



MEMO

To: James Caruso
COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

From: Nora De Cuir

Cc: Tammy Seale

Date: September 20, 2010

Re: Climate Action Plan, Land Use and Transportation Stakeholder Discussion Summary from August 23, 2010

Discussion Summary

The Land Use and Transportation Stakeholder Discussion began with an overview of the County's Climate Action Plan initiative from Long Range Planning Division Manager Chuck Stevenson. Consultant project manager, Tammy Seale, presented an overview of a climate action plan's contents and additional details on how reduction measures are developed and how they related to existing policy and programs. Following these presentations, participants were asked to informally discuss the opportunities for reduction measures that were provided to them in their meeting packets. Participants discussed a broad variety of topics related to land use and transportation. However, the following key issues were prominent features of the discussion:

- Balancing the roles of new and existing growth and development in the process to reduce GHG emissions.
- Location of new development areas
- How to balance regulations and incentives to encourage GHG emissions reductions
- Addressing transportation emission and jobs/housing balance
- New ideas and opportunities for transit
- Education and incentives to influence behavior change
- Funding challenges for transit

Participants provided a number of suggestions for enhancing alternative transportation systems in SLO County. For example, enhanced bus service and telecommuting centers in the more rural areas were popular suggestions for reducing vehicle miles traveled in the County. A more detailed record of the discussion is provided below. The Discussion Notes section provides the summary of the discussion as recorded from the facilitator's perspective. The section does not provide responses to or analysis of the stakeholders' comments. PMC's next step will be to use the stakeholder comments to inform the selection and refinement of draft GHG reduction measures.

Discussion Notes

Facilitator Question: What's missing? What needs to be taken a step further?

- Quantify target development area (refer to RTP-PSCS)
 - X% of new housing in target development areas by 2020
- Improve areas with residential – through increased services
 - Result: reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
- Break out transportation emissions
- Reduce rate of building permits in rural
- Growth is fast in unincorporated area (Staff noted 40% of all new housing in last 10 years was in the rural areas)
- Cities not here
 - Need to clarify for folks the role of each
- So much to impact and change
- Existing development – more to change
- VMT vs. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions?
- How to measure performance vs. refined baseline
- Set ratio for commercial/residential development in a community
- Balance burden on new and existing
- There's lots about smart growth – but, what about conservation of land, retiring land
 - Need policy for program – a framework to address rural development and the potential of rural areas to provide benefits – conservation and GHG reduction
- Potential for sequestration other programs
- Need for funds and human capacity
- Strongly agree in concept. But need to reduce as well and prevent
- True cost pricing of single occupant driving, no subsidies
- “Encourage”? What does this type of language mean for the Climate Action Plan (CAP)?
- Scarcity of development potential, based on GIS analysis
- Decide where density should go
- True cost? Sprawl?
 - Roads
 - Fire
 - Water/septic
- 2020 scenario shows gross reduction (minimal)
- Target development areas, focus on commercial & multifamily
- Focus of infrastructure improvements
- Surround development with deciduous trees for solar gain reduction
 - But – water use is more than xeriscape
- Encourage development on south facing slopes
 - Challenges from property rights with policies like this
 - Favor/disfavor, not mandate
- Regulate vs. incentivize
 - Combination? Balance?
 - Funds best incentive
 - County can actively cooperate with cities on this

- Parking downtown for customers
 - TDM for employees
- How much of county transportation tax is for GHG reduction projects?
- Parking
 - Transit Oriented Development (TOD)? How might this help?
 - What impact to parking?
- What does TOD look like for SLO County?
 - Limited opportunities
 - Tailored TOD here with bus or wheeled transit
 - Park & Ride
 - “Target Development Areas”
- Opportunities for property owners adjacent to TOD w/rail
- Funding – off from / time grant, other
- Operating funding for transit?
 - Other VAT to fund transportation?
 - Regular fees
- Transportation
 - Jobs/housing balance
 - Work location
 - Jobs where people are
 - Satellite work center
- From rider perspective, challenge in understanding transit
- How do we make transit better for commuters?
- Add faster routes
 - More service
 - Target new development
 - Schedules better for workers/customers
- Education!
 - Incentives for users for alternative transportation
- Jurisdictional issues
 - 8 transit operators
 - Hard to establish new routes
- Technology! Efficiencies!
 - Dynamic, hand held, online
- Work centers for telecommuting
- Alternative fuel vehicles
 - Safe?
 - Incentivize?
 - Make it easy, go further
- Low vehicle occupancy, so continued high energy profile of infrastructure
 - Bus more efficient
- “Need for speed”
 - Shuttles? Amenities?
 - Last mile issue
 - Market & brand the vehicles

- Allow coffee!
 - Social class
 - Don't abandon existing routes
- Fiscal constraints for transportation
 - Changing behavior performance measures
 - SR2S
- SLO car free program
 - Support local tourism
 - More support from jurisdiction
 - More linkage to funding
- Mitigating traffic impacts
 - Look at transit
 - Revise?
- Financing districts
 - Community facilities districts? – single purpose for opportunities for transit
- Personalized rapid transit
 - In India
 - Conference in San Jose in October
 - Last mile / link to other system
- Tourism
 - Service workers – maintain a span of service
 - Peak on weekend
- Free rides with transit tax
- Car sharing
 - Company “fun ride” (local)
- Transit is 80% subsidized
- Establish a carbon offset fee program
 - Spend it on
 - Conservation Easements
 - Buses
 - Bike share
- Transit fixed route fee recovery 30%
- Funding that rewards efficiency
- Commuter trip focus
 - Not all agree
- Market driven focus
 - E.g. Park & Ride center – meeting space, etc.
- Community driven programs
 - Technology dynamic
- Program and operator for land conservation
 - Build capacity
- Ratio of residential/commercial
- Balance of burden for new/existing
- De-couple parking
- Community technology centers

- Like library, more for tech.
 - Reduce trips
- Carpooling
 - Big reduction
 - Low cost
 - Good for rural area
- TMA – already have one
- Tax on 2nd or 3rd car

Attendees

Stakeholders

Mark Hutchinson, SLO County Public Works
Eric Greening
Aeron Arlin Genet, SLO APCD
Geoffrey Chiapella, SLOCOG
Ed King, SLORTA
Aimee Wyatt, SLORTA
Amanda Rice, North Advisory Council
Morgen Marshall, SLO Regional Rideshare
BK Richard
Bob Hill, SLO Land Conservancy,
Steve Devenceniz, SLOCOG

Long Range Planning Staff

Chuck Stevenson

PMC staff

Tammy Seale
Nora De Cuir