

2012 RTP/SCS PUBLIC OUTREACH WORKSHOPS

Workshop Agenda

July 25, 2011, 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
City of Corona Multi-Purpose Room, Corona, CA

10:00 AM	**Welcome and Introductions** *Rick Bishop, Executive Director* *Western Riverside Council of Governments*
10:10 AM	**VIDEO: The 2012 Regional Transportation Plan**
10:20 AM	**Introduction to the Day's Agenda** *SCAG Staff*
10:30 AM	**DRAFT Scenarios for Southern California's Future** *SCAG Staff*
11:05 AM	**Small Group Breakout Discussion**
11:45 AM	**Keypad Polling of Scenario Strategies**
12:15 PM	**Next Steps** *SCAG Staff*

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS
818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017 | Tel: (213) 236-1800 | Fax: (213) 236-1961 | www.scag.ca.gov

printed on recycled paper 2347.07.2011

2012 RTP/SCS
PUBLIC OUTREACH WORKSHOP

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Timeline

2012 RTP Development Timeline
Develop Financial Plan
Perform Transportation Needs Assessment
Develop Transportation Alternatives
Evaluate Transportation Alternatives
Develop Draft RTP
Develop Draft SCS
Develop Draft PEIR
Prepare Final RTP/SCS/PEIR
OCT '10
NOV '10
DEC '10
JAN '11
FEB '11
MAR '11
APR '11
MAY '11
JUN '11
JUL '11
AUG '11
SEP '11
OCT '11
NOV '11
DEC '11
JAN '12
APR '12
Hold Data Gathering Planning Sessions
May '11-Jun '11
PEIR Scoping Process
Jul '11-Aug '11
Hold Transportation Strategy Workshops
Jul '11-Aug '11
Hold Public Outreach Workshops
Oct '11-Nov '11
Hold SCS Workshops with Elected Officials
Release Draft RTP/SCS/PEIR
Dec '11-Jan '12
Draft RTP/SCS/PEIR Comment Period
Hold Public Hearings
Adopt Final RTP/SCS/PEIR

Where we've been



RTP Objectives: what should the plan work to accomplish?

1. What **Mobility / Accessibility** objectives should we strive for?
2. **Environmental**, **Health** and **Community** objectives?
3. Which **Modes** of Travel?
4. **Fiscal and Economic** objectives?
5. **Safety** outcomes?
6. **Environmental Justice** outcomes?
7. Other objectives?

Group Discussion



Scenarios for Southern California

Scenarios explore transportation and land development questions…

1. Should we grow up or out?
2. What type of homes should we build?
3. Invest more in roads or public transportation?
4. Bedroom communities, job centers, a balance?



…to understand how different futures might shape our lives, economy, and environment



Today's Activities

1. Overview of the 2012 RTP Process
2. Discuss objectives that you feel the RTP should meet
3. Identify regional issues that matter most to you
4. Provide input on scenarios for addressing growth and transportation

Scenarios Snapshot



Greenfield vs. Infill / Reuse

New Development 2008-2035

Greenfield vs. Infill / Reuse

New Development 2008-2035

1 2 3 4

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Development Proportions

New Growth 2008-2035

Standard Suburban	Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban
Mixed-Use Walkable	Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented
Urban Infill	Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

Standard

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Source: www.skyscrapercity.com USA, Riverside County, CA.

Standard

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

San Bernardino

Irvine

Rialto

Ventura County

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Standard

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill



Mixed-Use Walkable

Standard	Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban
Mixed Use Walkable	Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented
Urban	Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVE

Mixed-Use Walkable

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

Msole- Downtown Riverside

Medical Center BRT Station – Moreno Valley

Jefferson Corridor- Temecula

Library Square- Downtown Corona

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Mixed-Use Walkable

Urban

Standard	Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban
Mixed Use Walkable	Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented
Urban	Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

Gateway District - Lake Elsinore

Anaheim

Fox Theater Plaza - Riverside

Urban

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Urban

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use Walkable

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Development Proportions

New Growth 2008-2035



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Housing Product Mix

New Housing Units 2008-2035

Where is the long-term housing market headed?

