

May 19th, 2023 SacMoves Meeting

Attendance: Dan Allison (facilitator), Kevin Bewsey, Chris Brown, John Deeter, Gregg Fishman, Lynne Goldsmith, Angela E Hearring, Susan Herre, Mia Machado, David Moore, Dyane Osorio, Ralph Propper, Adrian Rehn, Goli Sahba, Barbara Stanton, Jeffery Tardaguila, Sue Teranishi

Dan Allison: We had a successful hybrid meeting a few months ago. The consensus of the group was to move forward as a key player in developing a plan for transportation funding in our area – region not confirmed. We also agreed to set up three committees for this effort. At the next meeting, however, we had significantly less participation. Energy seems to have dropped off. I would like to take some accountability with the committees, I got busy. But that does not mean they can't be formed in the future.

The SacMoves Process Committee met and decided it would be good to revisit where we are and where we want to go around this original goal. There are other conversations happening right now; SACTA is looking to write a new measure, as is Steve Cohn with SMART. The floor is now open for anyone interested in speaking on behalf of the interests of their organizations in terms of moving along with our original plan.

David Moore: I also want to take responsibility for not taking initiative with my committee. As far as energy and emphasis around a new funding measure, our energy is elsewhere, and that's okay. There are other opportunities that SacMoves may want to pursue. For example, there are many planning documents coming out right now. We could divert energy from a funding initiative to having more collective and robust feedback on these documents.

Susan Herre: ECOS has not been a part of the process committee, but I would hate to see SacMoves pull away or withdraw from these efforts—I think it's a very good group. If there is momentum and interest for these three subcommittees to be initiated, I think it would be fine. My perception is that the Steve Cohn group is good, but it's not completely robust at this point. It's certainly subject to important input, maybe SacMoves could give that.

Ralph Propper: I just want to share some information on the origins of SacMoves. In the wake of 2016 when Measure A received 66% of the vote and failed, we heard from the Executive Officer of STA say that we just needed to be doing a better sales job. I said, "No, you need to involve the larger community in a measure like this if you want to be successful." This is a quality that this group has. We have the tools to reach out to the community and connect with their interests. SacMoves started out as the BREATHE building groups, and we've had measurable impact on how things go since then. There may be groups that are looking into funding measures, but I continue to believe that a larger involvement, such as what SacMoves has had, would still be important to continue.

Chris Brown: I agree with Ralph and Susan. I think SacMoves has an important role to play because it's an open table. I couldn't make the SMART strategy meeting, but I think it's a little early to conclude that things will not come to fruition. We had a meeting in March and now it's May. Just because other things haven't happened yet, doesn't mean we need to write it off. This table has been really critical. It's important for us as a grassroots group to be able to talk transparently about what's happening. I'm

concerned that if this table disappears, will we only have constrained tables that are invite only or government agencies. This is an open forum that I don't think should disappear.

Dan Allison: STAR has opposed all the transit measures. They did not do enough for transit and too much for expanding highways. STAR will likely continue to be opposed unless there are huge changes. We believe in active transportation. We do not support highway capacity expanding. We also support housing, though we don't know what capacity this is in yet, we think it's an important factor.

Barbara Stanton: Speaking on behalf of Ridership for the Masses, we agree with Dan and Chris. I don't think this group should go away, I think we should try to expand our subcommittees and go from there. Ridership opposed the last measure, and we will likely be opposed to future measures if they're the same.

David Moore: I think as part of the process committee, I don't think any of us were recommending that we want this to go away, but we've observed the drop in participation. This is more of a check in to gauge whether there was still energy—and it looks like there is. It looks like the energy might be around the subcommittees. If so, that warrants a discussion about what these committees look like. If we want these committees to be our vehicle of navigating, we might want someone to volunteer. I'll have to be on paternity leave in July. I think SacMoves should play a part in shaping, but probably not creating a measure.

Chris Brown: I'm confused why you don't think that SacMoves is the place to talk about funding. I don't know of any other open places to talk about this. The disaster of 2016 was that there wasn't a place for everyone to get involved. I was involved and supported it, but Valley Vision and Adrian didn't, and I think it's important to have a forum to discuss these differences.

David Moore: I don't think that this is *not* a place to discuss, but in terms of an avenue for high-level writing of language, SacMoves is meeting once a month—I don't think anyone is talking outside these meetings. If we want to take part in writing the measure and drafting the framework, I think we would need to pick up a lot.

Kevin Bewsey: From STA standpoint, I don't know if anyone is actually working on that or on such a high level. It's still big picture stuff.

Jeffery Tardaguila: My suggestion is to have a few individuals involved in STA and bring back what's going on to this group.

Dyane Osorio: I agree that we need to keep SacMoves – as we've seen it, if it's not STA or SacRT succumbing to pressure, it's always someone preventing our progress of getting our interest in there – we could have more agency to have our interest represented.

