



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) 464-7900
fax: (510) 464-7985
info@abag.ca.gov
www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy

JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE — REGIONAL PLANNING PROGRAM

Date: May 11, 2012
To: Joint Policy Committee
From: Will Travis and Bruce Riordan, Joint Policy Committee Consultants
Subject: **Update on Joint Policy Committee Responsibilities, Programs and Projects
(for JPC consideration and possible action on May 18, 2012)**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following is a brief summary of the activities that have been undertaken, the analysis we have completed and the actions we recommend the Joint Policy Committee take to follow through on the decisions the JPC made at its March 16, 2012 meeting.

- **Coordination and Conflict Resolution.** The four regional agencies have begun implementing the coordination process endorsed by the JPC. To achieve this greater coordination, the agency executive directors met on April 2, 2012, the newly established JPC executive committee (agency officers and directors) met on April 25, 2012, and a special JPC meeting focused on the SCS is being held on May 11, 2012. Also, the Air District's planning staff has initiated discussions with the planning staffs of the other regional agencies and local governments to explore approaches other than a CEQA threshold to ensure that infill development does not expose the public to unhealthy air quality.
- **Criteria for Selecting Projects and Initiatives.** As directed by the JPC, working with the agency staffs and officers, we have developed draft criteria for selecting JPC projects and initiatives, primarily based on whether JPC leadership would provide clear value-added for a specific issue or topic.

We recommend that the JPC endorse these criteria.

- **Joint Policy Committee and Regional Planning Committee Roles and Responsibilities.** As directed by the JPC, we have evaluated the role of ABAG's Regional Planning Committee (RPC) to determine whether the RPC and the JPC, perhaps with some restructuring of one or both committees, can be merged. Based on our analysis of the roles and compositions of the JPC and the RPC, we found no compelling rationale for either merging the JPC and the RPC or for significantly restructuring the two committees so that one entity could accomplish the markedly different responsibilities of the two.

We recommend that the JPC concur in this conclusion.

- **Engagement with the Business Community.** As requested by the JPC, we have investigated approaches for more actively engaging the business community in the JPC's activities and decision-making. Over the past two months significant progress has been made in this engagement, and we believe two processes would be effective in continuing this engagement in the future: (1) the JPC agency directors will be meeting with the Bay Area Business Coalition on a quarterly basis; and (2) the JPC members will have an opportunity to directly interact with the business community in their capacity as members of the Bay Area Council Economic Institute's advisory committee on the regional economic development framework study.

We recommend that the JPC support this conclusion. In addition, we recommend that the JPC endorse adding a new provision to require community consultation in the coordination and conflict resolution process the JPC endorsed on March 16, 2012.

CONSULTANT'S REPORT

Summary of Decisions on the Joint Policy Committee's Coordination, Leadership Role and Management. At its March 16, 2012 meeting, the Joint Policy Committee reached the following three decisions based on our recommendations:

1. *Coordination and Conflict Resolution.* The JPC endorsed a six-step coordination and conflict resolution process.
2. *Leadership on Critical Issues and Projects.* The JPC endorsed a four-step process for selecting critical issues and projects in which the JPC will become engaged.
3. *Joint Policy Committee Management.* The JPC endorsed the establishment of an executive subcommittee, composed of the leadership officers of each agency, to work with the agency executive directors in directing the key activities of the JPC.

Each of these decisions is described in greater detail in Attachment A. In addition, the JPC directed us and the executive directors to evaluate and report back on: (1) the role of ABAG's Regional Planning Committee and whether the RPC and the JPC, perhaps with some restructuring of one or both committees, can be merged; and (2) approaches for more actively engaging the business community in the JPC's activities and decision-making. The progress in carrying out these JPC's decisions over the past two months is described in the following sections of this report.

Coordination and Conflict Resolution. We have begun implementing the JPC's adopted coordination and conflict resolution process to deal with two specific issues.

The first issue is the planned May 17, 2012 adoption by ABAG and MTC of a preferred land use and transportation strategy that will be evaluated over the next six months as part of the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy, which must be adopted pursuant to SB 375 by April 2013. A special meeting of the JPC is being held on May 11, 2012 to provide the JPC with an opportunity to offer its input on at this critical stage of the development of SCS, which is

also called Plan Bay Area, prior to action by ABAG and MTC. To ensure this special meeting is productive, the agency executive directors met on April 2, 2012 to hear from the staffs of each of the four agencies, to consider any concerns about the scenarios and to ensure that the scenarios are fully integrated and consistent. Also, as called for in the JPC's adopted coordination and conflict resolution process, a new ad hoc executive committee, which was endorsed by the JPC on March 16, 2012, met for the first time on April 25, 2012. This executive committee is composed of the officers and executive directors of the four agencies.