Housing Demand Projections for Southern California: 2010 - 2035

Our Aging Population

SCAG Region, 2010 to 2035



Seniors

Over ½ the demand for new homes

In 2040 73% of all households will be without children

Note: Percentages do not add to 100% due to rounding

Source: SCAG, Local Input/General Plan Growth Forecast, March 2010

SCAG Housing Demand 2035



Source: AC Nelson. The Shape of Metropolitan California in the 21st Century: Outlook to 2020 and 2035

SCAG Planning Bottom Line 2035



Source: AC Nelson. The Shape of Metropolitan California in the 21st Century: Outlook to 2020 and 2035

Housing Product Mix

New Housing Units 2008-2035



Anticipated Demand

1 | 2 | 3 | 4

Housing Product Mix

All Housing Units in 2035 (Existing + New)



Existing (2008)

1

2

3

4

Transportation Investments



Types of Transportation Investments

1. **Bus Rapid Transit**
2. **Light and Heavy Rail**
3. **High Speed Rail**
4. **<u>Highway Expansion:</u>**
   1. Lanes
   2. Carpool / Hot Lanes
   3. Interchange Improvements
5. **Local Arterial Improvements**
6. **Transportation System Preservation**
7. **Truck Ways**
8. **Freight Rail Improvements**
9. **<u>Operation and Maintenance:</u>**
   - Highway and Arterials
   - Transit
10. **Bike and Pedestrian Facilities**
11. **Transportation Demand Management Investments**
12. **Transportation System Management Investments**

Scenarios Snapshot



1

2

3

4

How The Scenarios Compare

Land Consumed

Square Miles

Land Consumed

Square Miles

Local Infrastructure Costs

Capital & Operations & Maintenance Costs for New Growth, 2008-2035

Includes capital costs and general fund O&M expenditures for local roads, wastewater and sanitary sewer, water supply, and parks & recreation

Local Infrastructure Costs

Capital & Operations & Maintenance Costs for New Growth, 2008-2035



Includes capital costs and general fund O&M expenditures for local roads, wastewater and sanitary sewer, water supply, and parks & recreation

Vehicle Miles Traveled

Annual per household, 2035

Vehicle Miles Traveled

Annual per household, 2035



Fuel Consumption

Billions of Gallons, 2035

Fuel Consumption

Billions of Gallons, Annual, 2035



Fuel and Auto Operating Costs

Per Household Auto-Related Costs, Annual, 2035 (2009 Dollars)

Fuel and Auto Operating Costs

Per Household Auto-Related Costs, Annual, 2035 (2009 Dollars)



Household Costs

Annual Costs for Transportation, Building Energy, and Water, 2035

Household Costs

Annual Costs for Transportation, Building Energy, and Water, 2035



Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Annual Emissions from Buildings and Auto Transportation, 2035

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Annual Emissions from Buildings and Auto Transportation, 2035



Building Energy Use

Trillion BTU, 2035

Building Energy Use

Trillion BTU, Annual, 2035



Building Energy Use

Trillion BTU, Annual, 2035

Equivalent to powering XX homes in Southern California for a year



Water Consumption

Acre Feet (Annual in 2035)

Water Consumption

Acre Feet (Annual in 2035)



Respiratory Health Impacts

Cost reduction from status quo due to health incidents, Annual in 2035

Respiratory Health Impacts

Cost reduction from status quo due to health incidents, Annual in 2035



Objectives for the Regional Transportation Plan

Group Discussion

RTP Objectives: what should the plan work to accomplish?

1. What **Mobility / Accessibility** objectives should we strive for?
2. **Environmental**, **Health** and **Community** objectives?
3. Which **Modes** of Travel?
4. **Fiscal and Economic** objectives?
5. **Safety** outcomes?
6. **Environmental Justice** outcomes?
7. Other objectives?

