhood shuttles are typically smaller buses, with capacities up to about 20 riders that offer residents greater mobility and another option for local trips within a community. Neighborhood shuttles have regular, pre-designated, pre-scheduled routes, but offer special curb-to-curb service (not to be confused with ADA/para-transit door-to-door service). Shuttles are able to "deviate" off route up to 1 mile to pick up and drop off passengers. Marked bus stops are located along routes.

## **Unresolved Air Quality Policies**

This section is organized as follows:

1. Topics outside the Collaborative's scope.
2. Points at which impasse was reached.
3. Other issues that were not resolved, but that were within the Collaborative's scope, including:
  - ✓ Topics addressed in the Agreements and Recommendations that have additional details to resolve.
  - ✓ Topics not significantly negotiated to reach either agreement or impasse.

### **Topics Outside the Collaborative's Scope**

During the education and visioning phase the Collaborative participants agreed that the Collaborative would not address the following:

- Stationary sources (manufacturing sites) at this time because the SMAQMD currently has significant regulatory authority over those sources.
- Area sources (e.g., leaf blowers, jet skis, ATVs, fireplaces, small boats, etc) of pollution at this time because significant efforts are underway at the federal and state level to establish new regulations over those sources.
- Sources that are currently under federal jurisdiction (e.g., airplanes, trains, interstate trucks).

### **Topics Within the Collaborative's Scope**

#### ***Points on which Impasse Was Reached***

The following subjects were sufficiently negotiated to determine that impasse was reached.

Despite significant education and discussion, comments made at the conclusion of the Collaborative's work indicates that there is still some difference in understanding about the need to enact local policies and programs that focus on long-term reduction of emissions from on-road vehicles.

While there is full agreement that attaining the 8-hour ozone standard by 2018 will require a significant percentage of ozone precursors to be reduced by directly

eliminating vehicle emissions, these programs will primarily advance the retirement of older, gross polluting vehicles.

Disagreement about the need to limit vehicle emissions to maintain conformance with ozone and other air quality standards as the population and travel demand roughly doubles is directly related to disagreement about future state and federal regulations on emission requirements for new vehicles.

One line of thinking is that the nation is rapidly moving towards vehicle technologies that will dramatically reduce, if not eliminate, vehicle emissions. This belief rests on an expectation that hybrid vehicles and new emission control technologies will be commonplace in the near future, through a combination of buyer's choices in the free market and government regulation. As this change in the average emissions for new vehicle sales increases, over time the natural attrition of older vehicles will ensure that emissions from the aggregate on-road fleet will continue to decline.

It is believed that this decline will occur more rapidly than a decrease based upon changing the form of development or modifying travel behavior.

Proponents of this belief, therefore, disagree with the following statement:

However, land use strategies and the provision of more transportation choices are expected to have a substantial, cumulative, positive effect on air quality over the "long term."

The majority of Collaborative participants disagree with this perspective. Those that disagree with this line of logic primarily point to the long history of seeming progress towards a zero-emission or near-zero emission fleet. Progress towards this has been hampered by changing consumer preferences – the dramatic increase in sport utility vehicle sales over the last decade, as an example – and a lack of resolve by State and Federal officials to tighten requirements on emissions from new vehicles.

In short, this perspective supports a zero-emission future but is skeptical about if or when that future will arrive. As such, alternative ways to reduce vehicle emissions must be sought in order to ensure continued attainment of air quality standards. Most significantly is a change in land use to support walking, biking, and transit usage, and a complimentary increased investment in these modes of transportation, to make driving less appealing.

This fundamental disagreement plays out in many policy issues, perhaps most dramatically around the question of whether air quality management districts should be given direct authority over "indirect sources," construction activities and travel associated with new developments.

The Collaborative’s Air Quality Team proposed two indirect source regulations, one for construction-related emissions, and the other for operations.

- ✓ Construction mitigation rules are aimed at off-setting mobile source emissions from construction the facility, building, structure, etc. This includes grading equipment, paving equipment, and portable generators.
- ✓ Development mitigation rules are aimed at alleviating mobile source emissions associated with the resulting use and operation. This is primarily the on-road travel to and from the development. Note: these rules do not apply to transportation facilities.

These agreements did not receive sufficient support in at least two of the Collaborative’s interest groups. “Voting” was not completed in the other three interest groups.

From the perspective of many participants, much of this “regulatory” measure is already being implemented through the CEQA process. The Sacramento Air Quality Management District reviews development projects and requires mitigation for construction and operational emissions on those projects that exceed a threshold of significance. However, absent an enforceable regulation the Sacramento area is not able to receive credit for these efforts when planning for attainment of State and Federal air quality standards.

Following is the section of the draft Air Quality agreement on indirect source regulations.

#### Construction Mitigation Rule

The Collaborative recommends that, subject to the conditions and limitations identified below, adoption of a new Construction Mitigation Rule by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District is a necessary part of the strategy to achieve attainment of the new 8-hour ozone standard by 2018, and is highly beneficial to the reduction of other harmful pollutants from mobile sources. These conditions and limitations are as follows:

- ✓ The Construction Mitigation Rule does not usurp or supplant local land use authority.
- ✓ It is demonstrated that adoption of a Construction Mitigation Rule results in measurable and cost-effective improvement of air quality. Cost-effective, in this context, should include costs to both the public sector and the private sector, weighed against the current market rate (cost) of obtaining emission reductions through voluntary, incentive-based measures.

- ✓ Work on a specific rule will not begin until late 2005, following completion of attainment demonstration modeling by the Air Resources Board. The total emission reductions needed for attainment are not known until the results of this modeling are obtained. The amount of emission reductions necessary for attainment, and requirements of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, could impact the specifics of the rule.
- ✓ There are many significant details to be considered in the development of a Construction Mitigation Rule, and support for the general agreement herein is not intended to be unequivocal support for any specific rule. Significant details to be considered during actual rule development include:
  - minimizing administrative fees (e.g. for processing and inspection), and establishing a mechanism for periodic, public review of administrative fees.
  - thresholds of significance that would trigger the rule;
  - types of activities that could be subject to the rule;
  - the specific schedule of any administrative and/or mitigation fees proposed to be charged pursuant to the rule; and,
  - the amount of emission reductions required by the rule.
- ✓ For purposes of this agreement it is understood that the construction rule will include an option for fee-based compliance, and offer the option to reduce emissions on-site in order to reduce or eliminate the fee.
- ✓ Expenditures of mitigation fees collected pursuant to the Construction Mitigation Rule will be made toward air quality improvement in compliance with nexus requirements to ensure a correlation between the impact and the mitigation.

Additional concerns that should be addressed as any Construction Mitigation Rule is considered are as follows.

- ✓ The concept of a Construction Mitigation Rule is focused on only one of many sources of on- and off-road mobile source emissions. Is this equitable?
- ✓ Is a Construction Mitigation Rule consistent with the overall agreement to improve air quality using those strategies that offer the “biggest bang for the buck?”

- ✓ The cumulative impact of all existing and proposed fees on new development.

