



JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of January 16, 2009 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	Jim Bourgart	Bill Dodd, Chair
Mark Green	Yoriko Kishimoto	Richard Gordon	Sue Lempert
Rose Jacobs Gibson	Mark Ross	Anne Halstead	Jon Rubin
	Pamela Torliatt	Sean Randolph	Jim Spering
	Gayle B. Uilkema		Ken Yeager

1. Call to Order

Chair Dodd called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of the Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of November 7, 2008

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3. Climate-Protection Program

Bruce Riordan spoke to the staff memo on potential joint climate priorities for the regional agencies in 2009. The JPC members were asked for their input on three possible priorities. “A” would focus on specific major strategies that can generate direct emissions reduction. “B” would “shake up the climate discussion” in the region to build support for “big ticket” climate strategies. “C” would provide a regional climate structure or framework—goals, funding, etc.

In discussion, committee members and public commentators made a number of suggestions.

- The JPC should focus more on taking action (Option A). We have had enough talk, and time is of the essence. Let’s do something positive and showcase it. One priority should be parking pricing and management. JPC should help cities to take strong parking measures by giving credibility to new parking approaches.
- We need both action and structure (A and C). Our priorities should be a formal climate plan and goals, carbon tax and financing mechanisms, CEQA reform, performance-based model projects and a green jobs/retrofit program.

- Before we pick specific strategies, we need to see how much financing would be required for each one.
- Broad consensus has already been created. We don't need "B." We need to focus on specific strategies that can produce direct results (A).
- Agencies are already proceeding with key strategies this year. JPC's role should be to inform this work and to coordinate what the agencies are doing. For example, the Air District is updating its CEQA guidelines. That should be brought to the JPC so agencies can build a uniform approach.
- An Indirect Source Rule is a strategy that the Air District is pursuing that can produce significant impact.
- Each agency has core competencies. We should take action (A). We can be a model for other regions by showing what works, better than by creating a plan. Each agency should pick a core competency (at least one) and show what we can do in six months.
- The structure (C) should fit with the Climate Compact being put together for San Jose, San Francisco and Oakland. We should discuss how the Compact can eventually become the structure for the region. We should not create a new structure.
- We need a political advocacy strategy. The real change for climate protection must come from Sacramento. Sacramento can give local officials the cover they need. We cannot just do this locally.
- The regional agencies should provide guidance and structure to help local officials move forward (C); not to tell them what to do, but to support—resources, funding, best practices, etc. For example, provide goals and a scorecard. Then, communities can choose how to implement.
- Focus for near-term on structure (C), not on picking specific major strategies (A).
- The voters have spoken, and they want change. We need bold action. This should be our approach for 2009. Government exists so we can take collective action at the highest level. The difficulty and complexity of climate action is why JPC exists.
- The four agencies need to work together and make a strong statement together to the taxpayers. For example, the Air District is going to pursue an Indirect Source Rule (ISR), but cannot do it alone. The Air District cannot get popular support for an ISR without the other agencies. We also need to work together to make the

most of these opportunities. Not just through JPC staff, but by the agencies working together.

- We need a broad and bold vision — a call to action— for a zero emission Bay Area (B).
- One of our goals should be unleashing innovation.
- The regional agencies should do a “state of the Bay Area” to show where we are and what we need to do (C).
- The specific major strategies may be best suited for large cities that are more advanced in their climate work (A).
- Partnerships with PG&E should be entered into carefully and with everything on the table. PG&E has spent millions working against San Francisco and Marin efforts to increase renewables, while PG&E’s renewable portfolio has actually declined from 2005-2008.
- Transportation emissions should be a main focus—parking pricing, congestion management, etc.
- We should be very aggressive with building an electric vehicle system. Plug in hybrids are our best bet to move forward.
- There is tremendous opportunity to provide the structure that local governments are looking for. The urgency of the climate crisis demands our regional leadership.
- Merit in all 3 strategies. We should provide leadership by providing a combination of structure (C), vision (B) and specific four to six impact strategies (A).
- We must do specific strategies but we need structure. We also need to renew our vision. Let’s do all three but narrow them.
- 2/3 on A and then 1/3 on C. Bay Area cities and businesses have already developed some great best practices. Disseminate those first. That is relatively easy to do. At the same time, time is of the essence so we should get something going (A) rather than talk about a framework indefinitely. For example, green building ordinances, Berkeley First-type program (or SF mode), CEQA reform, etc. We need some emphasis on structure (C), including funding, adaptation coordination, peer-to-peer networks, supporting model projects, etc.
- “B” can be an umbrella for the action items.

- Leading business groups are working to align their programs to bring them together in one voice. We should be in basically the same ship, heading the same way. Bay Area Economic Institute has offered its offices as a possible public/private platform to bring together government, business, labor, academia and others. There will be a more unified response from business by the March meeting. They are very engaged and progressive and we can go forward with them.
- Make sure that we coordinate Berkeley First with counties work on AB 811.
- This discussion gets to the purpose of the JPC. We should come up with a manifesto around climate change that will dovetail with great interest now in climate action in D.C. JPC has the credibility to come out with a regional set of unified goals and a scorecard, and then we are the organization that comments on (and legitimizes) best practices that are making the most headway. We can establish ourselves as the place to go on the best climate strategies. Opportunity to reposition ourselves in a more efficient and worthwhile manner: broadcasting P.R. role.
- This group should pick some priorities, either specific actions (A), or priorities to use as templates for regional action.
- The Regional Transportation Plan is the vehicle for addressing the biggest segment of greenhouse gas emissions in the region. The JPC should give MTC its input on the urgency of the climate problem and the need to make bold actions in this RTP.
- JPC should ask the Corps of Engineers to expand their current tidal studies to all of the bay so that accurate data on sea level rise can be provided to all cities and residents.
- Bay Area Council is in discussion with Silicon Valley Leadership to work with the regional agencies and others to create one unified approach on climate change. We need bold action and we need for a regional structure to make that happen.
- SB 375 is a huge opportunity for the Bay Area. Bay Area Council would like to help make sure that the region's Sustainable Community Strategy is very strong and will achieve our goals.
- We need to create a regional infrastructure for electric vehicles that use renewable energy. Plug in hybrids are a very important strategy that JPC should pursue.

4. Transportation 2035: Building Momentum for Change

Doug Kimsey made a presentation focusing on objectives and actions beyond the investments in the Transportation 2035 plan, and he sought the Committee's feedback on categories of change.

Comments from the Committee and public generally called for much bolder steps, particularly responding to the climate imperative. Suggestions included:

- Moving toward a VMT tax in addition to more aggressive bridge tolls, HOT lanes and congestion pricing;
- Implementation of an Indirect Source Rule;
- Moving well beyond business as usual with uncompromising bold goals that truly take climate change seriously;
- Setting an objective of “no net new trips;”
- Reducing highway investment and concentrating only on transit investment;
- Creating real incentives for change, not just ancillary programs;
- Meaningful performance measures for transit providers (including metrics for both efficiency and equity);
- Full road pricing;
- Moving aggressively on pricing measures now, not later, and using the revenue to fund much improved transit;
- Evaluating all transportation investments against an SB 375/climate-change filter;
- Encouraging more electric-powered vehicles, but ensuring that electricity came from clean sources, including nuclear;
- Using transportation funding to more aggressively encourage focused growth (e.g., safe routes to transit, conditioning local streets and roads money);
- Marketing transit more aggressively beyond the current rider base.

5. Public Comment

All public comment was made in the context of specific agenda items and is included in the summary of those items.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12 Noon.