Dan Allison: Summary of thoughts: SacMoves will continue to meet monthly, keep a close eye on other things developing, and perhaps clarify our role as these go along – go back to the committees, start meeting more frequently and see who will be leading these.

(Everyone gave a general thumb up).

Next Facilitator

Dan Allison: As you all know, Deb Banks agreed to facilitate for 6 months because the process committee agreed that not having a permanent facilitator was a good idea while also providing some consistency. Deb's time is done, we'll need to revisit who will be the next facilitator — is 6 months a reasonable time, is anyone interested in this role, what are your thoughts?

Barbara Stanton: The process committee talked about a shortlist, thinking about presenting this.

David Moore: There are some people based on energy and desire to participate that indicated they might be good facilitators – not restricted to those people – again I can do till July but need people to step up.

Dan Allison: I don't think we're going to select anyone today.

Chris Brown: I think it's great if the group came to a consensus on the same facilitator for 6 months – on Sac Climate Coalition, we have a fixed agenda and we switch off, it provides more flexibility. I'm curious why we haven't heard names?

Dan Allison: We're in an in-between right now. We've reached out to some potential facilitators so far, but nothing's been confirmed, so we aren't sharing any names yet.

Jeffery Tardaguila: Six months seems like a good timeline, if we have a good procedure about what we're doing and maybe a standardized agenda, it could be a good system.

Dan Allison: The process committee stands ready to support the next facilitator – we always solicit input for the next meeting.

UPDATES

Kevin Bewsey: We created a subcommittee in February to look at failures of citizen initiatives in 2022. Our meeting in March had 5 elected officials, two organizational leaders, one in labor and one in the environment, and we determined who were advisory members. In April we reviewed lessons learned on all prior efforts, and a presentation. Now listening session begin on Monday, trying to get info from measure is not okay – Nailah from Climate Plan will be joining —hoping to see where we go from here, what are the recommendations? The tone here is to have these conversations, see what we need to consider. Next plan is to meet with folks who wanted the measure to pass, and see their interests – hoping to find some common ground here after these meetings – maybe optimistic – there's some polling info going on right now, going to get this information in July – emphasis is on common ground and what the middle ground is. That's the starting point, then we could start working into the details here.

Chris Brown: Having a background as a political consultant and campaign manager, I'm concerned that if you all put a ballot initiative from a government agency, need a 2/3s vote – you're finding the middle, but you need more than the middle—thoughts on what will bring in way more than the majority?

Kevin Bewsey: We really don't know where this is going to land yet, we want to put a good foot forward with everyone working together – we're going to develop as much as possible and then polling will determine where we go.

Jeffery Tardaguila: Years ago, I would participate in STA Board meetings, I hope you keep SacMoves informed on what's going on and happening, but also understand that with getting all entities involved, we need to make sure everyone understands their vested interests in these efforts, and why they need to get involved.

Ralph Propper: Polling is a lot more difficult these days, can you elaborate on the plan?

Kevin Bewsey: I'm not sure what's going on there, you can talk to SacRT about it.

Gregg Fishman: Been in discussions with a few orgs to collab on polling, I don't think we've gotten to the stage of formulating the questions then putting the questions out there.

David Moore: (Efforts of Steve Cohn and SMART) Essentially SMART had a meeting where they invited folks from different sectors to hear about the work that they've done so far. They created a one-pager on this and are going to put together measure C as a city-focused, stand-alone measure or as incorporated into a broader County measure if its compatible. Don't have details yet, do have working committees on the efforts, draft language beginning— happy to answer questions given the one meeting I've been to.

Dan Allison: Could see the possibility of inviting someone from that group to come speak here on where they are at a future meeting.

Kevin Bewsey: Is it clear to you who IS behind measure C?

David Moore: Envisioned as a citizens-proposed 2024 ballot measure – housing and transportation components suggested.

Susan Herre: Steve Cohn contacted me and asked if I could lead TOD housing committee – I said yes, have been working on mapping idea for open space, for all transport elements, and development and housing pieces.

Gregg Fishman: Efforts with Kevin McCarty to only work with the City of Sac, create own district Assembly Bill 1072—moving to senate now, moving relatively quickly without a lot of opposition, another tool we could use, we have it in our back pocket – also on ballot in November, measure that would require even citizen initiatives to pass with a 2/3's vote, so the expectation is that we will need to work under that new paradigm.

Chris Brown: Active campaign going on, some groups have supported – efforts for a public bank – the city is where a bank is needed to be located given legislation.

Ralph Propper: The Climate committee met last night with staff on the Climate Adaptations Plan, showed 57% of greenhouse gasses are from transportation – main ways to reduce is more funding for public transportation – says they will work with SacRT to make that happen – all the more reason we should move forward with SacMoves.

David Moore: Appropriate time to call back to see if SacMoves might want to commit to responding to these efforts – idea is to create a concerted spreadsheet, where everyone can provide feedback – maybe this is on behalf of SacMoves?

Chris Brown: I like your idea.

Next Meeting: June 16th at 10am.