



## JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the Meeting of January 18, 2008 Held at 10:00 AM in the MetroCenter Auditorium, Oakland

#### Attendance:

<u>ABAG</u>	<u>BAAQMD</u>	<u>BCDC*</u>	<u>MTC</u>
Jane Brunner	Chris Daly	Jim Bourgart	Tom Bates
Dave Cortese	John Gioia	Charles McGlashen	Bill Dodd
Mark Green	Jerry Hill	Sean Randolph	Steve Kinsey
Scott Haggerty	Yoriko Kishimoto		Sue Lempert
Rose Jacobs Gibson, Chair	Mark Ross	*non-voting	Jon Rubin
Sam Liccardo	Pamela Torliatt		Jim Sperring
Gwen Regalia	Gayle B. Uilkema		Ken Yeager

#### 1. Call to Order

Chair Jacobs Gibson called the meeting to order.

#### 2. Approval of the Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of November 16, 2007

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

#### 3. Projections 2009

Paul Fassinger and Christy Riviere made a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the staff memo on this subject. They argued that grounding the policy-based Projections on explicit performance targets would increase transparency for both the regional agencies and local governments. Targets would make the regional purpose clearer and facilitate a common understanding of the challenges ahead. With interests clarified and presented in a consistently tangible manner, there was greater opportunity for meaningful and productive discussions between the region and local governments, commonalities and differences would be in stark relief, and areas requiring negotiation in order to achieve consensus would be highlighted.

Discussion generally favored this approach, with the following provisos:

- Consultation with local elected officials—particularly with those who are not regularly involved in regional issues—needs to occur early and in a big, visible way. Broad understanding and buy-in, both to the process and to the results, is essential.

- Achieving realistic consensus is critical. In the opinion of at least one committee member, both local and regional employment projections have been highly unrealistic.
- The targets will require considerable thought. Some will be easier to formulate and achieve than others. The equity target, for example, will be very difficult; but we cannot subordinate important targets to other easier or more attractive targets just because they are hard.
- If we are to establish aggressive targets and expect local governments to participate in their achievement through land-use decisions, then we will need to back up those targets with resources. Many significant land-use changes cannot happen without public investments, and local governments are too frequently bereft of the resources required to make those investments.
- Regional interests need to be tempered with a consideration of local impacts: particularly on traffic, schools, parks and open space. The public will need to be provided with good illustrative information so that it can begin to intelligently understand and make the tradeoffs between regional and global concerns (e.g., greenhouse gases) and local issues (e.g., traffic). It needs to become clear that we cannot have it both ways; that some reasonable compromises among objectives are required.
- Congestion management agencies need to be involved early in the process, as do business and development interests. All will be instrumental in making the projections real.

There was general consensus among all present that assertive outreach was central to making the new approach work, that both elected regional leaders (like those represented around the table) and regional staff would have to engage in this outreach, and that coordination with the outreach occurring as part of the FOCUS program was desirable to reduce confusion and duplicative effort.

It was moved and seconded and was the decision of the Committee to endorse the following draft recommendations to the ABAG Executive Board (underlining denotes amendment):

1. ABAG should evaluate the Projections forecast against performance targets aligned to those adopted by MTC for the Regional Transportation Plan.
2. ABAG should develop a series of land-use assumptions, such as percentage of future housing and job development that will occur near transit, intended to help the region meet the performance targets.

3. ABAG should work with MTC to develop additional assumptions, such as transportation pricing, to help the region in meeting performance targets.
4. ABAG's Projections forecast should reflect the adopted Priority Development and Conservation Areas.
5. In pursuing this program, ABAG should reach out early to all the elected officials in each county.

#### 4. FOCUS Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in the Real World

This was the first in series of presentations on Priority Development Area plans. Lisa Kranz from the City of Santa Rosa presented the recently completed plan for the area around the SMART rail station, encompassing most of downtown Santa Rosa. This area has been designated a PDA.