### Development Mitigation Rule

The Collaborative recommends that, subject to the conditions and limitations identified below, adoption of a Development Mitigation Rule by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District is a necessary part of the strategy to achieve attainment of the new 8-hour ozone standard by 2018, and is highly beneficial to the reduction of other harmful pollutants from mobile sources. These conditions and limitations are as follows:

- ✓ The Development Mitigation Rule does not usurp or supplant local land use authority.
- ✓ It is demonstrated that adoption of a Development Mitigation Rule results in measurable and cost-effective improvement of air quality. Cost-effective, in this context, should include costs to both the public sector and the private sector, weighed against the current market rate (cost) of obtaining emission reductions through voluntary, incentive-based measures.
- ✓ Work on a specific rule will not begin until late 2005, following completion of attainment demonstration modeling by the Air Resources Board. The total emission reductions needed for attainment are not known until the results of this modeling are obtained. The amount of emission reductions necessary for attainment, and requirements of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, could impact the specifics of the rule.
- ✓ There are many significant details to be considered in the development of a Development Mitigation Rule, and support for the general agreement herein is not intended to be unequivocal support for any specific rule. Significant details to be considered during actual rule development include:
  - minimizing administrative fees (e.g. for processing and inspection), and establishing a mechanism for periodic, public review of administrative fees.
  - thresholds of significance that would trigger the rule;
  - types of activities that could be subject to the rule;
  - the specific schedule of any administrative and/or mitigation fees proposed to be charged pursuant to the rule;

- exploring and considering adoption of mechanisms that could be simultaneously imposed to have a proportionate impact on existing development, such as requiring a one-time fee on real estate title transfers, with the option of onsite upgrades that would result in an equivalent pollutant reduction; and,
  - the amount of emission reductions required by the rule.
- ✓ For purposes of this agreement it is understood that the development rule will not mandate site design, but instead will provide a project sponsor with a choice between fee-based compliance and other design-related air quality mitigation measures, or some combination thereof.
- ✓ Expenditures of mitigation fees collected pursuant to the Development Mitigation Rule will be made toward air quality improvement in compliance with nexus requirements to ensure a correlation between the impact and the mitigation.
- ✓ Additional concerns that should be addressed as any Indirect Source Review rule is considered are as follows.
  - The concept of a Development Mitigation Rule is focused on only one of many sources of on- and off-road mobile source emissions. Is this equitable? Notwithstanding procedural and legal issues, should a similar, equivalent 1-time fee be proposed on existing development?
  - Is a Development Mitigation Rule consistent with the overall agreement to improve air quality using those strategies that offer the “biggest bang for the buck?”
  - The cumulative impact of all existing and proposed fees on new development.

Other specific questions and concerns with these proposed regulations are as follows:

- ✓ From the perspective of local governments, authority over land use projects is a power that must be closely guarded. Adoption of rules on indirect sources can be viewed as a sharing of an exclusively held power between local agencies and air districts.
- ✓ The development mitigation rule is viewed as a further example of new development being used as a mechanism to solve existing problems in disproportion to its impacts or the financial responsibility borne by existing residents.

- ✓ Though the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District has a history of timely project reviews, there is a general concern that adding more processes to the approval of projects works against streamlining efforts.
- ✓ There is concern about the administrative fees that will need to be charged to cover the air district's costs of implementing this rule. Even if the initial fees are nominal, if the program is to be revenue neutral, how can administrative fees and costs be kept to a minimum?
- ✓ The concept of a Development Mitigation Rule is focused on only one of many sources of on- and off-road mobile source emissions. Is this equitable? Notwithstanding procedural and legal issues, should a similar, equivalent 1-time fee be proposed on existing development?
- ✓ Is a Development Mitigation Rule consistent with the overall agreement to improve air quality using those strategies that offer the "biggest bang for the buck?"
- ✓ The cumulative impact of all existing and proposed fees on new development.

**Topics Not Significantly Negotiated to Reach Agreement or Impasse.**

The most significant Collaborative negotiations on air quality occurred from June through September 2005. These negotiations focused only on a subset of topics covered in the Staff Preliminary Draft Agreements in Principle (November 2004).

Because of this focused effort, the following topics (in no particular order) were not negotiated:

- 1) Measures to increase ridesharing, alternative work schedules, teleworking, etc.
- 2) Expansion of the parking cash-out law.
- 3) Greenhouse gas emissions / global warming.
- 4) Issues regarding airborne toxics other than ozone and ozone precursors. Neighborhood and community interests had hoped the Collaborative would negotiate agreements to reduce exposure to known pollutants for which standards have not yet been established. Related issues include:
  - The increasing number of studies demonstrating direct links between vehicle emissions and health problems.
  - Toxic air pollutant concentrations linked to cancer are especially high within 500 feet of freeways and arterials carrying high traffic flows.

- Toxic Hot Spots: In general, low-income communities are more likely to be located adjacent to the freeways system and access roads, creating continuous and prolonged exposure to poor air quality with negative impact the health of area residents.
- 5) Attainment of particulate matter standards. Related issues include:
    - Particulate matter concentrations (like other pollutants) increase the frequency and severity of asthma attacks.
    - High fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) concentrations are linked to premature mortality in patients suffering from advanced respiratory disease.
    - On-road motor vehicles produce over 50% of emitted fine particulate matter.
  - 6) Regulating or incentivizing clean fleets. The City of Citrus Heights has hoped to reduce impacts of pass-through vehicle emissions by obtaining agreement on regional implementation of alternative fuel vehicles – requirement that at least 35% of contracts to implement the use of alternative fuel vehicles.
  - 7) Transport of pollutants, including ozone precursors, from other regions and other areas of the Sacramento countywide area.
  - 8) Establishment of a program to provide public education to encourage walking and bicycling to schools.
  - 9) Establishment of a new program to encourage voluntary curtailment of portable engines on Spare the Air days.

### **Agreements and Recommendations with Additional Details to Resolve**

The following 15 agreements were reached and included in the Agreements and Recommendations. These agreements respond to statements of “why” the agreement is necessary, and “what is being agreed to.” These agreements do not address details of “how” the agreement will be implemented, and for most do not address “who” will implement them.

Agreement on the following assumes new revenues that will allow the Sacramento Air Quality Management District to administer the following programs, on a voluntary, incentive basis:

- a. Accelerating turnover of older, higher-emitting engines in on-road heavy-duty vehicles.
- b. Accelerating turnover of older, higher-emitting engines in off-road construction equipment.

- c. Retrofitting heavy-duty vehicles with technologies such as 3-way catalysts, dual fuel capabilities, and on-board diagnostics.
- d. Retiring older, higher-emitting, light duty vehicles.
- e. Replacing catalytic converters on light-duty vehicles, trucks and SUVs.

The agreements do not specify any further details of how these programs will be administered except that funds be allocated to those that are most cost effective.

Similarly, no details of the following “other” Agreements were discussed.

- a. Establishment of a new program to reduce idling of trucks, construction equipment, and locomotives.
- b. Encouraging programs that establish clean fleets and green contracting.
- c. Encouraging and facilitating broader use of zero-emission vehicles and neighborhood electric vehicles, including bicycles.
- d. Establishing a car sharing program.
- e. Further reducing energy consumption through the use of new energy-efficient technologies as they become available.
- f. Implementing additional urban heat island measures such as planting trees and using light colored roofing and paving materials.
- g. On-going monitoring of “best practices” related to new building design standards that might further reduce energy consumption requirements.
- h. Implementing measures to encourage use of electric or low-emission mowers and other lawn and garden equipment.
- i. Providing adequate on-site amenities for all travelers to support transportation choices provided through implementation of Blueprint-style growth principles.
- j. Establishment of new requirements to provide buffers between freeways and arterials, near sensitive receptors (i.e., schools, etc.), to reduce exposure to fine particulates.

Additional statements from the Staff Preliminary Draft Agreements in Principle were tested during the electronic polling in April 2005 and did not achieve 75% support in each of the Collaborative’s 5 Interest Groups. No further negotiations occurred on these topics and as such it is unfair to claim that impasse was reached. Rather, there was not sufficient cross-interest negotiation on these topics to reach either agreement or impasse. The Air Quality Team termed these as “considered but not requiring further action by the Collaborative.”

A description of each, the results of the April electronic polling, and a brief description of the status provided by the Sacramento Air Quality Management District can be found in the appendices to the complete air quality agreement.

## URBAN FORM, AND INFILL & REURBANIZATION

### STAFF SUMMARY OF UNRESOLVED ISSUES

#### PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION

The purpose of this section is to document the Collaborative participants' unresolved and unaddressed issues regarding Urban Form and Infill & Reurbanization.

This document is designed to be a companion piece to the Collaborative's agreements on this subject, which can be found in the *Agreements and Recommendations* document (Volume I) of the Collaborative's Final Report. The reader is advised to review the many agreements regarding Urban Form and Infill & Reurbanization before reading the following description of the unresolved issues for a broader context.

The list of unresolved issues was generated through discussions among Collaborative participants as well as through electronic polling exercises in April 2005. The electronic polling assessed the degree of agreement on issues related to the Draft Staff Agreements-in-Principles document, released in November 2004. Participants voted ("clicked") on 54 land use statements. The polling questions and responses are found on the Collaborative's website at: [http://www.sactaqc.org/clicker\\_Q.html](http://www.sactaqc.org/clicker_Q.html)

On the website, the electronic polling statements are labeled with an abbreviation of the topic, followed by a numbering sequence for that topic. For example, the 13<sup>th</sup> land use statement (concerning jobs-housing ratio) would be identified as LU13.