Because the staffs of MTC and ABAG will be presenting the scenario and the investment strategy to the full boards of all four regional agencies, it would be duplicative to make the same presentation to the JPC. Therefore, in addition to summarizing the feedback received from BCDC and the BAAQMD, the executive committee decided it would be more productive for the staffs' presentation to the JPC on May 11, 2012 to provide a more global perspective of the implications of the Plan Bay Area on the economy, equity and the environment. In other words, the presentation will focus at the bigger picture and begin laying the groundwork for making the next required update of Plan Bay Area more comprehensive and more than the just sum of the total programs of the four agencies, each of which addresses only a portion of what is needed to make the Bay Area better in the future.

The second issue deals with the guidelines adopted by the Air District to assist local jurisdictions and lead agencies in complying with the requirements of CEQA regarding potentially adverse impacts to air quality, particularly for development near major transportation corridors. In light of a judicial decision that has stalled the implementation of the guidelines, the Air District's planning staff has initiated discussions with the planning staffs of the other regional agencies and local governments to explore alternative approaches for achieving the policy objective of the guidelines. These discussions, which are still at a preliminary stage, will build upon previous discussions regarding integrating air quality considerations into regional and local plans. This approach is consistent with the JPC's adopted coordination and conflict resolution process.

Criteria for Selecting Projects and Initiatives: Consultant's Analysis. As directed by the JPC, we have developed draft criteria for selecting JPC projects and initiatives, primarily based on whether JPC leadership would provide clear value-added for a specific issue or topic. The draft criteria were provided to the JPC executive committee for its review and discussion at its April 25, 2102 meeting. Based on the feedback received, we have refined the criteria and, with the support of the executive committee, we recommend that the JPC endorse the six criteria listed below.

Once adopted, the criteria will be used to help the JPC decide on which issues the JPC will take on a leadership role. The criteria will first be used to deal with the one specific request for regional leadership already presented to the JPC—BCDC's request that the JPC facilitate the formulation of a regional sea level rise strategy.

In applying the criteria, it is important to recognize that some speculation is involved in deciding whether there is broad support for the JPC taking on a leadership role, what will happen if the JPC does not provide leadership, the relative importance of an issue, and whether funding might or might not become available. In addition, over time an issue that may score low today may emerge as important in the future as conditions change.

With those caveats, the following criteria should be used for selecting projects and initiatives in which the Committee will play a leadership role:

1. What is the relative importance of addressing the project or issue in achieving the goals of economic prosperity and environmental sustainability in the Bay Area?
2. How broad is the support among government, equity, environmental, and business interests for the JPC to provide leadership on the project or issue?
3. If the JPC does not provide leadership on the project or issue, will another entity do so?
4. Are resources available to support the JPC's leadership role on the project or issue?
5. Has a JPC member agency requested that the JPC provide leadership on the project or issue?
6. Is there likely to be a significant impact on achieving the mandated responsibilities of one of the regional agencies if the JPC does not take on a leadership role on the project or issue?

Recommendation. We recommend that the JPC endorse these six criteria for selecting projects and initiatives the Committee will take on.

Joint Policy Committee and Regional Planning Committee Roles and Responsibilities: Consultant's Analysis. The JPC directed its consultants and the executive directors to evaluate and report back on: (1) the role of ABAG's Regional Planning Committee (RPC) and whether the RPC and the JPC, perhaps with some restructuring of one or both committees, can be merged.

The JPC and the RPC play two markedly different roles and, therefore, are composed differently to fulfill their respective responsibilities.

Under the provisions of state law, the JPC is responsible for coordinating the development and drafting of major planning documents prepared by ABAG, MTC, BAAQMD, and BCDC, and reviewing and commenting on major interim work products and the final draft comments prior to action by any of the four agencies. To augment its coordination responsibilities, the JPC unanimously adopted a work program that commits the JPC to providing a leadership role on three projects that are aimed at making the Bay Area economically stronger and healthier in the near-term and more prepared for the major challenges confronting the region over the next half century. These projects, which are being conducted in conjunction with JPC's partners from business, academia, government, philanthropy and other sectors, include: (1) the Near-Term Green Jobs+ Project; (2) the Bay Area Economic Strategy Framework; and (3) the Bay Area Climate and Energy Resilience Strategy. To fulfill its intergovernmental coordination responsibilities, the JPC is composed exclusively of board members from its four member agencies.

