



JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of January 21st, 2011 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	Tom Bates, Chair	Geoffrey Gibbs	Bill Dodd
Mark Green	Ash Kalra	John Gioia	Steve Kinsey
Scott Haggerty	Mark Ross	Sean Randolph	Jim Spering
Rose Jacobs Gibson	Pamela Torliatt	Brad Wagenknecht	Ken Yeager
	Gayle B. Uilkema		

1. Call to Order

Chair Bates called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of the Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of May 21st, 2010

The minutes of the previous JPC meeting were approved.

3. One Bay Area

In a brief PowerPoint presentation, Ted Droettboom provided background, then Jack Broadbent, Ann Flemer (for Steve Heminger), Ezra Rapport, and Will Travis summarized their proposal for an integrated planning framework directed by the Joint Policy Committee.

Acknowledging that the JPC is valuable, the Committee members nevertheless believed that improvements were required. Committee discussion focused on a small set of ideas and issues:

Effectiveness of the JPC in meeting its State mandate

Under state law, the JPC is charged with coordinating the drafting and development of major planning documents prepared by its member agencies. However, the JPC may only see these documents late in the drafting process or after the responsible agencies have already made substantive decisions. The JPC has no authority to veto or require changes, and revisiting or second-guessing decisions is difficult even with authority. The meaning and effect of a JPC vetting or recommendation is not clear. The position of the JPC in the progression of policy-review and decision-making needs clarification and consistency, as does the effect of a JPC action relative to agency authorities.

Meaningful communication between the JPC and its member boards and commissions is not assured.

Place of the JPC in the complex of commissions, boards, and committees

Some Committee members noted that there was significant overlap in the memberships of the governing bodies of all four of the regional agencies and that the JPC may be redundant in terms of sharing information and issues among the agencies' commissioners or directors. Some were perplexed by the role of the JPC relative to other coordinating mechanisms like the combined meetings of the MTC Planning Committee and the ABAG Administrative Committee. Committees should not be duplicative. The capacity of busy elected officials to attend and participate in a multiplicity of meetings with a high level of redundancy was questioned.

Integrative policy

Members suggested three types of integrative policy which could be appropriately developed and pursued by the JPC:

- 1) High-level, synoptic policy which goes beyond the narrow mandates of the four regional agencies and speaks to broad issues of the Bay Area's continued sustainability as a place, economy and culture. Rather than being driven by agency policy concerns, the JPC should drive agency policies as implementation means for the JPC's higher ("30,000 foot") policy ends.
- 2) Policy which resolves perceived conflicts or inconsistencies among agency-specific policies (e.g., CEQA guidelines and infill development).
- 3) Policy which falls between stools, i.e., policy which guides regional imperatives that do not currently reside within the mandates or silos of any of the four regional agencies, e.g., climate adaptation.

One member suggested the JPC should not concern itself with substantive policy content, but should only oversee policy process and communication.

Size and composition of the committee and involvement of non-government interests

Some members spoke in favor of expanding the committee to include representation from non-governmental sectors and interests, particularly business and economic development. One member noted that there already is a regional committee so composed: ABAG's Regional Planning Committee. Most agreed that, regardless of whether they were voting or non-voting members of the JPC or whether they were not formal Committee members at all, there was a need to solicit the advice and participation of regional stakeholders that were not part of government. The regional agencies also need to recognize and reward the efforts of other agencies and actors in pursuing regional interests.

It was suggested that to broaden participation in the JPC and to reduce the redundancy with overlapping commission and board memberships that, with the exception of the chairs, the members of the JPC should be selected from those who serve on only one of the four agency governing bodies.

Need for a regional perspective

Several people spoke to the need for JPC members to rise above their roles as local-government or regional-agency representatives and to consider and advocate for a regional interest which transcends aggregated local-government or regional-agency interests. The need for a stronger and clearer regional perspective on economic issues was emphasized.