The issues of urban form as well as infill & reurbanization received widespread support among Collaborative members as documented in Volume I of the Collaborative's Final Report. However, a few concerns remain. There were specific statements that registered at least 25% disagreement or "unsure" among one or more Interest Groups. These statements are discussed in this section.

The format of this section is to identify the issue and provide explanation as to why there are differing views on each of the Unresolved Issues.

The following topics generated different opinions during the polling exercises and/or subsequent discussions among the Collaborative participants:

- ◆ URBAN FORM
  - Jobs-Housing Ratio
  - Certainty for Standards-Based Development
- ◆ INFILL
  - Neighborhood Support/Opposition to Infill

- Gentrification as a Consequence of Infill & Reurbanization
- Affordable Housing / Inclusionary Zoning
- Amount of Growth: Infill vs. Greenfield Development
- Master Environmental Impact Reports

### **Jobs/Housing Ratio**

**Jobs-Housing Ratio Polling Statement (LU-13):** Encourage each sub-area throughout the countywide area to strive for a jobs/housing balance where the jobs/housing ratio for that community is in the range of 1.0 – 1.5 jobs/housing ratio.

Jobs-Housing ratio can be defined as the number of jobs in an area divided by the number of housing units in the same area. A ratio of less than 1.0 is generally considered “housing rich / jobs poor”, while a ratio of greater than 1.5 is generally considered “jobs rich / housing poor”. Within the Sacramento region, the jobs/housing ratio is approximately 1.3 – meaning that each household supports about 1.3 jobs on average. Land use planners have often advocated a strategy of trying to achieve a “jobs/housing balance” for specific areas that comes as close as possible to the regional jobs/housing ratio.

Based on the electronic polling responses from April 2005, 76% overall agreed with the above statement, with strong agreement from the Business, Government, and Community Interest Groups.

Those who agreed with the polling statement generally explain that providing opportunities for people to live and work in the same general area is good land use policy. Those who supported the statement recognized that there are many reasons why households choose to locate in communities different from where they work, but at least some of the households will have the choice to live and work close enough to walk, bike, or use transit for this trip type.

However, 25% of the Environmentalists disagreed and 13% were unsure, and 13% of the Local Community Participants disagreed and 19% were unsure. Those who disagreed or were unsure stressed that the issue of land use balance is a complicated one, perhaps too complicated to be reduced simply to a target jobs/housing ratio. They mentioned that there are wide ranges of income levels and wide ranges of housing prices (spatial mismatch between job wage levels and corresponding housing affordability) which are not accounted for in a simple ratio. They expressed concern that targeting a jobs/housing ratio without consideration of these and other similar factors could possibly result in unintended consequences that would not benefit traffic or air quality. Furthermore, those who disagreed stressed that the commute trips represents only 20% of the total trips, and that efforts would be better directed toward achieving mixed uses that shorten non-commute trips.

## **Certainty for Standards-Based Development**

Certainty for Standards-Based Development can be defined as a streamlined regulatory process for projects that meet applicable standards. Developers have noted that the uncertainty associated with infill development is a major disincentive to building infill and reurbanization projects. They add that the current approval process discourages infill projects because requirements and expectations are not known until late in the process. Providing certainty through standards-based development is an effective strategy to set forward the requirements and expectations earlier in the process.

As documented in the *Agreements & Recommendations* (Volume 1), the Collaborative had general agreement on standards-based development. The Collaborative also agreed to support meaningful public participation in the development of detailed specific plans for infill areas. As explained below, the Collaborative believes that there is a strong linkage between standards-based development and civic engagement.

Conceptually, the Collaborative agreed with standards-based development, but concerns remain especially on the part of some of the environmental stakeholders and local community participants. These stakeholders struggled with how to meet both the needs for certainty for developers to promote infill & reurbanization and the needs for site-specific discretion and public participation. Thus, the Collaborative recommended pilot programs, wherein the incorporated cities and the County of Sacramento would use standards-based development for specific plan areas within their jurisdiction to work through some of these tensions.

With regard to standards-based development, the *Agreements & Recommendations* document advocates for an emphasis on up-front planning – master plans, environmental analysis, zoning code development, and robust civic engagement at the early planning stages – in exchange for streamlining and certainty for developments that meet the adopted standards set forth in the planning documents.

As detailed in the *Agreements & Recommendations*, Collaborative members are committed to civic engagement practices that better involve the public. Collaborative members also believe that citizens have an affirmative responsibility to engage at the policy level. Absent such citizen responsibility, many feel that the development approval process will continue in its current dysfunctional manner; infill projects are often delayed or dropped due to lack of public support in the immediate area of the project. This will undermine the ability to attract quality infill and reurbanization projects.

Even with the pilot program, some continue to feel the need to have the ability to influence the outcome of projects due to site specific concerns, even if such projects are consistent with agreed upon adopted standards developed through a good public participation process. Neighbors may not have understood how abstract policies and standards translate to specific projects. Advocates are reluctant to accept adopted standards as the final word, as the state of the art may change more rapidly than the formal revisions to standards.

## **Neighborhood Support/Opposition to Infill Development:**

**Neighborhood Support/Opposition** Polling Statement (LU8). Neighborhood opposition to infill development is often based on the following issues:

- traffic impacts
- impacts on local facilities, especially schools and parks
- lack of quality design that is sensitive to the neighborhood

Neighborhoods will be generally accepting of infill if these issues are addressed.

The results from April 2005 polling indicated that there is not agreement on this statement. The clicker results showed 60% disagreement from the Business Interest Group, and with significant disagreement from the other Interest Groups.

Those who supported the statement felt that if the principal objections to infill are adequately addressed, then the neighborhoods will support infill. Those stakeholders agreed that the principal objections to infill are usually traffic impacts, impacts on local facilities, and quality design. Those stakeholders believe that it is imperative that these objections be addressed; otherwise, the goals of accommodating growth through infill will not be realized.

However, even when care is taken to mitigate impacts and to ensure a high quality project, many Collaborative members believe that some neighbors may continue to oppose infill because quality of life is personal; what may be an acceptable trade-off or benefit for one neighbor might be unacceptable for another.

## **Gentrification**

Gentrification can be defined as the process of neighborhood change that results in the replacement of lower income residents with higher income residents; gentrification changes the character of urban neighborhoods.

The Collaborative did not formally discuss gentrification. As part of side conversations – particularly among those from the Community Interest Group – some have raised the issue as a potentially adverse consequence of infill and reurbanization. These stakeholders are most concerned about involuntary displacement (i.e., the displacement of those “original” residents who would prefer to stay in their neighborhood, but due to rapidly rising rents or increases in their property tax bills, cannot afford to remain in their neighborhood). In addition there may be *exclusionary displacement*, where changes in the neighborhood prevent *future* lower income households from being able to move into the neighborhood.

Collaborative members have pointed to historic displacement of Asian-American neighborhoods in the downtown (e.g., construction of Interstate 5), and the displacement of African-American residents during the 1960’s urban renewal efforts (e.g., Highway 99

improvements). These improvements also contributed to the unforeseen impacts of dividing established neighborhoods. There is a general sense among some members that seniors, low-income, ethnic populations, and the disability community are currently vulnerable to displacement from gentrification efforts in Sacramento.

The issue of gentrification has historically included a strong racial component—lower income African American, Latino, and Asian residents are replaced by higher income white residents. Some argue that this residential segregation occurs with the tacit support of public and private sector institutions and traditions. It should be noted that certain communities' original Codes Covenants & Restrictions promoted "red-lining" (the practice of a lending institution denying loans or restricting their number for certain areas of a community). Others believe that such segregation is unintentional and market-driven. Either way, an influx of higher income households inevitably puts pressure primarily on historically low-income minority communities.

More recently, there are concerns about the reurbanization efforts currently taking place in Oak Park. For example, some Collaborative members point to the upcoming project of UC Davis Medical School along Stockton Boulevard. They are concerned that this effort could affect current residents in Oak Park and other nearby communities. These Collaborative members explain that medical students and their families will be looking for housing and rentals close to the school and hospital. Despite being a "poor" student, they still may have the means to rent or pay for housing at a higher rate than current residents. These Collaborative members ask: "Where would current residents go?"