ABAG established the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) to study and submit the following matters to ABAG's Executive Board: (1) Regional Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area; (2) environmental management, housing and infrastructure planning; (3) special plans and reports from planning task forces or other regional agencies; (4) comprehensive planning policies and procedures; and (5) such other matters as may be assigned by the Executive Board.

Since the beginning of 2011, the RPC has been briefed on and discussed an assessment of schools in Priority Development Areas; ABAG's earthquake and hazards recovery planning; the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) alternative scenario concepts; regional employment and economic trends; the Regional Housing Needs Allocation methodology; the One Bay Area grant program, the SCS alternative land use scenarios; the SCS equity analysis; the Growing Smarter Together awards program; and the SCS alternative employment scenarios. During this period the RPC has taken action on two matters: Fremont's proposal for a Priority Development Area; and adding members to ABAG's Regional Disaster Resilience Council.

Unlike the JPC, the RPC is composed a wide range of stakeholders that include at least 18 elected officials, including at least one supervisor from each member county and a city representative from each county; the chair of the Bay Area Planning Directors' Association or designee; one representative each from the BAAQMD, BCDC, MTC, and the Regional Water Quality Control Board; and not less than ten citizens to represent the following categories: (1) business; (2) minorities; (3) economic development; (4) recreation/open space; (5) environment; (6) public interest; (7) housing; (8) special districts; and (9) labor. The RPC currently has forty members. Attachment B is a roster of these members.

In summary, the JPC is responsible for policy oversight of the work of four regional agencies and is composed of individuals who make the policy decisions of those agencies. In contrast, the RPC is responsible for providing comments to the board of one of the four agencies and is composed of a wide range of stakeholders who have technical expertise or particular perspectives on a range of issues. The one thing that the JPC and the RPC have in common is that they both meet for two hours every other month in the MetroCenter auditorium.

Because of these differences it would not be reasonable to expect that the members of the JPC would either benefit from the many briefings provided to the RPC or be effective in providing helpful technical advice to the ABAG Executive Board on matters that are exclusively the responsibility of ABAG. Similarly, it is unlikely the RPC would be effective in advancing coordination of the policy development of the four regional agencies or in providing regional leadership in achieving overarching economic, environmental and equity goals. However, should the JPC desire input from a wide range of stakeholders on a particular issue, the JPC could refer the matter to the RPC rather than establish its own permanent or ad hoc advisory group.

Therefore, we find no compelling rationale for merging the JPC and the RPC or for significantly restructuring the two committees so that one entity could accomplish the markedly different responsibilities of the two.

Consultant's Recommendation. We recommend that the JPC concur in the conclusion that the JPC and the RPC should not be merged or restructured so that either takes on the responsibilities of the other.

Engagement with the Business Community: Consultant's Analysis. On March 16, 2012, the JPC requested that we evaluate approaches for more actively engaging the business community in the JPC's activities and decision-making. This direction came at a fortuitous time because a few weeks earlier, nine organizations that deal with economic issues and business development—operating under the banner of the Bay Area Business Coalition (see Attachment

C)—contacted the executive directors of the four JPC agencies to offer their assessment of problems/concerns with the JPC, along with their solutions/reforms for addressing the problems.

The problems/concerns the Business Coalition identified are:

1. The JPC has not effectively fulfilled the roles and responsibilities envisioned when it was created.
2. With respect to the process for developing significant regional policy initiatives (including but not limited to the RTP/SCS process), individual agency committees, subcommittees, task forces, working groups, policy councils, etc., have proliferated at the expense of the JPC.
3. The diffuse nature of the process leaves far too little direct interaction between elected officials on the various agencies, stakeholders, and the public.
4. There are insufficient internal and external checks and balances on individual agency regulatory initiatives, including with respect to whether the initiative may promote or hinder successful implementation of the adopted RTP, SCS.

