



Joint Policy Committee / Regional Planning Program

ABAG-MTC Joint Policy Committee

Minutes of the Meeting of November 19, 2004
Held at 9:00 a.m. in MetroCenter Room 171

Attendance:

ABAG members:

Dave Cortese
Mark Green
Scott Haggerty (Chair)
Rose Jacobs Gibson
Steve Rabinowitsh
Gwen Regalia

MTC members:

Mark DeSaulnier
Steve Kinsey
Sue Lempert
John McLemore
Jon Rubin (Chair)
Jim Spering
Shelia Young

ABAG staff:

Alex Amoroso
Paul Fassinger
Henry Gardner
Clarke Howatt
Patricia Jones
Kenneth Moy
Janet McBride
Christy Riviere

MTC staff:

James Corless
Steve Heminger
Doug Kimsey
Valerie Knepper
Therese McMillan
Bruce Riordan

JPC staff:

Ted Droettboom

Other:

Jack Broadbent, BAAQMD
Stuart Cohen, Transportation and Land Use Coalition
Dana Cowell, Caltrans
Linda Craig, League of Women Voters
Duane De Witt
Nashua Kalil, BART
Seth Kaplan, Alameda County Supervisor Nathan Miley
Thomas Krouemeyer, Marin TAM
Sherman Lewis, Sierra Club
Peter Lydon, SPUR
Dan Phelan
Shelley Poticha, Center for Transit-Oriented Development
Geeta Rao, NPH
Jean Roggenkamp, BAAQMD
David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF
Doug Shoemaker, MTC Advisory Council

Janet Spilman, SCTA
Karen Stove
Leslie Stewart, Bay Area Monitor
Sandra Threlfall, Waterfront Action

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The chair opened the meeting with a welcome, and those in attendance introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of October 22, 2004

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3. Recent Housing Legislation

ABAG Principal Planner Alex Amoroso reviewed new laws affecting the Housing Element in local General Plans and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation. In general, the new laws clarify and support a close relationship between housing allocation and other regional smart-growth objectives. They also facilitate and protect the approval of housing projects that are consistent with local general plans, but may impose minimum density requirements on localities that do not allow for sufficient new housing in their plans.

Mr. Amoroso alerted the Committee that the State was considering requiring that local governments plan for housing twenty years in advance, not just five years as presently. He also indicated that there is a possibility that State funding for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process may be terminated, with the result that affected local governments may have to fund the COG to do this work.

4. Transit Oriented Development—Preliminary Policy

MTC Senior Planner James Corless presented preliminary policy ideas for conditioning Resolution 3434 transit expansions on supportive developments. Core policy concepts include:

- Planning for supportive development by corridor, with the potential to trade off specific development objectives among stations, so long as the corridor as a whole performs satisfactorily;
- Using planned residential population or planned population plus planned jobs within ½ mile of stations as the principal performance criteria for determining the level of supportive development, with criteria thresholds to vary by transit technology;

- Requiring qualitative, as well as numerical, criteria to evaluate the likelihood that station areas will deliver riders, function as viable transit villages, and get developed as planned;
- Recognition that localities can only plan for development; that actual development is subject to market and other forces beyond the control of local governments;
- Recognition that supportive development will require good local specific planning, which MTC proposes to fund.
- A willingness to support station area plan implementation with TLC and HIP funds.
- Coordination of land use planning and transportation project planning through a series of contingent decisions.

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

- The difficulty, but necessity, of planning corridors involving multiple jurisdictions and involving actors from all sectors (including business and development interests), some of whom may be suspected and disrespected because they have an interest in the outcome;
- The necessity to plan for both origins (residential locations) and destinations (employment locations) on transit lines, therefore using both population and jobs as development criteria—but also noting and emphasizing that the region does not have a shortage of employment locations; it does have a shortage of affordable housing;
- The requirement that other criteria in addition to supportive land use be used in evaluating and conditioning transit investments; for example the quality of connectivity with other transit systems and the associated ability to generate ridership from a larger catchment area;
- The probable perception among some localities that this policy is a heavy-handed attempt by the region to tell them how to plan and for what to plan;
- The responsibility the region has not to plan just to maximize fare box revenue but to achieve all the other environmental and quality-

of-life objectives associated with regional livability and smart growth,

- The possibility that good intentions embodied in paper plans may erode under public pressure once transit is built and that the actual development upon which the transit investment is predicated may not appear, leading to possibility that the region may have to find some mechanism to hold localities accountable for their promises;
- The need to plan for a broader area around specific station areas to ensure that required infrastructure and level of service on adjacent roads and intersections is capable of supporting both the new development and the traffic generated by transit;
- The likelihood that local jurisdictions and surrounding neighbors will need more persuasive arguments and perhaps tangible incentives to convince them that there is some benefit to them in accepting higher-density development around transit stations (It has to be demonstrated that this improves everyone's quality of life);
- The requirements that some jurisdictions may have for technical assistance and perhaps even regional review;
- The possibility that some transit-unfriendly uses (e.g., big box retail) may have to be prohibited from station areas;
- The requirement that some TOD planning occur quite quickly as some transit investments are nearly ready to proceed;
- The desirability of planning for a good mix of uses, a high quality of urban design and an attractive and efficient integration of public and private investment at each station so that the resultant neighborhoods are attractive and well-functioning communities, not just transit feeders.

5. SB 849—Composition of the JPC

It was moved and seconded, and it was the decision of the Committee:

THAT the Bay Area Air Quality District (BAAQMD) be invited to appoint seven members to the Joint Policy Committee, increasing the Committee's voting membership from fourteen to twenty-one members;

THAT the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing be invited to appoint an *ex officio* member to the Joint Policy Committee;

THAT size and composition of the Joint Policy Committee be reviewed after one year;

THAT the Committee chair rotate among member agencies, the chair or president of each agency serving a one-year term as chair of the JPC, in this order: ABAG, MTC, BAAQMD.

6. Other Business

Future presentations on BART station-area development policies, on Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), and on development incentives were requested.

A member also requested that at the next JPC meeting there be a discussion of meeting length and frequency.

Henry Gardner's appointment as the new Executive Director of ABAG was announced.

7. Public Comment

A member of the public raised concerns about the regional public involvement process, about implementation of the TLC program and about the level of transit service from Marin County.