### **Affordable Housing / Inclusionary Zoning**

During the Spring of 2004 – when the Collaborative was selecting its Scope of a Potential Agreement – there was disagreement about whether affordable housing should be within the scope of an Agreement. A significant number of stakeholders believed that the Collaborative's scope was already too broad and that the affordable housing would divert the Collaborative's focus. Others believed that there is not enough of a direct linkage between housing and transportation for the Collaborative and that this issue was not within our charge. Other stakeholders – particularly the Community Interest Group – believe that the affordable housing is integral to the discussion of transportation and air quality. These stakeholders argued that a spatial mismatch between jobs and housing would result in longer trips and an increased level of difficulty in effectively using the public transit system to travel between home and work. They are particularly concerned that low income residents are affected by this mismatch.

Some members of the Collaborative (particularly in the Community Interest Group) wanted an inclusionary housing policy in the Collaborative's recommendations (took this out because I thought it took away the balance) consistent with the Collaborative's social equity values. Based on the polling results and other discussions, the Collaborative did not pursue this topic as there was not agreement among the interests to do so. The business interests do not support jurisdiction policies of inclusionary housing. Key

arguments for and against recommending an inclusionary housing policy are summarized below:

Background: Inclusionary zoning is the requirement that residential development projects include dwelling units that are affordable to a specified range of income levels (as specified in the inclusionary zoning ordinance). The goal of inclusionary zoning ordinances/programs is to assure that residential communities provide housing for a variety of income levels in a manner that integrates the various income levels within the same neighborhood. Inclusionary zoning ordinances have been adopted by the City of Sacramento and the County of Sacramento. The ordinances specify the percentage of units within a development that must be affordable to different income levels (e.g. moderate income, low income, very low income, and extremely low income). Also, each jurisdiction in the countywide area has a housing trust fund ordinance which requires the payment of a fee to be used to produce affordable housing units.) In addition, each ordinance describes the methods and procedures that are required to comply with the ordinance.

*Following are arguments advanced by some of the Collaborative members in support and in opposition to Inclusionary Housing.*

*Discussion in Support of an Inclusionary Housing Policy – advanced by some of the Community Interest Group and Environmental stakeholders:*

- Social and economic integration has potentially beneficial impacts on traffic and air quality problems by creating opportunities for lower income individuals to live closer to their place of employment and to essential services.
- Social and economic integration of neighborhoods is vital to the long-term health of individual neighborhoods and the community.
- Social and economic integration of neighborhoods provides an environment for positive interaction between diverse segments of the community. This interaction is beneficial to those in the lower income levels by providing positive role models and opportunities for advancement. Creating these beneficial opportunities for lower income individual is beneficial to the community as a whole.
- Based upon empirical evidence, the housing market will not provide for economically integrated neighborhoods without government intervention.
- In communities where inclusionary housing programs have been adopted, they have been successful in providing at least some opportunities for social and economic integration.
- The fostering of socially healthy neighborhoods that minimizes social marginalization should be a major public policy goal of local government's use of its discretionary land-use authority;
- Racial and/or class segregated neighborhoods impose social and economic costs on the community
- Diversity without integration is to perpetuate de-facto segregation;

- The social benefits of integrated neighborhoods exceeds the marginal costs to the development / building community resulting from inclusionary housing program requirements

*Discussion in Opposition to an Inclusionary Housing Policy- advanced by members of the Business Group and others:*

- Many opponents of inclusionary housing programs do not dispute the benefits (as described above) of having socially and economically integrated neighborhoods.
- The cost burden of inclusionary housing ordinances such as those adopted by the City of Sacramento and the County of Sacramento falls solely on the housing developer. To the extent feasible under market conditions, these costs are passed along to the purchaser of market rate homes within the development which raises the price of the market rate units.
- This approach unfairly burdens a very narrow segment of society.
- Since there are community-wide benefits to the adoption of inclusionary ordinances, the costs of implementing such ordinances should be spread more broadly across the community.
- To date, there are no local examples of how this cost burden can be more equitably distributed. Until this occurs, inclusionary housing ordinances should not be adopted.
- If inclusionary ordinances are adopted in only some local jurisdictions within a market area, they can cause shifts in marketing efforts and development to areas without such ordinances.
- Some studies of inclusionary ordinances have concluded that they do not increase the overall production of housing.
- Production of market rate housing frees up more affordable units that are vacated by move-up buyers. As this process continues down through lower priced housing, affordable units are freed-up at lower price ranges.

**Amount of Growth: Infill vs. Greenfield Development**

As documented in the *Agreements & Recommendations* (Volume 1), the Collaborative has strong agreement on accommodating an increasing amount of the countywide area's new growth through infill and reurbanization. This agreement recognizes that this form of urban development reduces overall Vehicle Miles Traveled and Vehicle Trips.

The SACOG Blueprint Preferred Scenario identifies a level of infill and reurbanization that substantially exceeds the current levels experienced ever since the time period following WWII.

Some members of the Collaborative – particularly the Environmentalists - believe that more of the countywide development should take place as infill and reurbanization, with

significantly less emphasis on greenfield development. This approach favors reduction in the amount of land utilized for greenfield development (thereby protecting open space resources) and the provision for higher densities within the infill and reurbanization developments. Thus, some members feel that the Blueprint Preferred Scenario was not aggressive enough.

Other members of the Collaborative – particularly Business – believe that market forces will increasingly evolve toward higher densities and sheer number of infill products built over time – consistent with the assumptions in the Blueprint. They believe that infill and reurbanization faces a number of barriers including regulatory, neighborhood opposition, and site-specific land use constraints. Additionally, they believe that to attract employers to the area’s communities requires a range of housing product choices (including lower density and suburban development).

### **Master Environmental Impact Reports**

As documented in the *Agreements & Recommendations* (Volume 1), the Collaborative has general agreement that increasing infill and reurbanization requires a more proactive, strategic approach. One such approach would involve a coordinated series of planning activities including master or specific plans, master environmental impact analyses, master infrastructure plans, and a coordinated implementation strategy. The use of Master planning is key to attracting quality infill and reurbanization, as it provides more certainty for developers.

As documented in the *Agreements & Recommendations* (Volume 1), the Master Environmental Impact Review (EIR) document should be prepared with sufficient detail to address the environmental effects of the relevant specific plan or area plan, including area-wide and cumulative impacts related to traffic, air quality, infrastructure, and services. It should also address these and other topics in sufficient detail to minimize or, if possible, eliminate the need for subsequent environmental work on individual projects that are consistent with the master plan.

However, some Collaborative members – particularly the Local Community Participants and the Environmentalists – cautioned against the reliance on Master EIRs. They argue that such documents are based on cumulative conditions, with less emphasis on individual projects. They argue that, if a project does not strictly conform to the assumptions made during the Master EIR, it is difficult to rely on that Master Plan. Similarly, if other projects have been approved that were not consistent with the Master Plan, then the cumulative scenario is no longer current.

Another criticism of Master Environmental Impact Reviews is that the documents may not provide adequate analysis of site-specific issues. Thus, the need for site specific analysis does not relieve the local agency from preparing environmental review documents. For these reasons, some Collaborative members argue that the time and

expense of preparing a Master Environmental Assessment of a Specific Plan – especially for infill projects - may not be warranted.

## LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT & LOCATION OF OPEN SPACE

### STAFF SUMMARY OF UNRESOLVED ISSUES

#### PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION

The purpose of this section is to document the Collaborative participants' unresolved issues regarding the "Location of Development and the Location of Permanent Open Space."

This document is designed to be a companion piece to the Collaborative's agreements on this subject, which can be found in the *Agreements and Recommendations* document (Volume I) of the Collaborative's Final Report. The reader is advised to review the agreements regarding the "Location of Development and the Location of Open Space" before reading the following description of the unresolved issues for a broader context.

All along, the Collaborative viewed their discussion on the "Location of Development and the Location of Open Space" as one part of a larger package that would address the needs of all interests. In the Collaborative discussion, the assumption was that no piece of the package would go forward without other key pieces. The key pieces are transportation, air quality, land use and funding. The lack of progress on the discussions on the "Location of Development and the Location of Open Space" significantly interfered with progress on the other key pieces and, ultimately, the Collaborative negotiations as a whole.