The potential solutions/reforms the Business Coalition identified are:

1. Reorganize individual agency structures and practices to ensure that JPC meetings are the most meaningful, informative, and important to attend.
2. Give teeth to the current statutory requirement that the JPC review and comment on both initial drafts and final drafts of regional agency regulatory initiatives/measures by amending the statute to provide that failure to comply prevents the initiative/measure from taking effect (unless otherwise required by federal or state law deadline).
3. Require the regional agencies to prepare regulatory impact statements before adopting initiatives/measures that may have a regional impact (such as potential inconsistency with the RTP/SCS).
4. Provide for the regulatory impact statement to be brought before the JPC for review and comment, and give the JPC the authority to remand the matter back to the agency for revisions if it is inadequate.

To discuss these ideas and to explore approaches for improving the engagement of the business community in the work of the JPC, the executive staff of the four JPC regional agencies met with members of the Bay Area Business Coalition on April 2, 2012. Following are the main ideas that the business interests raised at that meeting:

- The business community wants more input, at an early stage, on proposed initiatives by the agencies.
- The cumulative impact on business of various regulations is important; it is not enough just to look at each regulation individually.
- In addition to identifying potential conflicts and opportunities for collaboration, the JPC could look at individual initiatives through a regional lens to identify those that could have significant regional impacts that need to be considered.

- Just as there are organized groups and processes to deal with equity and environmental issues in each agency's proposals, there should be a process for dealing with significant economic impacts.
- A seventh step (consultation with the business community) should be added to the six-step process that the JPC endorsed on March 16, 2012 to facilitate collaboration and avoid duplication among the four regional agencies
- The business community would like to work jointly with the JPC staff and agency directors to develop the framework that will formalize how to bring the business voice into the JPC and JPC agencies processes.
- The sea level rise strategy can be used as a test case for identifying and discussing the economic impacts of a proposed initiative.

The agency directors agreed to work with the business community on these ideas and to engage in two specific immediate initiatives: the executive directors will begin meeting with business community representatives on a quarterly basis; and the May 11, 2012 presentation by ABAG and MTC staffs to the JPC on the SCS will provide a more global perspective of the implications of the SCS on the economy, equity and the environment.

In addition to meeting with the Bay Area Business Coalition, we have continued to work with the Bay Area Council Economic Institute on the regional economic development framework study. To guide that study, the BACEI has formed an advisory committee composed of all the members of the JPC, members of the Bay Area Business Coalition, and businesses who have provided underwriting for the study. Attachment D is a roster of advisory committee members.

Furthermore, as noted above, the Bay Area Business Coalition has recommended that an additional step requiring consultation with the business community should be added to the six-step coordination and conflict resolution process, which the JPC endorsed on March 16, 2012. We support this recommendation, but in keeping with the regional goal of striving to advance the three E's (economy, environment and equity), we believe all three interest groups should be consulted. To achieve this, a new provision (shown in **bold** below at the end of step #2) should be added to require this early community consultation.

1. The JPC consultants would coordinate the identification of: (a) major opportunities for collaboration; and (b) potential inter-agency conflicts. Topics to be considered could be generated by the JPC consultants, JPC members, agency members and staff, and the public.
2. The JPC consultants would organize and submit potential topics to the JPC chair, member agency chairs, and executive directors for discussion. The JPC would be given an opportunity for early input on a topic's importance, key issues to address, and policy guidance, **and the business community, environmental interests and equity organizations would be consulted about the topics.**
3. The JPC consultants would take selected topics to the agency staff for discussion and action/resolution. Working through the agency chairs and executive directors, the issues would be first taken up by the agency planning directors. If no action/resolution can be agreed upon, the discussion would be elevated to the executive directors. If still no action/resolution can be agreed upon, the issue would be taken up by the agency chairs

for action/resolution. Any necessary formal action on the issue would be provided by the JPC.

4. The JPC consultants would provide a written description of the decision to the JPC member agencies, agency staff, and the public.
5. The JPC consultants would monitor the implementation of the decisions, and if issues arise, report on them to the JPC, agency chairs and executive directors.
6. To enhance the process, the JPC consultants would be responsible for scheduling regular meetings of member agency planning directors, executive directors and chairs and would facilitate opportunities for chairs and executive directors to develop better working relationships outside issue discussions meetings.

Consultant's Recommendation. We recommend that the JPC: (1) endorse the practice of holding quarterly meetings of the JPC agency directors and the Bay Area Business Coalition; (2) make full use of the Bay Area Council Economic Institute's advisory committee on the regional economic development framework study as an opportunity for JPC members to directly interact with the business community; and (3) endorse adding an early community consultation process to the JPC's adopted coordination and collaboration process.

