



## Joint Policy Committee

### ITEM #2

### Minutes of the Meeting of April 15, 2005 Held at 10:00 AM in the Auditorium, MetroCenter, Oakland

#### Attendance:

##### ABAG Members:

Jane Brunner  
Dave Cortese  
Mark Green  
Scott Haggerty, Ch.

##### BAAQMD Members:

Chris Daly  
Mark DeSaulnier  
Pamela Torliatt  
Gayle Uilkema

##### MTC Members:

Bill Dodd  
Steve Kinsey  
John McLemore  
Jon Rubin  
Jim Spring

##### ABAG Staff:

Paul Fassinger  
Henry Gardner  
Janet McBride  
Kenneth Moy  
Christy Rivierre

##### BAAQMD Staff:

Jack Broadbent  
Henry Hilken  
Jean Roggenkamp

##### MTC Staff:

James Corless  
Steve Heminger  
Doug Kimsey  
Therese McMillan

#### Other:

Jim Bigielow, Redwood City / San Mateo County  
Chamber  
Stuart Cohen, TALC  
Linda Craig, League of Women Voters  
Duane DeWitt  
Jean Finney, Caltrans, District 4  
John Fisher, BART  
Tony Fisher, NUMMI  
Sherman Lewis, Sierra Club  
Peter Lydon, SPUR  
Steve Lowe, WOCA / WOPAC  
Kate O'Hara, Greenbelt Alliance  
Marianne Payne, BART  
Bob Planthold, MTC Advisory Council  
David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF  
Barisha Sprieggs, League of Women Voters  
Leslie Stewart, Bay Area Monitor  
Steve Tyson, SOCF

#### JPC Staff:

Ted Droettboom

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The chair opened the meeting with a welcome and committee members introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of March 25, 2005

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3. Competition for Land Use: Projections, Forecasts, Monitoring,

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

4. TOD Policy Choices

James Corless led the Committee in a discussion of four of the nine key issues MTC is considering in finalizing its transit-oriented development policy for Resolution 3434 transit projects. The four questions which Mr. Corless asked the Committee to address were:

- Thresholds for housing and jobs: What are the appropriate housing and/or job measures for the corridor level thresholds?
- Affordable housing: Should the TOD policy require affordable housing in the corridors?
- Parking management: Should the policy require local parking policies for land uses close to transit stations, e.g. maximum ratios and pricing?
- Auto-dependent uses: Should the TOD policy prohibit auto-dependent uses, e.g., big box retail?

There was a lively discussion but no clear consensus on any of the questions. In part, this was because two criteria could be applied to each issue: (1) *substance*, i.e., what impact did the policy option have on the quality of the transit oriented development and (2) *jurisdiction*, i.e., what was the appropriate role for MTC on this subject. For example, almost everyone felt that Big Box retail was inappropriate in transit development areas, but not everyone felt it was the region's role to dictate this land-use prohibition.

As well, nearly everyone agreed that well designed mixed use was required to make transit station areas work. Mixed uses contribute to livability and pedestrian friendliness, reduce the need for non-work trips and can help reduce housing/jobs imbalances. However, there was not

agreement on whether both housing and job targets were required (or should be required) to achieve the right use mix.

The issue around affordable housing was largely one of perception: should it be characterized as “affordable” housing “work force” or “entry-level” housing. Some saw a substantive difference among the terms; others did not. Some argued for a requirement; others suggested that a rigid requirement would result in a push back from localities and that rewards were more appropriate at this stage in TOD policy evolution.

The manner in which development was described was seen as important: economic development was perceived as attractive to existing neighborhoods; housing, and affordable housing in particular, was less attractive. Making the connection between housing, economic development and jobs was required to sell change.

Parking policy was also seen as key for making transit areas work, but there was not agreement on how that parking policy should be implemented.

## 5. Regional Housing Needs Allocation

Business, Transportation and Housing Secretary Sunne Wright McPeak spoke to this item. The speaking notes for Ms. McPeak’s comments are on the JPC web site:

[http://www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/jpc\\_presentations.htm](http://www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/jpc_presentations.htm)

Ms. McPeak placed a changed RHNA process in the context of emerging state housing policy, which in turn is driven by an integrative vision of the relationship between housing, transportation, land-use, economic development and environmental quality. The state is trying to avoid “dumb growth” and sees “housing at the right place” as key to achieving that goal. The state believes that the California economy is threatened by the inability to provide enough appropriately located housing—particularly housing affordable to working households—and also sees housing quantity and location as key to dealing with a growing transportation problem.

Draft legislation is proposed to amend the state requirements related to the housing and land-use elements of general plans, and this will also affect the RHNA process. Cities and counties will be held responsible for taking care of their own through twenty-year housing plans, housing zoning for ten years, and action plans covering five years. COGs, like ABAG, will have responsibility for facilitating negotiations among localities so that they can meet their obligations in association with their neighbors. The state is looking at rewarding performance with additional infrastructure

investment and continuing tax dollars related to new growth. The state also recognizes that it will have to facilitate affordable housing with broad-based subsidies rather than relying exclusively on the narrow and inequitable base that results from inclusionary zoning.

The Secretary talked further on the state initiative to improve CEQA, which she believed was being used inappropriately as a substitute for good planning. She indicated that it was preferable that funds be used to directly improve the environment, rather than being consumed by wasteful project-specific EIR processes and litigation.

In discussion, a number of issues were raised, including:

- The need for ABAG to have a stable source of funding in order to permit it to participate fully in the regional planning and housing process;
- The possibility that some limited imposition of regional control over local land-use decisions might be helpful to the state, to the region and even to localities;
- The possibility that progressive revenue sources, like the income tax, may be required to support the state's affordable housing aspirations;
- The difficulties that some local governments have in imposing inclusionary zoning, particularly when they are already in a poor competitive position;
- The care needed when imposing universal state "as of right" conditions such as that which allowed secondary units (These might be appropriate in large, suburban back yards but severely impinge on privacy in urban subdivisions with smaller lot sizes. One size does not fit all.);
- The need to protect rural counties from metropolitan growth pressures, so they can truly take care of their own;
- The need to reward municipalities not just for future growth but also for what they have already done to accommodate growth;
- The desirability for environmental legislation that requires localities to mitigate the impact they have on their regional neighbors;

- The possibility that a state database on underused sites and potentially redevelopable sites would be made available for local planning use;
- The need to acknowledge that both rental and ownership stocks have a role to play in housing supply and affordability, noting that rental will always be the dominant affordable player and that poor construction dispute resolution is limiting multi-family ownership opportunities.

6. Joint Policy Committee Rules and Procedures

The staff report was received for information.

7. Future Agenda Items

These were received for information.

8. Other Business

There was none.

9. Public Comment

Public comment offered relative to the scheduled agenda items is incorporated in the summary of those items.

A member of the public requested that the member agencies clarify the procedure for preparation of air quality plans now that the role formerly played by the Regional Agencies Coordinating Committee (RAAC) has been assumed by the JPC.

A suggestion was made that the JPC web site include an ability for interactive comment from the public. That capability has now been added: <http://jpcforum.abag.ca.gov/>.