#### RECAP FROM THE *AGREEMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS* DOCUMENT (Volume I of Collaborative's Final Report)

##### What Was At Issue?

The Collaborative structured its discussion on the Location of Development and Open Space around the following six questions. The only policy topic from the following list that gained substantial agreement within the Collaborative was the issue of Urban Form. (See Volume I.)

- Where should future development physically occur in the county?
- What areas should be preserved as permanent open space? <sup>1</sup>
- How should future development be phased and should it be contiguous with existing development?
- What urban form should new development take?

---

<sup>1</sup> Definition of Open Space: In its July 2004 Progress Report, the Collaborative defined open space as that part of the countryside in its existing or restored state used for agriculture / ranching, ecological, aesthetic, historical or recreational purposes. Open space includes rangelands, woodlands, and urban greenbelt areas and cultivated agricultural lands.

- Is the resolution of the above questions best accomplished by regulation, through the market, or a combination of both?
- Who pays, who benefits, and how are the benefits and burdens distributed?

## Overview Of Hard And Soft Edges

To begin to address the above questions, the Collaborative developed the concepts of the “hard” and “soft” edges.

The hard edge refers to “location” decisions that would involve countywide policies identifying land areas planned for future development and land areas for permanent open space. The Collaborative named this concept the “hard edge” as discussions often centered on how to create -- either through regulation or the market -- a permanent urban edge to long-term development. Collaborative participants often described the “hard edge” as similar to the County of Sacramento’s Urban Service Boundary, but applying to all countywide areas. <sup>2</sup>

The “soft edge” refers to policies that would develop a system for maintaining a continuous 20-25 year countywide supply of developable land for the provision of housing, jobs and public uses within the Sacramento countywide area. This land supply would include a combination of greenfields, infill sites, and areas with reurbanization opportunities.

As the Collaborative discussed it, the soft edge was to be reviewed and updated every five years to inform whether, how much, and where to expand or contract in response to such factors as demand for housing and newly established local government land use policies. Since areas earmarked for potential future development could change, the Collaborative named this concept the “soft edge.” Collaborative participants often described the “soft edge” as similar to the County of Sacramento’s Urban Policy Area (UPA), but applying to all countywide areas. <sup>3</sup>

Conceptually, the hard and soft edges were conceived as part of an integrated and reinforcing system, where the hard edge would provide clear direction on where development would or would likely occur over the long term (e.g. 2050), and the soft edge would provide for the orderly progression of growth toward, but not beyond, the hard edge.

The hard and soft edges were discussed as one part of a larger package that would provide certainty for the needs of all interests (See boxed insert below.) In the Collaborative discussion, the assumption was that no piece of the package would go forward without the other key pieces.

---

<sup>2</sup> Urban Service Boundary (USB) and Urban Policy Area (UPA): The USB and UPA are policies of the County of Sacramento and therefore the incorporated cities bordering the USB (Elk Grove, Folsom, Rancho Cordova and Sacramento) are not bound by these policies.

<sup>3</sup> See footnote 2 above.

## **WHERE SHOULD FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OCCUR IN THE COUNTY? WHAT AREAS SHOULD BE PRESERVED AS PERMANENT OPEN SPACE?**

The shorthand within the Collaborative for referring to the above two questions was notion of “hard edge.” When Collaborative members discussed these questions their attention generally focused on undeveloped land outside of what is described as the County of Sacramento’s Urban Service Boundary (USB). The Collaborative understood that the USB is a policy of Sacramento County, and therefore the incorporated cities bordering the USB (Elk Grove, Folsom, Rancho Cordova, and Sacramento) are not legally bound by it. Because the City of Citrus Heights is located in the middle of urban and suburban development, the development of a hard edge was not related to their direct interests.

Although many participants had differing views on these two questions, nowhere was the disagreement more clear than between the Business Interest Group and the Environmental Interest Group. These disagreements were rooted in each of the group’s basic underlying interests and needs, and therefore finding common ground was illusive.

The Collaborative participants developed three trial balloons, for discussion purposes only, to discuss the issues related to the hard edge: Where should future development physically occur in the county? What areas should be preserved as permanent open space?

### **The Hard Edge Trial Balloons**

The reader needs to be advised that the trial balloons below cannot be seen as freestanding options. This is because support for any one of these trial balloons had to be part of an integrated package that contained other linked policies, particularly policies relating to the various needs for certainty as described in the boxed insert on the next page. The Collaborative was neither able to support any of the options below on a consensus basis nor develop a detailed outline of what an integrated package might look like.

The Environmental Community supported Option A and the Business Community was interested in Option B *only* if linked to other key policies for their constituency (See boxed insert on next page). The participants found Option C somewhat interesting, but no agreement developed on that option either. The discussions of Option C did not get far enough along to more specifically characterize Collaborative members’ concerns with that option.

Trial Balloon A: Permanent Urban Limit Line: The Location of Development and Open Space would be determined by a permanent urban limit line that separates developable land from permanent open space, with firm assurances and guarantees based on

regulation, preferably a voter ballot initiative. This general concept is similar to the County's Urban Service Boundary, but would apply countywide to all the cities as well.

#### **Need for a Larger Package of Agreements with an Emphasis on Certainty**

Collaborative members realized that the resolution of issues related to the location of development and the location of open space had to be part of a larger package that also addressed such issues as the linkage between transportation and land use, infill and reurbanization, and the social equity implications of land use decisions. Each interest group also expressed that certainty and predictability of outcomes were essential pieces of any long-term solution.

**For developers and the business community,** support for a hard edge would need to be linked to other interests' support for a multi-modal transportation system, which would include the maintenance, upgrade and expansion of roads and key corridors along with transit, walking and biking. The timely and predictable approval of projects consistent with adopted local land use policies and regulations was a critical piece of the overall package for the business community.

**For the environmental community,** certainty means the permanent protection of open space, natural resources, and land buffers between communities, with firm assurances of an "end-game" for long-term future development on greenfields within the county. They also saw the establishment of a hard edge as providing a strong incentive for directing a larger portion of growth inward through infill and reurbanization.

**For social equity interests,** discussions on the hard and soft edge posed questions about the distribution of benefits associated with land use decisions: Who pays, who benefits, and how are the benefits and burdens distributed? How do decisions about the location of development and the location of open space affect the economic development and revitalization of existing neighborhoods, particularly those in economically depressed areas? Are public resources diverted from existing neighborhoods to greenfield development?

**For neighbors and community members,** certainty means being able to rely on adopted land use policies that provide for neighborhood quality of life as the basis for approval of development projects. They value balanced growth policies that place a priority on investments in existing communities. They would want to seriously evaluate the impact of countywide hard and soft edge policies as related to their particular communities.

**For local governments,** certainty means being able to implement the vision of how its citizens wish to grow and develop as expressed in its general and areas plans. It also means having projects built out in full compliance with all the terms and conditions of its approval.

**For agricultural and ranching interests,** the location of future development and open space relates to their core interests. The viability of the agricultural and ranching industries is directly linked to the placement of appropriate land use buffers between their industries and residential populations. Equally important, they are concerned that a regulatory hard edge could undermine the economic value of their land. The market value of most rural lands is greater than its value based solely for agricultural or ranching uses.

Trial Balloon A, supported by the Environmental Interest Group, relied on a firm urban limit line, using regulatory methods to assure that the line remained secure over time. The environmentalists acknowledge that nothing is 100% secure over the long haul, but they believe that a voter initiative establishing a permanent urban edge provided the most certainty for their interests. They prefer the ballot approach rather than policies set by

elected bodies, which they believed could more easily altered based on development pressures. The environmentalists also believe a firm urban an edge creates significant incentives to grow though infill and reurbanization, rather than through greenfield development.

The business community could not support an urban limit line approach (Trial Balloon A). They believe that a line does not respect private ownership of land on either side of the line and, as a side note, believe that its adoption was not politically realistic for the incorporated cities with undeveloped land areas near or in their city borders. Furthermore, the business representatives explained that the use of regulation to uphold the urban limit line was inconsistent with a market-based approach to creating a permanent edge, as provided for in Trial Balloon Balloon B described below. The business representatives believe that the use of the market over time, in conjunction with developer purchase of open space as a condition of development, was a more certain way of creating a permanent edge to development.