ATTACHMENT A**March 16, 2012 Joint Policy Committee Decisions on Consultant's Recommendations Regarding JPC Coordination, Leadership and Management**

Introduction. At its March 16, 2012 meeting, the Joint Policy Committee reached the following decisions on three recommendations contained within a March 9, 2012 report from its consultants based on their review of the JPC's Purpose, Process and Topics.

JPC Coordination Role: Consultant's Analysis. To help the agencies contribute to attaining a shared regional vision, all four agencies agreed that as an advisory body, the JPC's primary role should be to facilitate collaboration and avoid duplication among them. Because the process for coordinating this collaboration has been poorly defined and quite troublesome over the past few years, a clear and robust process would help the agencies work together on the most critical regional issues and avoid conflicts. The JPC process, featuring early advance work among the agencies, would help the agencies reach consensus through discussion and consultation.

Based on the input gained to-date, a six-step process seems most likely to achieve this desired coordination:

1. The JPC consultants would coordinate the identification of: (a) major opportunities for collaboration; and (b) potential inter-agency conflicts. Topics to be considered could be generated by the JPC consultants, JPC members, agency members and staff, and the public.
2. The JPC consultants would organize and submit potential topics to the JPC chair, member agency chairs, and executive directors for discussion. The JPC would be given an opportunity for early input on a topic's importance, key issues to address, and policy guidance.
3. The JPC consultants would take selected topics to the agency staff for discussion and action/resolution. Working through the agency chairs and executive directors, the issues would be first taken up by the agency planning directors. If no action/resolution can be agreed upon, the discussion would be elevated to the executive directors. If still no action/resolution can be agreed upon, the issue would be taken up by the agency chairs for action/resolution. Any necessary formal action on the issue would be provided by the JPC.
4. The JPC consultants would provide a written description of the decision to the JPC member agencies, agency staff, and the public.
5. The JPC consultants would monitor the implementation of the decisions, and if issues arise, report on them to the JPC, agency chairs and executive directors.
6. To enhance the process, the JPC consultants would be responsible for scheduling regular meetings of member agency planning directors, executive directors and chairs and would facilitate opportunities for chairs and executive directors to develop better working relationships outside issue discussions meetings.

Consultant's Recommendation. The consultants recommended that the Joint Policy Committee: (a) endorse the development and adoption of a prescribed coordination and conflict resolution process; and (b) provide direction to the JPC consultants on any refinements needed in the six-step process described above for facilitating agency collaboration.

JPC Decision. The Committee unanimously (11–0) endorsed the recommended coordination and conflict resolution process. (Committee member Jake Mackenzie, who did not attend the meeting, sent an email prior to the meeting supporting the recommendation.)

JPC Leadership Role: Consultant's Analysis. The JPC should continue to provide regional leadership by facilitating work by others on critical issues that are outside the current scope of the four agencies. Current JPC leadership initiatives include the Bay Area Climate and Energy Resilience Project and the Regional Economic Development Strategy. However, the JPC's performance on such initiatives could be improved by providing a clearer process for selecting issues and for establishing the JPC's specific role(s). The selection process would have to take into account JPC and agency resources, potential partners, alternatives to JPC involvement, timing, and other relevant factors. To leverage the limited JPC and agency resources emphasis should be placed on using non-JPC using resources provided by foundations, universities, other public agencies, the private sector, and other sources of funding.

Based on the input gained to-date, a four-step process seems most likely to identify critical issues and projects:

1. The JPC consultants would draft criteria for selecting JPC projects/initiatives, primarily based on whether JPC leadership would provide clear value-added for a specific issue or topic.
2. The chairs and executive directors would discuss, modify and agree upon the project selection criteria. The JPC would ratify the selection criteria after making any necessary modifications.
3. Based on the criteria, the JPC consultants and agency staff would bring proposed projects/initiatives to the agency chairs and executive directors for discussion. To aid this process, the JPC consultants would prepare a brief report on each potential project, describing the roles the JPC and the four agencies could play. Selected projects would be advanced to the JPC for endorsement.
4. Under the direction of the chairs and executive directors, the JPC staff and agency staff would prepare a work plan for a selected project.

