

**January SacMoves Call**  
Friday, January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2023

**Attendance:** Deb Banks, Sam Rice, Ralph Propper Dan Allison, Greg Thompson, Adrian Rehn, Carolyn Tran, Mia Machado, John Deeter, Susan Herre, Sue Teranishi, Barbara Stanton, Betsy Weiland, Dyane Osorio, Barbara Leary, Chris Flores, Anne Stausboll, Frank Aceves, Kathy Saechou, Jeffery Tardaguila, David Moore, Steve Cohn, Lynne Goldsmith, Angela E. Herring, Roger Dickinson, Emel Wadhwani

**Opening Welcome to 2023**

**Deb Banks:** Deb has stepped in as interim chair for the SacMoves Coalition. As Deb hopes that someone will eventually take over for this role, she emphasized that she is not the leadership of these meetings but helping with facilitation; “the leadership comes from all of us.”

Deb shared housekeeping updates around both a letter of support, and an upcoming event:

1. A letter of support was drafted on behalf of SacMoves for a SACOG grant. Those interested in signing onto the letter needed to let Deb know by 2pm on January 20<sup>th</sup>.
2. Brent Toderian will be the keynote speaker at the upcoming “State of Downtown” Breakfast in Sacramento on Tuesday, February 1<sup>st</sup>.
  - a. Brent Toderian is a nationally and internationally respected practitioner and thought-leader on cities and city-building, with over 30 years of experience in advanced urbanism, city planning, urban design, transportation and change management. Over the last 10 years since returning to consulting practice, he has advised and collaborated with cities, states, agencies and best-practice developers around the world.
  - b. Tickets for a cheap seat with coffee are \$35, and \$150 for a table for lunch. Deb encouraged folks to come listen if they have time.

<https://www.downtownsac.org/learn-about-downtown/events/state-of-downtown/>

**Three Revolving groups and meetings taking place since Measure A was defeated**

*\*Climate Plan was unable to attend the meeting—so they were unable to provide an update\**

**Steve Cohn:** There have been several different conversations going on around the failure of Measure A, and Steve has been involved in many of these. There is widespread agreement that the failure of Measure A provides the opportunity to develop a better measure-- or a series of measures—to promote transit, bike, and pedestrian needs. However, many have noted that funding for any new measure should also include components on other key issues such as housing; “Equity is a piece that permeates all discussions.”

Despite these various conversations, however, Steve expressed that it does not mean it will be easy to create a measure capable of gaining a majority support, or even 2/3s. There has also been discourse about the opportunity to focus on a city measure, where they are likely able to garner support for a measure focused primarily on transit.

Steve also touched on the mayor's ongoing Environmental Advocacy Roundtable meetings. There has been good energy at these meetings, and they may become a gathering spot for a lot of different conversations. However, if partners begin drafting a city measure, these conversations will likely need to leave City Hall and move to more private venues. Steve touched on the growing consensus around the need for more data—about what is needed or wanted from the public—so data gathering may be an important next step.

Steve elevated a point raised by the mayor that many agree with, that we should use SACOG's MTP/SCS Plan (Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy) as a foundation or starting point for our work. If it's a city measure, we will narrow in, but we could use this to focus on the data. SACOG's plan was developed around the goal of decreasing greenhouse gas emissions, but also issues related to housing and equity. Steve thinks this was the key issue in Measure A— that they ignored the data in the SCS, and tried to push issues that were not in the plan, such as the southeast connector, and include items that conflicted with SACOG's goals. Using this framework, we have the potential to come up with a measure—which may or may not be a sales tax measure-- with more momentum.

**Sam Rice:** Sam has looked over the map of who was and was not in support of Measure A, and noticed a clear delineation in support based on whether you're from the city itself and/or the areas of the county served by transit. Sam shared that he recently had a meeting with Kevin McCarty, who mentioned an interest in carving out a smaller district in the city and including a bit of the county, where there may be more potential for a measure to pass. However, the timeline for this plan is very tight, and an assembly member would need to request permission for this by today (Jan. 20<sup>th</sup>). They can put in a placeholder bill that states its intent but allows the legislative council to work with organizations on the language of the bill later.

Sam also asked if we could still use benefits of a citizen's measure, or if they would need to increase the threshold to 2/3s for passage once a special district was created. Sam explained that with any map we make, we would have to include other districts besides McCarty's – so there may be other representatives in the area that have competing interests. These representatives would also have a say in drafting this legislation.

**Roger Dickinson:** Roger wanted to augment the points made by Sam Rice. While it is “fundamentally all correct” that Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> is the last day to make a request for either a fully fleshed out bill or a spot bill, another option available is to take a bill that has already been introduced and alter it—to include more and revise it to include these components. Given this option, there may be less urgency than Sam suggests, as long as McCarty has another existing bill that he would be willing to allow us to build from. The bigger issue, Roger suggested, is

appeasing other members of the legislature that would have a piece in this district and subsequently a say in its framework.

**Chris Flores:** Chris discussed the plan to explore the idea of implementing a parcel tax into a new Measure A structure as a source of funding. Chris shared that a few people have suggested that as a good political strategy, we do not aim for full half cent tax. While this may not generate as much revenue as previous plans for Measure A, they would likely not need as much revenue without the need to assist funding for the Southeast Connector.

*\*Dan Allison and Barbara Stanton both expressed support for SacRT's exploration of a parcel tax\**

**Sue Teranishi:** Sue pointed out that there has been a lot of discussion around bus rapid transit becoming a lot cheaper. Sue heard of a district in Portland where the RT had developed a light rail project, and inquired into whether this may be part of SacRT's future plans, if enough ridership is predicted. – Chris affirmed the possibility of this and provided the Greenline ([link](#)) as an example.

**Dan Allison:** Dan directed discussion back to voting trends in Sacramento County for Measure A. He advised that if you are looking to examine who did or didn't vote for Measure A, that you don't use the maps created by the County, as they are misleading and unrepresentative. Dan volunteered to take on being the map person for these efforts, so that they can be more accurate.

Dan also noted that he appreciates the idea of a carve out measure, and would like to support SacRT with this effort. Thinking "outside the box," Dan proposed the idea of passing legislation to give SacRT more agency and control over transit measures.

**Roger Dickinson:** Roger cautioned that any extension of SacRT powers would need state legislation, and groups such as the League of Cities-- among others-- would heavily oppose any such effort.

**Barbara Leary:** On the topic of a new ballot measure, Barbara emphasized the need to sell public transit outside of the central city. She explained that it's difficult for people outside the city to visualize themselves getting anywhere without a car. Given this, it begs the question about whether we should pursue a transit measure intended for the whole county.

**Adrian Rehn:** Adrian shared that Valley Vision will be releasing its next scientific public opinion poll either in February or March. Some of this information will be around the built environment

and transportation in case this data may be helpful. However, he noted that it's not a political/campaign-style poll.

### **Next Steps for the Group**

*\*Deb prompted the group to discuss what they think SacMoves should do from here\**

**Sam Rice:** Since the group is not as up against the deadline as he originally thought, Sam suggested that if we make contact with McCarty today about other measures, that should work. After this, SacMoves should think about establishing principles about what a new measure would need. This way, we understand the parameters that we will not be able to go beyond for a measure. Sam suggested establishing a map or boundary of where we think we would be successful.

**Davis Moore:** There is a lot of momentum around Measure A, so SacMoves can still focus on this issue and serve as a meeting space, but maybe not as its sole purpose.

**Dan Allison:** Dan suggested using SacMoves as a meeting space to solidify a process committee.

**Next meeting:** We will be meeting next on **February 17<sup>th</sup> at 10am.**