The plan, funded in part by a station-area planning grant from MTC, was completed over a relatively short period (eighteen months) but is remarkably comprehensive. Among its chief features are:

- A relatively high level of residential change: It accommodates over 3000 new housing units at densities approaching 60 units per acre or heights up to ten stories. Previous densities had not exceeded 30 units to the acre.
- A high level of attention to creating a complete and livable community: The plan includes new and parks and open spaces, walkable streets and pedestrian links, needed and desired commercial amenities (e.g., a grocery store), and retention of historical structures and character. Streetscapes have been planned to facilitate interest, diversity, and pedestrian activity.
- An inclusive planning process: The plan was prepared with extensive community involvement and includes features desired by the existing residents. It enjoys wide community support.

The plan is now entering its implementation stage, and considerable work needs to be done and challenges need to be overcome, including the preparation of zoning code amendments and design guidelines, securing a catalyst development, managing the retention of some industrial uses and the conversion of others, the assembly of small sites into developable parcels, the resolution of jurisdictional issues between the City and County, and securing of funds for required public investments.

The Chair thanked Ms. Kranz for her presentation.

## 5. Regional Transportation Plan—Financial Incentives for PDAs

Therese McMillan, MTC Deputy Director, led off the discussion of this item. She opened by noting that traditional transportation infrastructure investments (with only a few exceptions) were remarkably ineffective relative to the provisional targets identified for the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and that land use (along with transport pricing) would have to play an increasing role. Past RTPs had assisted supportive land-use with the TLC and HIP programs and most recently with the Resolution 3434 TOD policy. It was now appropriate to consider additional funding from regional discretionary sources in order to assist Priority Development Areas, which are central to the region's focused growth initiative.

Ms. McMillan noted that most of the expenditures in the RTP were committed by past agreements and by dedicated funding sources and that discretionary funds were limited to a maximum of about 20% of the \$200 billion (escalated dollars) plan and more practically to about 10%. She sought the Committee's feedback on four general options for directing discretionary funding to PDAs: (1) creation of a new special PDA program for the existing pool of funds; (2) carving out PDA sub-programs within existing programs (e.g., TLC, Local Streets and Roads, and Bike/PED); (3) giving non-exclusive priority to PDAs within existing programs via weighting criteria; and (4) only funding PDAs from new funds, not affecting existing programs and allocations.

The Committee was not of a single mind on the options, and additional perspectives were contributed through public comment. Some favored prioritization of PDAs within at least a few of the existing discretionary programs, most particularly TLC and perhaps the safe-routes-to-transit effort within the regional bike/ped program. Others feared the diminution and dilution of already small programs by further slicing the pie: small slices would be reduced to slivers. The redirection or reprioritization of regional money for local streets and roads was particularly anathematic to some members.

Some argued for delegating PDA discretionary funding to CMAs. Others contended that the regional purposes would not be served by anything other than a regional program, directed by the region.

Regardless of their attitude to the use of existing funds, most speakers agreed that PDAs deserved regional support and that the pool of discretionary funds needed to be expanded to accommodate this and other needs. In particular, our aggressive climate-change targets will require an astounding scale of effort and a fundamental departure from business as usual, with the PDAs playing a big role. There was a call for a systematic and comprehensive consideration of new revenue sources to fund new and critical priorities. Revisiting committed projects, which may no longer be relevant to the changing circumstances of this century, was also suggested. The funds freed up by abandoning anachronistic projects could be redirected to PDA or could accelerate transit projects serving those PDAs. However, as many big-ticket projects have been

committed through specific tax measures and other statutes, the law would not be on the side of radical change.

There was also general consensus that PDA funding ought to come with clear performance expectations: that areas should clearly deliver more housing, for example, in return for achieving PDA funds. A requirement for local matching money was also suggested, as was the need for further information delivered at the local level to ensure that regional objectives were understood and respected. Targeting regional funds to specific region-serving purposes within PDAs was advocated. At minimum we should set clear expenditure criteria. There was recognition that one size does not fit all, but that there should be some basic regional standards for quality of fit and finish, regardless of size.

6. Air District Climate Protection Grants

Mr. Broadbent's memo on the Air District's climate protection grant program was received for information.

7. Public Comment

Public comment received in response to specific agenda items is included in the summary of the discussion of those items.

In addition, Linda Craig, on behalf of the League of Woman Voters, informed the Committee of the League's upcoming meeting on *Transportation Solutions to Climate Change*. The meeting will occur on Friday, February 22<sup>nd</sup> from 9 AM to 2:30 PM in Nile Hall, Preservation Park, Oakland. The public is welcome.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 PM.