

South Bay Cities Council of Governments

Livable Communities Working Group

Wednesday, July 18, 2012

2:30 to 4:30 p.m.

**South Bay Environmental Services Center
20285 Western Ave., Suite 100**

Agenda

I. Welcome & Introductions

Attendees: Yvonne Mallory (Gardena), Otis Ginoza (Lawndale), Liz Sinclair (LACO), Eric Haaland (MB), Alicia Velasco and Charles Felix (Lomita), Leza Mikhail (RPV), Rebecca Cutting (Torrance), Grieg Asher (SCAG), Lance Harris and Austin Anderson (Pro-Forma), Sarah Jepson and Alex Oster (Metro), Wally Siembab, Rosemary Lackow, David Magarian (SBCCOG).

II. Minutes for June 20, 2012 – Receive and File

III. Car-sharing: Car2Go input request

A number of emails were received from the cities in response to Jacki's email (to which was attached a sample permit for a car-sharing). The email responses were pasted onto a word document and given to Wally and there was a brief discussion. Wally explained the background to the car sharing project – around March and April, Daimler approached the COG, attracted to the makeup of the SB, wanting to create a car-sharing program. This would be a departure for their company, as their existing programs are being operated in a single city (e.g. San Diego, Austin, Texas). Anticipating that they would be working with several cities in a single program as in our sub-region, they are seeking information to assist them in the permit process, as they would be required to seek permits from each city individually.

Wally also noted that recently the COG received word from Enterprise Rent a Car (ERAC) and Edison International – they are also interested in investing in a car sharing program with South Bay, but in their (ERAC-Edison) case, the cars would all be electric. So in our region we have 2 companies vying for market share.

The two programs are pretty different: Car2Go: gas powered only and you would leave the cars when done, anywhere you want. You get in and drive wherever you want to go and users pay by the minute, and there would be an extensive range of area where cars can be dropped off. Wally suggested that there is a lot more to the program, however and perhaps their representative could address the group and describe in more detail.

The ERAC- Edison "We-Car" service: The cars would be electric and would be returned to a point of origin where there would be a charging station. You would rent the car for a longer period of time frame, and you can't just walk away from it -

you pay until you return it. The charging station also stays vacant while you are gone. (Question: what happens to it while vacant?) As Wally as noted before, 2-headed charging stations are available for close to the same price as a single-head station, so perhaps this would offer an opportunity for our cities to add charge ports.

Wally closed the topic by summarizing that the COG is now collecting city info on the Car2Go program and we'll see what ERAC- Edison comes up with. They both want to move quickly. The COG is looking forward to the dialogue on this.

Otis made the point that Car2Go must have a lot of cars – as this is a much more broad program than one operated in a single city, it seems they would have to bring in commensurately more cars.

IV. Compass Project: NOD Feasibility – Base Conditions Analysis

Pro Forma Advisors

Lance Harris, Austin Anderson

Contact info: email: lance.harris@proformaadvisors.com (619) 779-9045

Wally introduced the speakers, first reminding everyone of the COG land use strategy. He posed the question: What can you do from the land use side if you don't have a lot of transit infrastructure to build on, and beyond that - in an already built out environment without the political will to add transit oriented (high) density development? Subsidies are needed to make public transit work, and as we know, transit agencies don't have guaranteed funding. So what can cities do? Our sub-region's answer: Neighborhood Oriented Development (NOD), but the question is, is this model economically feasible for our area?

Wally recalled the COG's corridor study in Lawndale/Hawthorne and how an economic analysis was done. Questions asked: will people make money? Will the city get tax revenue? So we reversed the traditional land use orientation, by putting commercial at block ends and residential in the middle. We found this development model would break even economically. So the thought was to analyze three more study areas. Now we have those 3 study areas. A group consisting of Lance Harris, Austin Anderson, with Judy Taylor and RBF Consulting won the bid from SCAG. The project came together and now we will hear their first report, regarding establishing a baseline.

Lance proceeded with a powerpoint, focusing on the initial "base line conditions" work product. Lance explained the team includes not only him and Austin, but also Paul Martin from RBF. The following are major points:

- Work Products: Base Conditions Analysis; NOD Economic Analysis (develop prototypes); Market & Financial Analysis (to see if prototypes will work) and Final Report.
- Timeline: September: have the Base and Economic Analyses, December: the market and financial Analyses, and January: Final Report
- Study areas: Primary: Rosecrans/Normandie intersection in Gardena; Secondary: PCH corridor in Hermosa Beach, and Inglewood Avenue in Lennox