Group Discussion

Group Worksheet

2012 RTP Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP

Mobility

1. Reduce the need to travel long distances
2. Reduce commute times
3. Keep drivers at or near the posted speed limit, reduce congestion
4. Make commutes more predictable and reliable
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____

Environmental, Health and Community Impacts

8. Reduce demand for fossil-fuels
9. Reduce air pollutant emissions for better public health
10. Reduce demand for development at the edge of the region
11. Encourage revitalization of existing communities and infrastructure
12. _____
13. _____
14. _____
15. _____

Modes of Travel

16. Create more travel choices in more places: driving, riding, walking, biking
17. Enable more people to ride public transportation
18. Enable more people to walk and bike for daily needs
19. Serve more parts of the region with high capacity roadways
20. _____
21. _____
22. _____

Fiscal and Economic Considerations

23. Help our economy thrive and be resilient (e.g., despite energy price spikes)
24. Keep governmental transportation expenditures low
25. Minimize household transportation expenditures (how much it costs me to get around)
26. Prioritize the most cost effective transportation investments
27. Improve the movement of freight through the region
28. _____
29. _____
30. _____

Safety

31. Improve safety for people who walk, take transit, or bike
32. Improve safety for drivers
33. _____
34. _____

Environmental Justice

35. Help all residents, not only drivers, get around
36. Avoid disproportionate impacts on lower income communities
37. _____
38. _____

Other

39. _____
40. _____
41. _____
42. _____
43. _____

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Group Discussion Steps

1. Add to an initial list of objectives for the RTP
2. Individually, place an orange dot next to your top priority objective

3. Discuss as a group
4. Individually, place 6 small dots based on your priority objectives



5. Identify your group's overall priorities to be shared

Ground Rules

1. **Be respectful of each other**'s right to be heard
2. **Focus on related topics** to the regional transportation plan
3. Your **facilitator is neutral**
4. Feel free to also **record your personal ideas** on comment cards

Group Discussion Steps

1. Add to an initial list of objectives for the RTP
2. Individually, place an orange dot next to your top priority objective

3. Discuss as a group
4. Individually, place 6 small dots based on your priority objectives



5. Select a spokesperson to report your group's priorities to overall participants

Keypad Polling

Have you ever lied to your mother?

21%	1.	Never…Honest!
4%	2.	Only once and I paid for it dearly.
7%	3.	Only a couple of times.
4%	4.	Yes, but I was young and candy was involved.
29%	5.	I prefer to call it a “stretching of the truth”
18%	6.	Only when it was in her best interest.
0%	7.	Yes, but my brother/sister made me do it!
18%	8.	Too many times to count!

A few preliminary questions…

II. Which part of the region do you live in

0%	1.	Coachella Valley
4%	2.	Orange County
0%	3.	Ventura County
64%	4.	Western Riverside
0%	5.	High Desert (Victor Valley and Antelope Valley)
14%	6.	San Bernardino County (Other than Victor Valley)
4%	7.	San Gabriel Valley
4%	8.	Westside and South Bay Cities
0%	9.	Gateway Cities
11%	10.	Los Angeles City

III. Which part of the region do you work/go to school?

0%	1.	Coachella Valley
0%	2.	Orange County
0%	3.	Ventura County
69%	4.	Western Riverside
0%	5.	High Desert (Victor Valley and Antelope Valley)
8%	6.	San Bernardino County (Other than Victor Valley)
4%	7.	San Gabriel Valley
0%	8.	Westside and South Bay Cities
0%	9.	Gateway Cities
19%	10.	Los Angeles City

IV. What is the first most important priority in Southern California?

59%	1.	Economy
15%	2.	Environment
4%	3.	Housing
0%	4.	Infrastructure
11%	5.	Public Health
0%	6.	Social Equity
11%	7.	Transportation

V. What is the second most important priority in Southern California?



VI. Which statement best describes your daily commute?

74%	1.	I primarily drive alone.
0%	2.	I primarily walk or bike to common destinations.
4%	3.	I primarily carpool.
7%	4.	I primarily use public transportation.
15%	5.	I do not commute.

VII. Which statement describes your access to transportation options?

61% 1. I drive; little access to transit

32% 2. I have some access to transit but choose to drive

7% 3. I have adequate access to transit and do not drive

VIII. What is the biggest barrier to using public transportation?

25%	1.	Does not stop near my home.
43%	2.	Does not go where I need.
14%	3.	Does not come frequently enough or run late enough.
0%	4.	Too crowded, I do not enjoy riding.
0%	5.	Too expensive for my budget.
18%	6.	None of the above..