Consultant's Recommendation. The consultants recommended that the Joint Policy Committee: (a) endorse the development and adoption of a process for selecting critical issues and projects in which the JPC would become engaged; and (b) provide direction to the JPC consultants on any refinements needed in the five-step process described above for identifying critical issues and projects.

JPC Decision. The Committee unanimously (11–0) endorsed the recommended development and adoption of a process for selecting critical issues and projects in which the JPC would become engaged. (Committee member Jake Mackenzie, who did not attend the meeting, sent an email prior to the meeting supporting the recommendation.)

JPC Management: Consultant's Analysis. The board of the Joint Policy Committee is responsible for managing the JPC and achieving its objectives. The number of members on the JPC board is not established by law, but two requirements of state law do affect the board's size. There must be at least one member from each of the nine Bay Area counties, and a majority of the representatives from BCDC must be local elected officials. The current 20-member size of the JPC (five from each of the four agencies) came about because the chair and vice chair of BCDC are directly appointed by the Governor and, by law, cannot be local elected officials. In order for BCDC's chair and vice chair to serve on the JPC, the BCDC delegation must include three additional representatives who are local elected officials. Therefore, in 2009, the JPC decided that each of the other four agencies should have a five-member delegation on the JPC board.

The current governing board of the JPC provides broad representation from throughout the Bay region. However, the current practice of holding two-hour meetings bimonthly effectively limits the amount of time each JPC member has to offer input and direction on a particular issue. Therefore, the current arrangement has not proven to be particularly effective when dealing with important matters, such as regional policies and interagency coordination. We see three options for dealing with this problem.

1. Hold more frequent or longer JPC meetings. Properly managed, monthly meetings or half-day sessions could allow for more in-depth review and JPC discussion on key topics, as well as more substantial progress reports on the JPC's projects.
2. Establish an executive subcommittee, composed of either the chairs or the chairs and vice chairs of each agency, to work with the agency executive directors in directing the key activities of the JPC. While the full JPC board would continue to have the final responsibility on all policy and procedural matters and the selection of issues and projects the JPC would take on, the executive subcommittee would provide a nimble, action-oriented leadership approach to JPC management. The processes described above for agency coordination and leadership draw heavily on the active engagement of the officers of the four agencies, and a subcommittee composed of the chairs or chairs and vice chairs would not be inconsistent with the current provisions of state law.
3. Restructure the JPC, reducing its size to perhaps 12 members. To ensure that the JPC membership represents the leadership of each agency, compose the JPC of the chair, the vice chair and one at-large member from each member agency. The provision of state law requiring a majority of the BCDC members of the JPC to be elected officials would preclude both BCDC's chair and vice chair from serving on a JPC board restructured in this manner. Therefore, unless the law is amended, BCDC would have to be represented by either its chair or vice chair and two local elected officials. The provision of law requiring that there must be at least one JPC member from each of the nine Bay Area counties could be met through a careful selection of the at-large members.

Consultant's Recommendation. The consultants recommended that the Joint Policy Committee: (a) determine which, if any, of the three options identified above for managing the JPC's activities is preferable; and (2) provide direction to the JPC consultants for implementing the preferred option.

JPC Decisions. The Committee unanimously (11–0) endorsed Option #2. (Committee members Jake Mackenzie and Geoffrey Gibbs, who did not attend the meeting, sent emails prior to the meeting supporting Option #2.)

In addition, the Committee voted (9–2) to direct the staff and the executive directors to evaluate and report back to the JPC on: (1) the role of ABAG’s Regional Planning Committee and whether the RPC and the JPC, perhaps with some restructuring of one or both committees, can be merged; and (2) approaches for more actively engaging the business community in the JPC’s activities and decision-making.

