



JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of January 15th, 2010 Held at 10:00 AM at the MetroCenter Auditorium, Oakland

Attendance:

<u>ABAG</u>	<u>BAAQMD</u>	<u>BCDC</u>	<u>MTC</u>
Jane Brunner	Chris Daly	Richard Gordon	Tom Bates
Dave Cortese	Ash Kalra	Anne Halsted	Bill Dodd
Mark Green	Mark Ross	Charles McGlashan	Steve Kinsey
Scott Haggerty	Pamela Torliatt (chair)		Jim Sperring
Rose Jacobs Gibson	Gayle B. Uilkema		Ken Yeager

1. Call to Order

Chair Torliatt called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of the Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of November 6th, 2009

The minutes of the previous JPC meeting were approved.

3. Climate Progress Report and 2010 Strategy Discussion

Bruce Riordan, JPC Climate Consultant, presented the staff memo with a PowerPoint presentation.

The first section of the presentation summarized activities undertaken in 2009 by the four agencies for the six Joint Climate Actions. These include:

1. Begin developing the Sustainable Community Strategy (SB 375). (ABAG/MTC)
2. Design and adopt an Indirect Source Rule. (BAAQMD)
3. Develop and advance climate-friendly regional parking policies. (MTC)
4. Provide support for a coordinated public/private regional plan for electric vehicles. (BAAQMD/MTC)
5. Design and implement a regional solar installation/energy efficiency financing program for existing residential/commercial buildings. (ABAG)
6. Coordinate a regional/local approach to climate adaptation. (BCDC/ABAG)

Committee members were asked to respond to two questions:

1. How satisfied are you with the progress being made on these six joint actions and progress generally on climate change in the Bay Area? Please explain.
2. What issues should staff consider as they develop proposals (to bring back to JPC) for a re-focused set of joint actions and guidelines for how we work together?

Committee members made a number of suggestions for further consideration and future discussion, including:

- Staff should prepare a flow chart for how the regional agencies are going to work with local jurisdictions.
- Staff should prepare a white paper on each of the 6 Joint Actions, not just on the EV topic. This will make it easier to communicate with colleagues in cities and counties.
- We need better communication among the regional agencies. We should coordinate discussion so concerns from one agency are clearly heard by the others.
- There is a lot of good work being done by the regional agencies. If we structure the process correctly, we will keep much of the resistance and friction from developing at the local level.
- We are not making enough progress on good communication with local governments. We are working on climate change policies but most of the local governments do not know about these policies. It would be a good exercise to check with 10 cities to see who is following these regional developments.
- The Air District held special meetings about the CEQA guidelines, sent letters, discussed issues at board committees, etc. but still not everyone got the message.
- These actions on climate change are running up against the realities of the economy when they get to the local level.
- We need to build more public support, help the public understand AB32 and SB375, so they understand why their local elected officials are implementing these laws. Need more public awareness if we are to sustain our commitment to climate change.
- We are on the right track but need more local conversations on these issues. CARB report shows very high costs for local implementation of AB32. This will be hard for local governments. So, don't just reach out to elected officials, build public support for the SCS and other policies.
- While we are debating the difficult policy decisions, we need to keep moving forward on tangible efforts like the work on electric vehicles. Show those gains to the public. This should make it easier to work together on the tougher issues like smart growth.
- Need to focus on getting resources to implement these various policies at the local level. Without additional resources, very little will be accomplished.
- We need more information on the strategies—what funding will it take to produce a certain amount of GHG reduction. Same with adaptation. What adaptation strategies will give us the best result for a given investment?

- For EVs, we need a regional infrastructure, not a city-by-city approach with lots of holes. The consumer needs a comprehensive, regional network.
- We should be more aggressive in how we take our messages out to local elected officials.
- It sounds like we have different agencies going out on “roadshows” on various related issues. We should look for opportunities to streamline and consolidate these activities.
- We need a dedicated staff person at each regional agency to be a resource for local staff and elected officials. Local staff do not have the time to keep up with the growing number of issues. We are reducing staff while there are an increasing number of requirements. Regional agency staff could be very helpful as designated “ombudsman” for local questions and concerns.
- We have made substantial progress. Let’s not lose sight of that. We still need to do a better job of framing policies and informing local stakeholders.
- There is a distinct difference between outreach to the public and outreach to elected officials. The public needs “show me stuff.” They need to touch and feel something. Most of the public will not get engaged on policy. Make it real. Show how it will provide tangible benefits.
- Outreach to elected officials can happen best through the mayors and councilmember groups in each county and at each board of supervisors.
- We need to consider JPC members more as partners. For example, after all the good feedback at the last JPC meeting, it would have been good to show the resulting matrix today.

Members of the public made the following comments:

- We need to fully support the development of electric vehicles, plug-ins and full battery electric vehicles, in the region. While the long-term issues of transportation and land use are being discussed, we can have an immediate impact on greenhouse gas emissions with a strong EV program.
- There are significant concerns about the impacts of the climate change planning process on racial and economic segregation. There is a danger of forcing poorer residents to move to the urban fringe while higher income individuals move to urban cores where there are more amenities. We can move aggressively on climate change and address social equity issues. Communities of color must be included in the climate change planning process. Right now they are under-represented.
- We need to look more at regional job creation, not just where we are developing housing. This should be a major initiative that will support climate and energy policies.

The second half of the presentation focused on Climate Bay Area, the new regional climate coordinating body formed in 2009. Committee members were asked to respond to two questions:

1. What do you think is the greatest contribution the Bay Area can make to the global climate effort?

2. What issues should we consider as CBA develops the strategic options (to bring back to JPC)?

Committee members made a number of suggestions for further consideration and future discussion, including:

- We need clarification on the requirements that CARB is placing on local governments. What exactly does the state require? What are they encouraging cities to do?
- We must have resources at the local level to implement climate change strategies. What is our plan to secure the needed resources?
- We need a 3 E's strategy that combines economy, equity and environment. The economy will drive the climate change agenda. Companies will take green actions and develop green products because they will make money.
- This has to be fun. No one will sit through a meeting like this. We must engage people by speaking to their pocketbooks. We must go meet them where on their turf.
- We need to create an institutional framework with dedicated funding. We must do more than just have a few "star" cities. We must help all cities get going.

4. Progress on Items of Interest to the Joint Policy Committee

The staff memo was received for information.

5. Public Comment

All public comment was received in response to particular agenda items and is included in the summary of those items.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:50 AM.