Trial Balloon B: Designate Broad Zones: Location of Development and Open Space would be determined by designating broad zones where development is encouraged or discouraged, but not disallowed. Significant incentives would be provided for development occurring within the suggested development zones and disincentives outside the zones. Additionally, this approach would require developers to purchase open space land based upon a specified ratio of the land they develop. Over time, a definitive pattern of development and permanent open space would evolve, creating urban edges throughout the county.

The business representatives expressed more interest in this trial balloon, but their interest in Trial Balloon B was linked to a larger package of agreements, particularly those that would provide certainty for the timely approval of projects consistent with adopted local land use policies and transportation mobility including a multi-modal transportation system that included key road and highway expansions. (See boxed insert on previous page.)

The environmental representatives could not support Trial Balloon B for several reasons. They believe that the use of incentives and disincentives to encourage the eventual development of a permanent edge would not work. They believe that, with the pressures and financial rewards associated with development, the disincentives could never be strong enough to actually discourage development in the outlying areas. They were also concerned that development pressures would compromise a program that relied on the market, rather than regulation. The environmentalist pointed to the escalating speculative value of land in the outlying areas to support their perspective.

Trial Balloon C: Set Number of Acres for Development: Location of Development and Open Space would be determined by an agreement on a set number of acres available for development in the countywide area. When the set number of acres was developed, development would stop in the countywide area on a permanent basis and the remaining

would be permanent open space. In calculating the set number of acres, consideration was to be given for the acres within the current County of Sacramento's Urban Policy Area that had to be set aside under the Endangered Species Act, and therefore not able to be developed.

## **HOW SHOULD FUTURE DEVELOPMENT BE PHASED AND SHOULD IT BE CONTIGUOUS WITH EXISTING DEVELOPMENT?**

The short-hand within the Collaborative for referring to this question was notion of the "soft edge" (see above for description). The Collaborative members used the general concept behind the County of Sacramento's Urban Policy Area (UPA) as a way of thinking about a soft edge, but applying it countywide for the purposes of the Collaborative's discussion.

Assumptions about the percentage of future growth projected to occur in greenfields as compared to that occurring through infill and reurbanization was a source of tension in the discussions on the soft edge, particularly between the business and environmental representatives. The environmentalists believe that, with more aggressive policies, a much larger proportion of the growth can be handled within the current urban footprint, thus putting less pressure on both soft and hard edges. Others in the Collaborative, particularly the Business and Government Interests, cite the Blueprint's preferred scenario as their guide and explain that the Blueprint was developed with input from diverse interests and has the support from the elected officials. The Blueprint, although very supportive of infill and redevelopment, has substantial future growth occurring in the county's greenfield areas.

In general, Collaborative members were somewhat interested in the potential concept of a "soft edge," but the discussions did not get very far due to the difficulty developing common ground on the hard edge discussions. The concerns expressed regarding the soft edge are documented below.

Business Interest Group: The business community expressed more support for the soft edge concept than the other interest groups, although some business representatives wondered if the soft edge would be another government hurdle for development, making affordable housing less available by constraining the availability of land.

Environmental Interest Group: The Environmental Interest Group is concerned that, absent a firm countywide urban edge, the implementation of soft edge policies could provide a venue for the continual expansion of growth and development. Their concern is that a soft edge policy could be developed as substitute for a firm urban limit and, therefore, they believe that most of the county's land would then eventually be urbanized through the soft edge process. Contiguosness of development is a very important policy consideration for the environmentalists.

Government Interest Group: When polled, the Government Interest Groups had high "unsures" and low disagrees about the soft edge concept, which most likely means that

there was more uncertainty about the soft edge than actual disagreement. As mentioned above, the lack of agreement on the hard edge concept truncated the discussions on the soft edge. One likely concern of the Government Group would be the process for establishing and maintaining a soft edge on a countywide level that would satisfy the more specific needs of each of the jurisdictions. Most government representatives believe that this would be very challenging.

Community Interests Groups: When polled, the Community Interest Groups also had high “unsures” and low disagrees about the soft edge concept, which likely means that there was more uncertainty about the Soft Edge than actual disagreement within this group. The Community Interest Group expressed the need for more information and discussion on the soft edge before determining their perspective.

Local Community Participants: When polled, more than half of the Local Community Participants supported the development of the “soft edge” with the other half unsure or disagreeing. Local Community Participants also expressed the need for more information and discussion on the soft edge before determining their perspective.

## **WHAT URBAN FORM SHOULD NEW DEVELOPMENT TAKE?**

The Collaborative was able to achieve agreement on the issue of the urban form of development. The reader is referred to the *Recommendations and Agreements* document (Volume I) of the Collaborative’s Final Report.

## **SOCIAL EQUITY QUESTIONS: WHO PAYS, WHO BENEFITS AND HOW ARE THE BENEFITS AND BURDENS DISTRIBUTED**

With regard to the land use questions posed by the hard and soft edge issue, the social equity interests were especially interested in the following questions: Who pays, who benefits, and how are the benefits and burdens distributed? How do decisions about the location of development and the location of open space affect the economic development and revitalization of existing neighborhoods, particularly those in economically depressed areas? Are public resources diverted from existing neighborhoods to greenfield development? Because discussions did not get far on either the hard or soft edges, these questions were not adequately addressed.

## **CLOSING NOTE**

Without traction on the land use issues involving the location of development and the location of permanent open space, resolution on such topics as transportation, air quality and funding became challenging.

Since the Collaborative required agreement among all five interest groups to recommend policies to the elected governing boards, the strongly differing perspectives between the Business and Environmental Groups on these “location” issues led the Collaborative to question how it could productively move forward.

It is important to note that the Community Interest Group and the Local Community Participants strongly expressed that they would have wanted more involvement in and influence upon the discussions between the representatives of business and environmental participants on the “location” issues. Initially, the discussions on the hard and soft edges were primarily between the environmental and business representatives, thinking that if these two groups could tentatively support some general agreements-in-principle on the location issues, the Collaborative would then have a more solid starting place to design a broader and more specific agreement inclusive of all the interests. In hindsight, integrating a broader group of stakeholders earlier in the process might have been a better way to approach these long-standing tensions between the environmental and business communities.

## Unresolved Funding Policies

As is described in the transportation section of this unresolved issues document, differences in world views underlie many of the points of disagreement that have been addressed within the Collaborative. The differences in the worldviews above become further amplified when transportation funding decisions have to be made.

This difference in views is illustrated in the responses to each of the following electronic polling statements (interest groups with less than 2/3 aggregate support<sup>5</sup> are identified in parentheses following each statement).

- ✓ A new incentives/rewards program, related to funding expansion of the transportation system, should be developed that would allocate regional funds to local jurisdictions based on their implementation of agreed to land use principles and objectives. (Business)
- ✓ High, Medium, or Low Priority? Investing in projects that encourage economic development and vitality. (Environmental<sup>6,7</sup>).
- ✓ A system of new transportation facilities should be provided, including transit services, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities, but no new roads or highways. (Business, Community, Government, and Local Community)<sup>8</sup>.
- ✓ A transportation system should be provided that is based significantly upon the increased availability of communications technology, reducing car trips through increased telecommuting, teleconferencing, and on-line shopping and services. (Business, Government).

Setting aside underlying issues, unresolved issues related to funding can be summarized into disagreement around the following:

- ✓ The importance of achieving efficiencies with the use of current revenues before raising new revenues
- ✓ The philosophy of who should pay for facilities and services.
- ✓ The philosophy or priority of changes in administering funds.
- ✓ Inherent opposition to each specific funding source (new or increase).

---

5 Aggregating “agree” and “agree with qualifications”

6 51% “high priority” plus “medium priority” support

7 It is interesting that “investing in projects that protect the environment” did receive 2/3 high plus medium support in each interest group.

8 It is interesting that “a system of new roads and highways should be provided, but no expanded transit services, or bicycle or pedestrian facilities” received 1/3 or less support for the following statement in each interest group.