Transportation Investments

Investment in Roads and Transit

Projected Costs FY2007 to 2036



Source: 2008 RTP

IX. The RTP should invest most of its money into roads and highways.



X. The RTP should invest in a mix of transportation options, including road, highway, rail transit, express bus and bicycle/pedestrian.



XI. The RTP should invest most of its money into rail transit, express bus and bicycle/pedestrian.

7%	1.	Strongly Agree
22%	2.	Agree
30%	3.	Neither Agree nor Disagree
19%	4.	Disagree
22%	5.	Strongly Disagree

Driving Distances in Southern California



SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Traffic improvements can be difficult to sustain…



Two Approaches to Improve Mobility

(the time it takes to get from A to B)

- Create faster ways to get from A to B…



- Bring A closer to B…



Spectrum of Strategies for Mobility

Adding Supply

- New cross town routes
- New lanes
- Carpool lanes
- Telecommuting
- Development near transit
- Walkable communities
- New homes in job centers

Reducing Demand

XII. The RTP should focus relatively more on expanding ways to travel more quickly, or reduce distances traveled?

14%	1.	Expand Mobility (expand roads and transit)
64%	2.	Balance between 1 and 3
21%	3.	Focus most on reducing distances traveled

Bicycling in Southern California

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Source: Southern California Association of Governments, Year 2000 Post-Census Regional Travel Survey: Final Report of Survey Results, page 21. Published Fall 2003. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

Balancing Jobs With Housing?

Balancing Jobs and Housing?



Opportunities to Work Near Where We Live



Residents that work in home county

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Growth's Impacts Vary By Location



County by County Driving Distances

XIII. Encourage more employment growth in or near residential communities.

57%	1.	Strongly Agree
25%	2.	Agree
18%	3.	Neither Agree nor Disagree
0%	4.	Disagree
0%	5.	Strongly Disagree

XIV. Encourage more residential growth in or near employment centers.



Housing Choices?

The Impacts of New Housing

New Homes by Housing Type

2010 to 2035







XV. To accommodate the region's future population, new housing development and housing types in the coming decades should be primarily…

14%	1.	Large Lot Detached
21%	2.	Small Lot Detached
25%	3.	Townhouse
39%	4.	Multi-Family Development

Transit Oriented Development?

Today, 47% of households live where they can choose to bike to high capacity transit

About 8% live a short walk from transit

Coordinating Growth with Transit

- Following same household, after moving next to transit…
  - 10 fewer miles driven
  - 25% lower commute expenses



XVI. Future development of employment centers and commercial areas should mostly occur in:

4%	1.	Standard Suburban Areas
39%	2.	Part Standard, Part Mixed Use Walkable
11%	3.	Mixed Use Walkable
46%	4.	Part Mixed Use Walkable, Part Urban
0%	5.	Urban Areas

XVII. Future development of residential areas should mostly occur in:

4%	1.	Standard Suburban Areas
50%	2.	Part Standard, Part Mixed Use Walkable
18%	3.	Mixed Use Walkable
29%	4.	Part Mixed Use Walkable, Part Urban
0%	5.	Urban Areas

Scenario Next Steps

- Concepts will be refined and further tested
- The most effective and supported ideas will become a draft combined scenario
- A preferred scenario, or Sustainable Communities Strategy, will be integrated with the 2012RTP



Stay Involved in the 2012 Plan

Present: July - August 2011	Public Outreach Workshops
Fall 2011	Workshops with Local Elected Officials
December 2011	Release of Draft Plan
December 2011 - January 2012	Public Hearings
April 2012	Adoption

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

THANK YOU!

