

Association of Bay Area Governments
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Bay Conservation and Development Commission
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter 101 Eighth Street P.O. Box 2050 Oakland, CA 94607-4756 (510) 464-7942 fax: (510) 433-5542 tedd@abag.ca.gov www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy

JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting of July 17, 2009 Held at 10:00 AM at the MetroCenter Auditorium, Oakland

Attendance:

ABAG BAAQMD BCDC MTC

Jane Brunner Chris Daly Geoffrey Gibbs Tom Bates

Dave Cortese Yoriko Kishimoto Sean Randolph Steve Kinsey

Mark Green Mark Ross Ken Yeager

Scott Haggerty Gayle B. Uilkema

Rose Jacobs Gibson

BTH: Jim Bourgart

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Randolph called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of the Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of May 15th, 2009

The minutes of the May JPC meeting were approved.

3. Draft BCDC Staff Report and Preliminary Recommendations on Adapting to Climate Change

Will Travis gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the implications of sea-level rise on the Bay shoreline and potential regional policy responses.

Among the significant implications are:

- A projected rise of 55 inches by the end of the century and 16 inches by mid century;
- The 16-inch rise potentially inundating 84% of the land covered by the 55-inch rise;
- With storm surge and other compounding factors, what is now categorized as a hundred-year-flood (i.e., occurring on average once every one hundred years) becoming an annual event;

• Some effects of sea-level rise already visible (e.g., the destruction of the underside of Pier ½ in San Francisco).

Travis outlined a "triage" policy approach to threatened, low-lying shoreline areas, dividing areas into those which:

- 1. Must be protected;
- 2. Are unsuitable for development and where "retreat" from the shoreline is warranted;
- 3. Merit special attention (where, because of over-riding local or regional objectives, development under tightly controlled mitigation conditions might be warranted in spite of the threat of inundation).

Nuanced policy and innovation will be required to effectively manage category 3 and to differentiate between that category and category 2.

It was moved and seconded and was the decision of the Committee to continue to play an active role in the development of policy to deal with sea-level rise and to endorse the general policy directions of the Bay Plan amendments proposed by BCDC, subject to the refinement of the exact language to incorporate public comment and to encourage a context-sensitive policy approach and innovation in those situations which merit special attention (Category 3).

4. Regional Parking Reforms for Climate Protection

MTC's Valerie Knepper introduced Jeffrey Tumlin from Nelson/Nygaard, who summarized and expanded upon his memo with a slide presentation. The presentation is available on the JPC website:

http://www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/jpc_presentations.htm.

In discussion, Committee members and others noted:

- Parking policy can be an effective shorter-term initiative within the Sustainable Communities Strategy. A change in parking rules can be encouraged by the region and undertaken by local governments without the need for state and federal legislation and it can have relatively immediate impacts because it requires little or no physical construction to become effective; it can affect existing as well as new development.
- The cost of parking is currently hidden in the cost of goods and services. Appropriate parking policy will make the true cost of parking more visible. Taking the cost of parking out of hiding will change perceptions of who pays for parking and how much they pay and will, therefore, be controversial. Any substantial change in parking policy will need to be accompanied by a very

good public information campaign explaining the rationale and demonstrating how the policy opens up choices (including the ability to save money) rather than closes choices. Most folks do not have a good understanding of transportation economics, and this needs to change.

- The perception of choice will be enhanced by more and better-funded transit services, though transit is not essential in all situations; ride-sharing and other TDM approaches are also viable options when faced with higher parking costs or with additional income as the result of not choosing to drive and park alone.
- Parking fees can be structured like a carbon tax and parking policy could be used within a cap-and-trade regime.
- A local approach to levying parking fees in suburban shopping centers is likely to fail, because those centers who charge for parking could be put at a competitive disadvantage relative to those who do not charge for parking. A uniform, cross-jurisdictional approach would be required to keep the playing field among centers level.
- However, traditional downtowns may gain a competitive advantage by charging for parking, even if competing centers do not charge. This is because in many downtowns, it is parking availability, not parking price, that is the issue. Appropriate pricing makes more spaces available, and is most effective if accompanied by convenient pay mechanisms that do not require pockets full of quarters.
- Municipal programs can be structured to allow developments to opt out of the
 expensive provision of parking while still mitigating the impacts for which
 parking regulations have traditionally been designed. Management
 mechanisms are also available to reduce the neighborhood externalities of
 reduced parking requirements for projects.
- CMAs are critical to bridging the gap between regional interests and local interests in parking.
- Inter-regional competition needs to be considered as well as intra-regional competition, particularly for retail parking.
- Any system to price people out of single-occupant automobiles, including parking pricing, needs to be accompanied by an attractive and convenient set of alternative choices. Otherwise, it will simply look like a money grab or worse. The price of parking needs to make rational sense to the payee as well as the charging entity. It cannot be perceived as punitive.

There was broad consensus that if real and consequential parking reform were to occur, it would have to happen regionally because competition among localities precluded independent local action; it would need to be accompanied by aggressive public education; and there would need to be viable, attractive and convenient alternatives to single-occupancy-vehicle use.

5. Climate Bay Area

Bruce Riordan summarized the staff memo.

Committee members and public commentators suggested a number of additions to the coordinating group, including a representative of labor, a representative of the education community, representatives of community aggregation interests, representatives of PG&E, and a member of the Sierra Club. The Committee members also stressed the importance of including representatives of both large and small cities, not just counties, on the group. One member of the Committee suggested webcasting the meetings so that more interests could keep informed of the coordinating group and its meetings. Another expressed a desire for more detail on how the work of Climate Bay Area would be reported to and respond to elected officials.

It was moved and seconded and it was the decision of the Committee to approve the structure for Climate Bay Area with the addition of membership from both large and small cities, from labor, and from public health.

6. Regional Agency Joint Climate Action Progress Report

The report was received for information.

7. Public Comment

General public comment addressed the following topics:

- The need to task Congestion Management Agencies with an explicit responsibility to reduce vehicles miles traveled (VMT);
- The need for a working group to address issues of environmental justice and social equity in the Sustainable Communities Strategy;
- The need for the regional agencies, local governments, environmental, and private sector stakeholders all to work together to craft suitably responsible and responsive climate adaptation strategies;
- The need to consider elevated rail right-of-ways as *defacto* flood-protection levees requiring protection and armoring.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 PM.