- ✓ How limited funds should be allocated amongst many deserving programs.
- ✓ How limited funds should be allocated within a program to specific projects.

These reasons combine to explain the dynamics that kept the Collaborative from agreeing to a specific funding strategy, and even unequivocal support for any particular funding source.

### **Achieving Efficiencies before Raising New Revenues**

To all interest groups increasing the efficient use of existing funding sources was deemed a high priority. However, some participants – at least one in each interest group – placed achieving greater efficiencies as nearly a pre-requisite to discussing new funding sources.

Most participants, however, viewed the aggregate funding deficit as so significant compared to any realistic opportunity for improving efficiency, that this was simply a strategy that should be combined with multiple new funding sources to close the revenue deficits.

A related issue to achieving efficiencies is using standard methodologies to determine life cycle costs.

### **Philosophical Differences on Who Should Pay for Facilities/Services**

Even more significant than agreement on one or more new/increased funding sources would be agreement on an integrated package of funding sources consistent with a prevailing philosophy.

During negotiations, several approaches were considered, each rooted in a strong underlying interest. For instance, several participants supported an approach that would appropriate allocate responsibility for constructing, maintaining, and operating the transportation system based upon a ‘those who benefit should pay.’ A closely-related approach is ‘those who use the system should pay.’

The Collaborative tested each of the 5 following approaches during the April 2005 electronic polling, and each failed to show significant support.

- ✓ Additional funds should be raised from increases in traditional sources such as the fuel tax and sales tax.
- ✓ Additional funds should be derived from a series of user fees that are directly related to use of the transportation system, such as the vehicle miles of travel taxes, tolls, parking charges and transit fares.

- ✓ Additional funds should be proportionally derived from existing residents, existing employers, future residents, future employers, and visitors in rough proportion to the impacts created and benefits received by each of the user sub-groups. This could include a combination of development impact fees, traditional sources, and user fees.
- ✓ Most of the additional funding should from new residential and non-residential development except for existing backlogs which would be financed by existing residents and existing employers. This could include a combination of development impact fees and traditional sources.
- ✓ Additional funding should be provided by any and all mechanisms that voters are willing to support without regard to an overriding philosophy.

A final question about philosophical approaches asked respondents which of the 5 approaches they would prefer. The results demonstrated the disparate views of stakeholders within each interest group.

BONUS -- If you could choose only 1 of the previous 5 approaches, which would you prefer???	BIG	CIG	EIG	GIG	LCP	TOT
Additional funds should be raised from increases in traditional sources such as the fuel tax and sales tax.	33%	13%	29%	40%	0%	22%
Additional funds should be derived from a series of user fees that are directly related to use of the transportation system, such as the vehicle miles of travel taxes, tolls, parking charges and transit fares.	17%	13%	43%	20%	20%	22%
Additional funds should be proportionally derived from existing residents, existing employers, future residents, future employers, and visitors in rough proportion to the impacts created and benefits received by each of the user sub-groups. This could include a combination of development impact fees, traditional sources, and user fees.	17%	63%	29%	33%	60%	43%
Most additional funding should come from new development except for existing backlogs which would be financed primarily by existing residents and employers. This could include a combination of development impact fees and existing sources.	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%
Additional funding should be provided by any and all mechanisms that voters are willing to support without regard to an overriding philosophy.	17%	13%	0%	7%	20%	12%
Number of Voters	6	8	7	15	15	51

One related issue that was discussed in the analysis of each specific funding proposal was “regressive” vs. “progressive” mechanisms.

The terms progressive and regressive taxes are not value judgments, rather these terms apply to the tax formula. In a progressive tax, the more you earn, the higher your tax rate (e.g. Federal income tax). In a regressive tax, the less you earn, the higher your effective tax rate (e.g. sales tax).

## Differences on How to Administer Transportation Funds / Programs

Several other issues were discussed that held greater or lesser degrees of importance to each interest group, and even participants within each interest group.

- ✓ Flexibility to use funds vs. accountability to, and certainty for, taxpayers.

F-SP6. A significant portion of new revenues should be unrestricted to allow for strategic decision-making by public agencies. Without flexibility, it is difficult, if not impossible, to quickly respond to changing circumstances, or to take advantages of one-time opportunities.	BIG	CIG	EIG	GIG	LCP	TOT
High Emphasis	33%	13%	0%	64%	27%	32%
Medium Emphasis	33%	38%	57%	14%	40%	34%
Low Emphasis	33%	38%	29%	14%	20%	24%
Unsure / need more information	0%	13%	14%	7%	7%	8%
Abstain	0%	0%	0%	0%	7%	2%
Number of Voters	6	8	7	14	15	50

F-SP7. A significant portion of new revenues should be ear-marked for specific purposes. Accountability to the taxpayers and voters is more important than the ability to be flexible. Additionally, in order to obtain the support of voters and approval of new funding sources, specificity, certainty, and accountability as to how funds will be used are essential.	BIG	CIG	EIG	GIG	LCP	TOT
High Emphasis	60%	57%	43%	38%	69%	53%
Medium Emphasis	0%	29%	43%	38%	19%	27%
Low Emphasis	40%	14%	14%	25%	13%	20%
Unsure / need more information	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Abstain	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Number of Voters	5	7	7	16	16	51

- ✓ Re-allocating or re-prioritizing how existing revenues are spent.

F-SP8. Developing New Revenue Sources / Reallocation of Existing Funds: With which of the following two statements below do you most agree regarding the funding of future transportation and air quality needs? (a.) The focus should be on developing new revenue sources, rather than reallocating existing funds. There are strong constituencies for all existing programs and it is not feasible to assume that a significant change to this can or will occur; (b.) In an era of insufficient funding, existing backlogs, and future shortfalls, funds should be allocated to those programs that are determined to be the higher priority, even if that means reducing funding for programs that have strong constituencies.	BIG	CIG	EIG	GIG	LCP	TOT
Emphasis should be on "a."	33%	25%	0%	35%	20%	25%
Emphasis should be on "b."	0%	13%	20%	6%	27%	14%
A blend of "a" and "b," meaning that we should have the fortitude to reallocate some of our existing funds, but realize that the community may not have the political will to do this "across the board."	67%	63%	80%	59%	53%	61%
Unsure / need more information	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Abstain	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Number of Voters	6	8	5	17	15	51

- ✓ The environmental community believes that current transportation models focus upon short term public costs, and thus bias the public decision-making in toward automobile modes. They explain that most transit costs are public and most auto costs are private. They believe that the analysis of transportation alternatives should be based on the full cost, including private costs to families and individuals.
- ✓ Many participants want new methods to assess and disclose direct and indirect economic, environmental and social costs of transportation and land use policies and actions, including the monetary and non-monetary costs to society of consuming natural resources. This is sometimes referred to as “full cost accounting.”
- ✓ Funding Allocated on Basis of Need: When funding is allocated to projects and services, priority should be given to meeting the transportation needs of those under- served by the existing transportation system.
- ✓ Universal and standard transit fares vs. (distance-based) variable transit fares. The underlying differences on these topics appear to be related to differing emphasis on subsidized fares for transit dependent groups.
- ✓ Implementing technology solutions to provide alternatives to driving was generally supported in all interest groups except the Government Interest Group. It appears that this is due to a generally discounting of the usefulness of this strategy by the transportation professionals.
- ✓ Finally, the proposal for a statewide program to monitor and backfill lost revenues due to the increasing share of new sales that are alternatively fueled vehicles failed to receive a significant level of support in any interest group.

### **Inherent Support/Opposition to Each Specific Funding Source**

The following 12 funding sources were including the Collaborative’s “toolkit” although, as noted following each, electronic poll results suggest that all but one would have likely opposition if not considered as part of a package of funding sources agreed to by a wide congregation of interests.

1. Use Fuel Sales Tax Revenues for Transportation Purposes (Proposition 42). This was one of the most widely supported programs as it re-allocates existing taxes from the State general fund to local transportation purposes. Opposition is likely from social equity interests that are concerned that critical state programs, including public health, public education, and social programs.
2. Obtain a Greater Share of Federal & State Funding. There is no known opposition as this re-allocates existing taxes.