2012 RTP/SCS
PUBLIC OUTREACH WORKSHOP

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Riverside County

		Riverside County								
		Corona		*Riverside*		*Palm Desert*				
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
Mobility										
	Reduce the need to travel long distances	3	10	3	11		4	**31**	6	25
	Reduce commute times		9	2	4			**15**	2	13
	Keep drives at or near the posted speed limit, reduce congestion	1	1		1	1	5	9	2	7
	Make commutes more predictable and reliable	1	2		1			4	1	3
Additional Mobility Objectives	*Facilitate access to job centers*	1	2					3	1	2
	Local trip accessiblity		1					1	0	1
	Other trips besides the commute							0	0	0
	Facilitate freight movement							0	0	0
	Maximize people's movement, not just vehicles		2					2	0	2
	Reduce auto-dependency							0	0	0
	Evaluate mobility by mode							0	0	0
	Encourage employers to offer telecommute options							0	0	0
	Infrastructure investment to increase connectivity between destinations	1	2					3	1	2
	Build mixed-use sustainable housing/communities and jobs/housing balance			4	2			6	4	2
	Jobs near homes and homes near jobs				5			5	0	5
	Reduce number of vehicle trips							0	0	0
	Reduce overall VMT				1			1	0	1
	ITS utilization				1			1	0	1
	In car ITS technology linked to system							0	0	0
	Jobs-housing balance/ Greater access between houses and jobs (vice-versa)			1	1			2	1	1
	Coordinate uses and transportation							0	0	0
	TSM Improve existing infrastructure							0	0	0
	Encourage transportation hubs (transit) at major arterials			1				1	1	0
	Increase local accessibility and efficiency						3	3	0	3
	Jobs housing relationship						5	5	0	5
	Avoid long intraregional travel						1	1	0	1

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Riverside County

		Riverside County								
		Corona		*Riverside*		*Palm Desert*				
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
	Facilitate agricultural commuting						1	1	0	1
	Enhance mobility options for mobility impaired							0	0	0
	Reduce all travel						1	1	0	1
	Improve access and availability to public transit						4	4	0	4
	Make transit (not necessarily bus) more predictable, friendly and available						2	2	0	2
	Transit of demand/Dial-a-ride						2	2	0	2
	Better regional connectivity between I.E. cities						2	2	0	2
	Improve frequency of public transportation						3	3	0	3
	Increase coverage of bus line					2	9	**11**	2	9
								0	0	0
Environmental, Health and Community Impacts		2		1			1	4	3	1
	Reduce demand for fossil-fuels		8	2	8	3	5	**26**	5	21
	Reduce air pollutant emissions for better public health	1	11	2	5	1	3	**23**	4	19
	Reduce demand for development at the edge of the region		1		4		6	**11**	0	11
	Encourage revitalization of existing communities and infrastructure	1	10	1	7	4	4	**27**	6	21
Additional Environmental, Health and Community Impacts Objectives	*Jobs/Housing balance (including affordability)*	1	8					9	1	8
	Provide more opportunities for recreation/activity within neighborhoods/communities (access-wise)							0	0	0
	Develop barriers (walls and plants) to separate homes and schools and parks from major roadways/rail							0	0	0
	Encourage agriculture closer to consumers	2						2	2	0
	Better balance of jobs and housing, especially in suburban areas	2						2	2	0
	Encourage services closer to housing, especially in historic downtowns		3					3	0	3

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Riverside County

	Riverside County								
	Corona		*Riverside*		*Palm Desert*				
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP									
Mitigation of existing pollution sources							0	0	0
Encourage growth in existing areas		1					1	0	1
Focus on incentives and avoid disincentives		1					1	0	1
Respect local control	1	1					2	1	1
Work with funding partners to ensure funds for redevelopment/revitalization		1					1	0	1
Better utilize what we already have							0	0	0
Maximize open space				3			3	0	3
Reduce demand for water				4			4	0	4
Implement green building initiatives beyond 2011 code				2			2	0	2
Encourage BMPs to protect water quality				2			2	0	2
Provide infrastructure for alternative fuels				2			2	0	2
Cleaner air				1			1	0	1
Cleaner water							0	0	0
Reduce number of cold starts							0	0	0
Encourage alternative fuel infrastructure/electric/hydrogen etc.				1			1	0	1
Opportunities for active lifestyle- reduce obesity							0	0	0
Minimize freight pollution							0	0	0
Encourage higher design standards in manufactured homes							0	0	0
Complete communities better enable sense of community- safety, knowing neighbor, emergency response					3	1	4	3	1
Live, work, play neighborhoods						2	2	0	2
Encourage development near infrastructure							0	0	0
Advance non-motorized connectivity throughout Imperial E. Valley							0	0	0
Develop mitigation measures/policies to address urban-ag interface (edge of ag issues)						1	1	0	1
Incentivize mixed-use neighborhood commercial development						4	4	0	4
Encourage TDM							0	0	0