- Brief Overview: Showing maps of the study areas, at the Rosecrans intersection – went out a half mile radius, studied land uses, then zeroed in on any parcels that touched the major arterials or connected to corridor.
- Difference between areas out from corridor and corridor itself: off the corridor there is markedly more industrial use. It was noted by Yvonne Mallory, from Gardena, that the land uses and zoning shown, based on Assessor data, should be double checked for accuracy; Lance responded that he would follow-up with the City of Gardena.
- Other areas: PCH corridor in Hermosa Beach: also did a half mile radius investigation of land uses, including average daily traffic, and categories of land uses (general commercial being the most prevalent). Along the Inglewood Avenue in Lennox, a similar radius was taken – this is a minor arterial, not as wide or capable of carrying as many cars as PCH, land use pattern shows residential is common along this corridor – there’s a different dynamic here.
- Preliminary Findings: summary tables indicate percentages of commercial, residential, etc. the total land area, average parcel size, assessed values total and by square foot. While Inglewood has different land use pattern, it is more close than PCH to our NOD model (has the residential already – just needs the commercial nodes). Also, parcel sizes smaller than the Normandie study area.
- Under-utilized parcels also studied. Looking at FAR (floor area to land area ratio), good opportunity is when the improvement to land value relationship is less than .4. One issue in the PCH area: there is a large amount of city owned parcels – these show as underutilized, but don’t fit this category. In the Inglewood Avenue area, there’s a mid-block area (between 104th and Lennox Boulevard) that is underutilized, it was noted that with so much residential, this appears to be a good candidate for applying our model.

In summary, Lance noted that the next step will be more interesting – they will be trying to describe the spatial economic relationships implicit to the NOD model – and ultimately testing its premise.

Yvonne (Gardena) stated she is very much interested in the financial aspect of the study especially and wants to see this as it moves along. Wally emphasized that this study goes beyond design and that the economics really are critical for making this work. We need to test the broad concepts – it may not really work economically.

IV. Metro Countywide Sustainability Planning Policy

Sarah Jepson and Alexandra Oster, Metro

To view and download the Draft Countywide Sustainability Planning Policy go to:
http://www.metro.net/projects_studies/sustainability/images/20120418AAHS.pdf

Wally recalled the April meeting at which Alex made the first presentation on the draft policy. This is the completed version of that document.

Sarah introduced Alex's power-point presentation, explaining this is about the draft Countywide Sustainability Planning Policy, that sustainability is a broad subject vaguely understood. This is a way to integrate sustainability in what they are doing at Metro. Alex noted she made changes to the draft document based on our input last April.

Main points:

- What does it mean to be sustainable? Meet present needs without compromising ability to satisfy future needs.
- Connecting sustainability and transportation = connect peoples and places, create and conserve. Provide opportunities for more people to drive less, and more efficient vehicles, while reaching the places need to go – AND lowering VMT.
- Key Concepts: Essential to success: transportation and Land Use integration, bundling different types of strategies, (pricing and parking) network optimization to maximize system efficiency, and inclusion of both regional and local strategies.
- Planning strategies: 1) actions advancing sustainability planning principles and priorities in the Policy 2) those already in place or being constructed 3) overlap with SCS and other efforts 4) concept one size does not fit all 5) more focus on integrating land-use and transportation. (SB 375)
- Two components: Universal Policies, and Place Based Policies (4 “clusters” based on accessibility characteristics of job centrality and household density)
- Implementation activities: Performance metrics established with measurement time frames
- Strategy Guide: being developed, will be included in the final document; will include comprehensive initiatives, a funding guide, individual strategies, benchmarking tools. Question: will this include case studies? Response: will be a list of types of strategies with related funding sources.
- Next steps: Comment period ends mid August, Board Adoption in September.
- Contact Info: sustainableplanning@metro.net phone: (213) 922-4833

Please send comments by August 15 to sustainableplanning@metro.net.

Q and A and input:

Group comment: the plan seems well organized and impressed how quickly Metro got to this point.

Q. Are these divisions within Metro?

A. Yes.

Q. Re: the cluster categories – will there be a map?
A. Yes, in the technical appendix, part of the actual policy

Q. Observation noted: all sub-regions have all four cluster categories. How do you use this if you are a city?
A. Will find a lot of this is not really cut and dried – strategies overlap. The strategies can support NOD. It was suggested that this is not really clear – perhaps language can be added to strengthen this. This is an opportunity to be innovative and creative.

V. Review major projects about to begin:

Wally Siembab
SBCCOG

- Regional and Sub-Regional PEV Readiness Planning – SCAG already doing the regional plan with Luskin, we are about to get some funds for sub-regional case studies. Wally will go through this scope of study at a later meeting. Also will be looking at the charging characteristics of households in South Bay. Will also be getting a regional market analysis. Separately, Wally is meeting with Art Center – they are showing products that are going to come on the market. (e.g. dual mobility -- a car trunk that accommodates a Segway). We are not necessarily promoting any specific electric vehicle, but saying we have established there is a market for local use vehicles.
- BEV Demonstration Project (approval expected 7/13/12) just heard funded by AQMD will take a while to get contract out. Budget cut, 45 households participating – will talk more about this next mtg. one of our holes in overall strategy is the kind of mobility transit provides (i.e. low cost) the long range issue is: what do you do when people can no longer afford cars? Wealthy people are the ones buying. Having a vehicle is critical to employment. Can we extend our study by providing lower cost e-vehicles? If we can tie the EV movement into the regional economy we can stimulate the local market – Wally wants any advice on that.
- Car sharing – we are working on the Car2Go data needs

VI. Updates

Wally Siembab

- UC Davis EV Project – CEC funded. No new information.

VII. Other Business - None

VIII. Adjourned: 4:30