3. Increase the DMV Air Quality Surcharge. The electronic polling indicates likely opposition from “average” residents and possibly business. Also, social equity interests would consider this a regressive funding program. Based upon subsequent negotiations, depending on the amount and proposed use of the surcharge, opposition from business might be somewhat mitigated. For instance, if the surcharge were used to attain air quality standards without the need for fees or regulations on new development, support from business is possible.
4. Increase the Gas Tax for Local Transportation Improvements. Moderate opposition appears likely from all interest groups, but particularly with average citizens that do not represent a particular interest. Also, social equity interests would consider this a regressive funding program.

Surprisingly, there was no significant support from any interest group to index the existing fuel taxes to off-set the impacts of inflation.

5. Provided an Expanded Menu of Parcel-Based Assessment Programs. There are a number of potential parcel-based funding mechanisms. Business Improvement Districts were a low priority for the Community Interest Group as well as the Business Interest Group and only a moderate priority for governments.

Benefit Assessment Districts were not, as could be expected, strongly supported by the Local Community Participants.

6. Implement an Additional Sales Tax Increment. This was the preferred funding source for the Business Interest Group, but only if enacted on a multi-county basis to avoid a significant disparity in the sales tax in Sacramento County, compared with neighboring counties. Social equity interests would consider this a regressive funding program and some in the Community Interest Group were most opposed to this funding source.
7. Implement a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Surcharge. This was support in the context of a potential for the gasoline tax revenues to continue to decline, and perhaps at an even greater rate than it has to date. In any event, this only received significant support from the Environmental Interest Group. Social equity interests would consider this a regressive funding program.
8. Implement new Vehicle Weight Fees. This was supported as a user fee to have the weight-related impact on road maintenance be more-fully recouped from vehicle weight fees. This was supported in all but the Business Interest Group.
9. Implement Tolling on New Facilities. While this program was included in the funding toolkit as a potential long-range funding option, it had mixed support in each interest group. Social equity interests would consider this a regressive funding program.

10. Implement Parking Districts. The Community Interest Group (CIG) and Environmental Interest Group participants strongly supported parking districts, primarily as a way to achieve “full cost accounting” regarding automobile use, and provide an incentive to use alternative modes. Not surprisingly, the other interest groups had the expected concerns about increasing the costs for automobile users.
11. Implement a Real Estate Title Transfer Fee. Considerable opposition is likely from all segments of the community. Support for this mechanism came as a result of the recent, significant “profits” that have been realized on properties held more than a year or two. Also, this was seen by many as a creative way to counter balance development impact fees with a fee on existing parcels.
12. Implement a DMV Transportation Surcharge. This was proposed near the end of negotiations in response to pending State legislation. Insufficient negotiation occurred to properly assess the perspective of various participants. Social equity interests would consider this a regressive funding program.

The above funding sources address “what is being agreed to.” These agreements do not address details of “how” the funding source would be implemented, and for most do not address “who” will implement them.

The following funding sources were discussed in the Collaborative but were not included in the “tool kit” because of a lack of support.

1. Airport Access Fee/Ticket Surcharge (for transit service).
2. Carbon Tax.
3. Cordon Pricing Fee.
4. Emissions Fee (for air quality measures).
5. Payroll Tax (for transit service).
6. Regional Development Fee (for share of corridor improvements).
7. Rental Car Surcharge.
8. Development Impact Fees.

Most of these were dropped for reasons other than lack of consensus. The one exception is development impact fees.

There was also significant discussion about the role of impact fees on new development.

The Environmental Interest Group (EIG) participants feel strongly that new development should fund its actual costs. The EIG’s Issues and Interests statement cites studies that found: 1) the average new single family low density residence in the State of Washington creates a need for \$83,000 of new public infrastructure (and contends that infrastructure costs in California are higher than those in the state of Washington); and, 2) shows that new single family low

density housing in Placer County does not generate enough tax revenue to maintain the new infrastructure needed or provide adequate services.

Similarly, the Community Interest Group participants expressed concern that existing residents not pay for new development's impacts on existing infrastructure.

Representatives of the Business Interest Group representatives supported the concept of development impact fees, however several concerns were expressed about a continued emphasis on impact fees as an increasing source of transportation revenues.

In particular, business interests in general see new development being used to resolve existing deficiencies as part of mitigating their impacts. These interests see new development as the predominant funding source being contemplated by local jurisdictions with no other revenue-expanding initiatives gaining momentum to complement impact fees.

Business interests have argued that fees and requirements on new development have the potential to soften the otherwise strong housing market, and have presented evidence that without the development-related economy the great Sacramento area would have been in a recession over the last couple of years.

Government Interest Group and Local Community participants also expressed concerns from their perspectives about the cumulative amount of fees being assessed to new development for a variety of capital improvements.

Finally, many worry about the effect that fees and regulations on new development are having on efforts to provide housing that is affordable to all income levels.

On final note: there was generally no difference in perspective from participants on any source because of whether it was a new source or an increase of an existing source.

### **Allocating Limited Funds amongst Many Deserving Programs**

The Collaborative's negotiations on funding occurred with many participants aware of, if not supporting, other efforts in the community to raise significant revenues other deserving causes, including libraries, parkways, and schools.

Setting that issue aside, the Collaborative and under efforts have clearly documented the significant funding deficits to occur in almost every transportation program: existing revenues are insufficient to operate the projected transit system, the condition of public roads is projected to decline due to insufficient funds for maintenance and operations, congestion is projected to

increase as funds to build sufficient infrastructure in any mode does not exist to accommodate future travel demand. The same can be said for constructing, maintaining and operating bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Given the insufficient available funding the different opinions relative to the priorities for transportation expenditure, in parts, relates directly to the worldviews explained in the transportation section.

Not surprisingly, the tensions regarding the allocation of transportation resources are often between business and government with one set of perspectives and the environmentalists and community interests with another.

These dynamics materialized in many of the Collaborative's negotiations.

A series of more than 40 questions regarding relative priorities was posed in the electronic polling. No agreement appeared to be emerging in the following:

1. Cost-effective operational and safety modifications should be given priority consideration over road widenings.
2. A system of new transportation facilities should be provided, including transit services, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities, but no new roads or highways.

If you were prioritizing how to spend transportation dollars, would you give higher priority to...?

3. ... implementing clean air measures or expanding transportation facilities and services?
4. ... implementing safety improvements or expanding existing transportation facilities and services?
5. ... expanding the bus system or expanding the light rail system?
6. ... expanding freeways or expanding local roadways?
7. ... expanding existing light rail services or expanding existing freeways?
8. ... implementing bus rapid transit systems on major streets or widening major streets?
9. ...maintaining existing transportation facilities and services or adding new transportation facilities and services?

No agreement exists that each of the following be given a high or medium priority for expending limited transportation-related funds.

10. ...investing in projects that encourage economic development and vitality.
11. ...investing in projects that project the environment.
12. ...implementing technology solutions to provide alternatives to driving.
13. ...improving air quality through additional measures, such as those defined in the preliminary draft Air Quality agreements in principle.
14. ... expanding highway and road capacity.
15. ... providing improved freight and goods movement.
16. ... providing new sidewalks.
17. ... providing new bicycle facilities.
18. ...enhancing demand-management strategies that are designed to reduce vehicle demand.
19. ... expediting construction of improvements to meet Americans with Disabilities Act, and related, requirements.
- 20....improving accessibility in low-income neighborhoods, including removal of physical and other barriers, to all modes of transportation.
21. ... providing transportation services for low-income persons transitioning from public assistance to employment.

### **Allocating Limited Funds within a Program to Specific Projects**

The Collaborative had few conversations about specific projects. Nonetheless, it appears that the limited availability of funding is likely to create tension when determining priorities within any given program.

## **Project Staff**

Cheryl Creson, Director 2001-2003

Matt Boyer, Director 2004-2005

Scot Mende, Deputy Director

Katie Eastham, Project Staff

Bonnie Feldman, Executive Secretary 2001-2003

Shelly Cristiani, Executive Secretary 2003-2004

## **Consultants**

Steve Brown, Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc.

Bob Grandy, Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc.

Tom Hutchings, Consultant

John Long, DKS Associates

Susan Sherry, Center for Collaborative Policy, Sacramento State

Sue Woods, Center for Collaborative Policy, Sacramento State