



Joint Policy Committee

Minutes of the Meeting of December 17, 2004 Held at 10:00 a.m. in Nile Hall, Preservation Park, Oakland

Attendance:

ABAG Members:

Jane Brunner
Dave Cortese
Mark Green
Scott Haggerty, Ch.
Rose Jacobs Gibson
Steve Rabinowitsh
Gwen Regalia

BAAQMD Members:

Chris Daly
Erin Garner
Patrick Kwok
Gayle Uilkema

MTC Members:

Mark DeSaulnier
Steve Kinsey
Sue Lempert
John McLemore
Jon Rubin
Shelia Young

ABAG Staff:

Paul Fassinger
Henry Gardner
Patricia Jones
Janet McBride
Kenneth Moy

BAAQMD Staff:

Jean Roggenkamp

MTC Staff:

Evelyn Baker
Steve Heminger
Doug Kimsey
Rebecca Long
Therese McMillan

Other:

Eva Alexis, League of Women Voters
Linda Craig, League of Women Voters
Melisa Joshi, Caltrans Planning
Sherman Lewis
Peter Lydon
Val Menotti, BART
Kate O'Hara, Greenbelt Alliance
David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF
Janet Spilman, SCTA
Leslie Stewart, Bay Area Monitor

JPC Staff:

Ted Droettboom

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 November 19, 2004

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3. Transportation 2030

Ashley Nguyen, manager of the 2005 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) work, summarized the new final-draft plan. Her presentation emphasized the role of new land-use assumptions, the resultant modal splits and environmental impact. Information on the RTP and the associated Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is available at <http://t2030.mtc.ca.gov>.

Discussion centered on the implications for non-automotive travel (i.e., transit, walking and biking). As automobile trips are so dominant in the current overall travel picture, significant changes in the percentage modal split are very difficult to achieve. For example, a one-percent reduction in automobile usage requires a twenty-percent increase in transit ridership. The RTP analysis, particularly the work on the TRANSDEF alternative, shows that land-use and pricing policies can be most effective in influencing travel choices. Open questions are the acceptability and feasibility of various policy choices.

4. Advocating the Regional Interest through Major Plan and Project Review

Ted Droettboom summarized the staff report on this matter.

Committee feedback was mixed. Some members indicated that regional comment, both positive and negative, would be welcome in their jurisdictions. Others thought that regional intervention would not be appreciated and would be treated as outsider meddling. Proponents argued that, even if unwelcome, regional oversight was required to remind localities of the bigger picture: regional, sub-regional and super-regional. They also argued that the ability to positively consider all alternative perspectives was a healthy characteristic of mature local development processes.

Some members also believed that a formal vision confirmation process was also needed. It would encourage local appreciation and consciousness of the regional interest. These members argued that we should pursue every opportunity to remind localities of their effect on and obligation to the Bay Area as a whole. We needed to continually enhance regional consciousness and get support for the region on the record.

The idea of trying out regional review on a few pilot projects was suggested. The Dumbarton rail project, including associated land-use changes, was offered as one such pilot project where we could test the utility of regional review and comment. One member suggested, however, that we needed more specific criteria than the *Preamble and Policies for Smart Growth* if we expected to add anything more than clichés to the local discourse.

Other members reminded the Committee that there was a great deal to be learned regionally by examining local success stories for best practices and disseminating these to others in the region. The preparation of model codes was one way of positively pursuing the regional interest at the local level. Awards and checklists were suggested, as well.

The sub-regional review of local projects was vetted as a possible model, as a way of pursuing regional interests and driving down regional consciousness without necessarily having to take projects up to the context of the entire Bay Area. This could be more expeditious and would build on a procedure already in place for some CMAs, particularly relating to sub-regional trip generation.

Finally, it was emphasized that whatever we did, we needed to get in early for maximum impact. It was much more difficult to influence a local plan or project after dollars, time, and effort have been sunk into detailed project planning and environmental review.

The recommendations in the staff memo were not voted upon. Staff will report back at a future meeting with revised concepts reflecting Committee comments.

5. Meeting Frequency and Length

It was agreed that:

- The Committee would continue meeting monthly through June, 2005, at which time the meeting frequency would be reviewed;
- Meeting lengths should not exceed two hours and should be shorter if possible;
- Staff presentations should be concise, particularly if accompanied by a written report, so as to maximize the time available for Committee discussion.

6. Other Business

Committee members Brunner, Green, Haggerty, Lempert, McLemore, and Rabinowitsh volunteered to sit on a sub-committee to assist with TOD outreach program early in 2005.

7. Public Comment

Public comment occurred in the context of the listed agenda items and is summarized in the discussion of those items.