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Riverside County

		Riverside County									
		Corona		*Riverside*		*Palm Desert*					
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary		**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
									0	0	0
Modes of Travel									0	0	0
	Create more travel choices in more places: driving, riding, walking, biking	1	9	2	6	2	4		**24**	5	19
	Enable more people to ride public transportation		3		12	1	4		**20**	1	19
	Enable more people to walk and bike for daily needs		3	1	10		8		**22**	1	21
	Serve more parts of the region with high capacity roadways		2	1	2		3	*Note from 2 participants: Remove this; Subject of disagreement for East CVAG*	8	1	7
Additional Modes of Travel Objectives	*Additional pilot projects- bike and pedestrian*								0	0	0
	More frequent/available local transit and marketing								0	0	0
	Encourage development of PEV and battery electric vehicles				3				3	0	3
	Proper placement of Metrolink stations			1	5				6	1	5
	We should not endorse serving more parts of the region with high capacity roadways, we need to serve existing development								0	0	0
	Regionalize air service			1	2				3	1	2
	Prioritize non-polluting modes			1	1				2	1	1
	High quality bike facilities (Class A bike facilities)			1	1				2	1	1
	Incentivize transit				2				2	0	2
	Off-road connections- golf carts, bikes, and scooters				1				1	0	1
	Increase rural transit						1		1	0	1
	More bike routes/facilities & off-road trails/paths						3		3	0	3
	Airport and express shuttle or buses- variety of size and bike space								0	0	0
	Car-share program						2		2	0	2
	Provide more public transportation						1		1	0	1
	Farmworker vanpools								0	0	0
	Evaluate expansion of passenger rail/metro						1		1	0	1

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Riverside County

		Riverside County								
		Corona		*Riverside*		*Palm Desert*				
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
	Create infrastructure for bike trails and sidewalks for NEVs						4	4	0	4
	Consider expanding light rail to I.E.						1	1	0	1
								0	0	0
								0	0	0
Fiscal and Economic Considerations								0	0	0
	Help our economy thrive and be resilient (e.g., despite enery price spikes)	2	9	3	8	1	9	**32**	6	26
	Keep governmental transportation expenditures low		1		1			2	0	2
	Minimize household transportation expenditures (how much it costs me to get around		3		2		5	**10**	0	10
	Prioritize the most cost effective transportation investments		2		4	1	4	**11**	1	10
	Improve the movement of freight through the region	1	2		4		3	**10**	1	9
Additional Fiscal and Economic Considerations Objectives	*Create jobs building transit, etc.*							0	0	0
	Public/Private partnerships		2					2	0	2
	RDA/Infrastructure financing							0	0	0
	Create a more diverse job base		4					4	0	4
	Equitable geographic distribution of funding		4					4	0	4
	Funding opportunities for large and small cities		1					1	0	1
	Respect economic impacts and market preferences							0	0	0
	Encourage product mix diversity							0	0	0
	Job development- 4 colleges RCCD	2	7					9	2	7
	RTP needs to reinforce/support employment centers			1	1			2	1	1
	Encourage manufacturing growth				3			3	0	3
	Prioritize operation and maintenance of system preservation							0	0	0
	Jobs-housing balance				5			5	0	5
	Job creation- broad base, white/green/blue							0	0	0