ATTACHMENT B
ABAG Regional Planning Committee (RPC) Roster
March 2012

Supervisor Dave Cortese, *Chair*, County of Santa Clara
Councilmember A. Sepi Richardson, *Vice Chair*, City of Brisbane
Supervisor Susan Adams County of Marin/Public Health
Shiloh Ballard Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Andy Barnes, Policy Chair/Urban Land Institute
Linda Craig, League of Women Voters – Bay Area
Supervisor Valerie Brown, County of Sonoma
Councilmember Ronit Bryant, City of Mountain View / Santa Clara County Cities
Paul Campos, Building Industry of America, Bay Area
Supervisor Diane Dillon, County of Napa
Councilmember Pat Eklund, City of Novato / Marin County Cities
Supervisor Rose Jacobs Gibson, County of San Mateo / San Mateo County Cities
Mayor Mark Green, ABAG Immediate Past President, City of Union City
Supervisor Scott Haggerty, County of Alameda
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club / Environment
Mayor Jennifer Hosterman, City of Pleasanton / Alameda County Cities
Councilmember Janet Kennedy, City of Martinez
Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez, Director of External Affairs, San Francisco Municipal
Transportation Agency
Councilmember Tiffany Renee, City of Petaluma / Sonoma County Cities, Sonoma County
Cities
Jeremy Madsen, Executive Director Greenbelt Alliance / Smart Growth
Allen Fernandez Smith, Executive Director, Urban Habitat / Social Equity
Councilmember Anu Natarajan, City of Fremont / Transportation
Andrew Michael, Bay Area Council / Business
Supervisor Nate Miley, County of Alameda
Councilmember Nancy J. Nadel, City of Oakland
Councilmember Julie Pierce, City of Clayton / ABAG Vice President
Laurel Prevetti, Assistant Planning Director City of San Jose / Bay Area Planning Directors
Association

Mayor Harry Price City of Fairfield / Solano County Cities

Councilmember Mark Ross, City of Martinez / BAAQMD

Pixie Hayward Schickele California Teachers Association

Supervisor Linda Seifert, County of Solano

Carol Severin East Bay Regional Park District Board of Directors / Parks & Recreation

Supervisor James P. Spering, County of Solano / MTC

Egon Terplan, Planning Director SPUR / Urban Development

Supervisor Gayle Uilkema Contra Costa County

Beth Walukas, Alameda County Transportation Commission; Congestion Management Agency /
Congestion Management Agenciess

To Be Appointed, Special Districts

To Be Appointed, Nonprofit Housing of Northern California

To Be Appointed, County of Solano

To Be Appointed, City and County of San Francisco

ATTACHMENT C

**Bay Area Business Coalition Members
March 2012**

Jim Wunderman, Bay Area Council

John Coleman, Bay Planning Coalition

Paul Campos, Building Industry of America, Bay Area

Linda Best, Contra Costa Council

Karen Engel, East Bay Economic Development Alliance

Gregory McConnell, Jobs & Housing Coalition

Cynthia Murray, North Bay Leadership Council

Roseanne Foust, San Mateo County Economic Development Association

Sandy Person, Solano Economic Development Corporation

ATTACHMENT D

**Bay Area Council Economic Institute
Regional Economic Development Framework Study Advisory Committee
April 2012**

Tom Bates, BAAQMD

Linda Best, Contra Costa Council

Jane Brunner, ABAG

Steve K. Buster, Mechanics Bank

Paul Campos, Building Industry of America, Bay Area

John Coleman, Bay Planning Coalition

Dave Cortese, ABAG

Bill Dodd, MTC

Karen Engel, East Bay Economic Development Alliance

Roseanne Foust, San Mateo County Economic Development Association

Andrew G. Giacomini, Hanson Bridgett LLP

Geoffrey Gibbs, BCDC

Rose Jacobs Gibson, ABAG

John Gioia, BCDC

Mark Green, ABAG

Scott Haggerty, ABAG

George C. Halvorson, Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc., and Hospitals

David Hennefer, Pacific Eagle Holdings Corporation

Lisa Joyner, US Bank

Ash Kalra, BAAQMD

Steve Kinsey, MTC

Jake Mackenzie, MTC

Tarkan Maner, WYSE Technology

Eric Mar, BAAQMD

George M. Marcus, Marcus & Millichap

Gregory McConnell, Jobs & Housing Coalition

George E. McCown, American Infrastructure Funds

Lenny Mendonca, McKinsey & Company

Mark W. Midkiff, Union Bank

Kevin Murai, SYNEX Corporation

Cynthia Murray, North Bay Leadership Council

Sandy Person, Solano Economic Development Corporation

Mary Nejedly Piepho, BAAQMD

Mark Ross, BAAQMD

Bijan Sartipi, BT&H

Jonathan Scharfman, Universal Paragon Corporation

Kathrin Sears, BCDC

Michael Shepherd, Bank of the West

John A. Sobrato, Sobrato Development Company

Jim Spering, MTC

John P. Thacher, Wilbur-Ellis Company

Adrienne Tissier, MTC

Brad Wagenknecht, BCDC

Zachery Wasserman, BCDC

Jim Wunderman, Bay Area Council