Effect of state budget on regional priorities

It was suggested that the Joint Policy Committee and its member agencies needed to develop an advocacy position around an alternative to state budget proposals currently being considered in Sacramento, as these would affect the ability of the region to achieve current priorities related to focused growth and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Of particular concern were the elimination of redevelopment authorities and the diversion of long-term capital dollars to short-term operating purposes. Alternative self-help revenue sources may be required to move forward with both service needs and development objectives.

Priority choices and tangible progress

Some argued that the JPC needed to guard against becoming overly and unrealistically ambitious. It was better to choose a very few priorities and assure that these are done well (For example, perhaps the Committee should focus on removing the impediments to housing development.). Clear, measureable progress indicators are essential as are practical initiatives. While the JPC's head needed to be in the clouds, its feet needed to be on the ground and taking small concrete steps. It was also noted that the JPC is not resourced to take substantial independent action.

Continuity and certainty

The JPC has drifted recently. The Committee needs to meet regularly and take charge. Agency staff need to work more closely together, and the criteria for bringing items to the JPC need to be clearly defined.

Coordinated and credible communication

The agencies need to reduce confusion with clear and consistent communication and outreach. The relationship between regional initiatives, even within a single agency, is not apparent, and the community is confused. Slogans like "One Bay Area" need to be supported by real actions and real changes. Policy initiatives need to be grounded in well-founded, transparent and understandable information and analysis. The "science" needs to be apparent and reasonably unassailable. The performance of our predictive models against measurable reality should be documented and readily available.

Motions

The following motion was put and *lost*:

THAT the Executive Directors of the regional agencies meet together and develop a comprehensive set of proposals for the state budget which would assist the region in pursuing its long-term priorities for regional development, AND THAT these proposals be brought to the JPC in March.

This motion was put and *approved*:

THAT the Chairs of the four regional agencies meet with the Executive Directors of the four agencies and report back to the JPC on a proposal for a JPC program. That proposal should consider, but not necessarily include, the following:

- 1) The development of high-level, integrated policy which would transcend individual agency mandates and guide the work of the four regional agencies;
- 2) A mechanism for resolving conflicts between or among agencies;
- 3) A procedure for ensuring that the JPC reviews draft agency plans early in the process and, therefore, has a real opportunity to influence their content;
- 4) Opportunities for the JPC to facilitate the work of all four agencies on joint regional strategies;
- 5) Other ideas, as appropriate.

AND THAT the Chairs report back to the JPC in March.

4. Public Comment

Public comment was directed at item 3 and is included in the summary of that item. A letter received from the League of Women Voters is attached to these minutes.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:40 AM.



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE BAY AREA
An Inter-League Organization of the San Francisco Bay Area



January 21, 2011

Mayor Tom Bates, Chair
Joint Policy Committee

Re: JPC and One Bay Area

The League of Women Voters of the Bay Area supports the effort of the Joint Policy Committee to restore its role as chief coordinating group for the Bay Area's regional decision making. This was the key purpose of its creation in 2004 by the State Legislature.

It is encouraging that the JPC is addressing the challenges that face the four regional agencies in their attempts to work together effectively on the urgent issues that climate change poses for the Bay Area. It is disturbing, however, to read that the JPC subcommittee that was established to consider its effectiveness has not met even once during its 10-month existence.

LWV has been active in working to make AB 32 and SB 375 work for the Bay Area. Yet, the process within our area has become impossibly complicated. It is hard to keep track of the various "initiatives" like FOCUS, One Bay Area, Climate Bay Area, not to mention the latest Regional Transportation Plan update and RHNA, but also the Bay Area Air Quality District health issues initiatives and BCDC-related sea-level rise concerns.

Traditional planning and regional funding activities have always been complex within the Bay Area and as climate change concerns have emerged they are even more complicated. Many other regions can face this assignment because there is one lead regional agency (thinking of SCAG, SANDAG and SACOG).

Effective regional leadership will be required not only to coordinate, but to lead many of these efforts. We wholeheartedly support Item 8 the review of the Committee Composition and Governance Structure. This is essential to success of the entire regional enterprise.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda Craig".

Linda Craig, Regional Planning Director
LWV of the Bay Area