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Riverside County

		Riverside County								
		Corona		*Riverside*		*Palm Desert*				
	Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
	Container charge- get local benefits from freight							0	0	0
	Local toll charges from freight				2			2	0	2
	Improve jobs/housing balance, where economically feasible					1	7	8	1	7
	Improve air cargo capabilities							0	0	0
								0	0	0
Safety								0	0	0
	Improve safety for people who walk, take transit, or bike		2		6		8	**16**	0	16
	Improve safety for drivers							0	0	0
Additional Safety Objectives	*Horse trails near Cajalco Road/Parkway*							0	0	0
	Reduce rail conflicts							0	0	0
	Improve access to government functions via transit/especially in rural areas					1		1	1	0
	Bike safety						1	1	0	1
	Improve lighting and safety on streets and sidewalks						3	3	0	3
								0	0	0
Environmental Justice								0	0	0
	Help all residents, not only drivers, get around	1	1	1	3		1	7	2	5
	Avoid disproportionate impacts on lower income communities		4		2	1	2	9	1	8
Additional Environmental Justice Objectives	*CEQA/Streamline development*	1	1					2	1	1
	Encourage development of green spaces/recreation opportunities in low-income areas							0	0	0
	Explicit calculations of subsidizing driving				3			3	0	3
	Development considerations and water usage						2	2	0	2
	Maintain housing affordability near transit						1	1	0	1
	Balance the quality of infrastructure in all communities					2	2	4	2	2
								0	0	0
								0	0	0
Other	*Land Use Objectives*							0	0	0

PRIORITIES FOR THE 2012 RTP/SCS

Group discussion results within Riverside County

	Riverside County								
	Corona		*Riverside*		*Palm Desert*				
	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Secondary	**Total All Votes**	Primary	Secondary
Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP									
Balance jobs and housing							0	0	0
Eminent domain							0	0	0
Reduce freeway congestion							0	0	0
Education, public participation, outreach and inform the public				5			5	0	5
Address interrelationship between cities				3			3	0	3
Political will							0	0	0
Greater integration of planning for different modes - freight/commuter							0	0	0
Preserve, enhance natural beauty and habitat conservation							0	0	0
Improve aesthetics of cities as population attractor							0	0	0
Coordination with SANDAG- Regional travel and air space					1	1	2	1	1
Complete communities- Minimize need for travel							0	0	0
Better county to county connections- Transit- DMV or commuter rail					1	1	2	1	1
Minimize light pollution impacts							0	0	0
Integrate land use planning for sub-region and region-wide basis to emphasize TOD					2	6	8	2	6
No 'one size fits all' planning					3	5	8	3	5
Improve parks at community level						3	3	0	3
Improve food access in all communities						4	4	0	4

Public Comments Received

Corona Workshop

Monday, July 25, 2011

Comment
It is important to take into consideration the difference between agricultural lands of high quality versus open space lands that have little or no agricultural potential.
Growth should balance jobs and housing. More housing and transit choices, closer to shops and schools, more energy independent options, help protect clean air and water. Growth should happen in existing cities and towns and near transit options.
Ensure a good discussion in your RTP update process concerning water (specifically water resources: local/import supplies, reuse/recycling water, and desalinization to match your quantified number in millions of acre feet.) Take a unitized approach to explain it to your audiences and readers. Synchronize with all water/waste water agencies in your service area. Note: all construction starts with a survey and water.
The amount of excess mortality due to particulate air pollution is an important metric/to measure. Increasing density of development is excellent to reduce VMT, however it must be done wisely. Housing should not be built next to major roadways or rail yards, or public health will be adversely impacted by increased rates of asthma/cardiovascular disease due to PM 2.5, and cancer due to diesel particulate matter. Unfortunately, there were few people present who were not City Planners. This is not an adequate representation of the public interest. Metrolink Riverside line needs to run throughout the day - not just needed by people at 8am and 5pm (4-hour gap is too long).
Great presentation on scenarios! Loved the photo simulations with moving cars. Add jobs/housing balance to objectives or some other housing affordability (integrate housing element goals?). Housing affordability as distinct from form (lot size).
Fantastic opportunity to learn about RTP and have a voice in the planning! Thank you!
Although many here voted more for business development in suburban areas more than urban areas - homeowners will not want industry in their neighborhoods due to environmental issues. The mix between suburban and urban will be important.
After the recession many businesses have vacated buildings. These areas that have already cut trees and been developed should be reused or returned to natural state.
I disagree with many instances of eminent domain. More should be done to accommodate residents in paths of roads and transit development.
Some points I did not get to emphasize: need for affordable housing, safety assessment when considering mode share - safety of bicycle/pedestrian.
Did not include options about: "transit does not save time" and "transit is too complicated/don’t know how to use transit".