



JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE — REGIONAL PLANNING PROGRAM

Minutes of the Meeting of May 18, 2012 Held at 10:00 AM at the Metro Center Auditorium, Oakland

ABAG

Jane Brunner
 Dave Cortese
 Mark Green
 Scott Haggerty

BAAQMD

Tom Bates, Chair
 Eric Mar
 Mark Ross

BCDC

John Gioia
 Kathrin Sears
 Brad Wagenknecht
 Zack Wasserman

MTC

Jake Mackenzie
 Jim Spering
 Adrienne Tissier

Lee Taubenek, Caltrans (for Bijan Sartipi)

Executive Committee

Mark Luce
 Julie Pierce

1. Call to Order

Chair Bates called the meeting to order.

2. Update and discussion on Senator DeSaulnier’s SB 1149

State Senator Mark DeSaulnier discussed his bill, SB 1149, on Bay Area regionalism. Mr. DeSaulnier reported that he will ask that the bill be held in committee and not advanced which will kill the bill for this year. Mr. DeSaulnier proposed that he engage the JPC members in discussions through the end of the calendar year on how to improve regional governance and how to make the JPC more effective. He noted that it is a different world than 40-50 years ago —there is a different social model for how people live and work—in metro areas around the country and internationally. Most metro regions in the world are struggling to adjust and to govern effectively. He noted that he introduced the bill to stimulate discussion on these issues for the Bay Area.

In discussion, members of the Committee considered a number of issues:

- Mr. Green supported killing the bill and believes the JPC should engage in the planned discussions. Merging agencies makes sense and should be looked at. Complexity of the Bay Area deserves a much improved regional structure.
- Mr. Gioia stated we must look at ways we can improve and be more effective. We must resolve tensions between agencies on certain issues.
- Mr. Ross asked “What kinds of models are out there that could be imported and adapted here?”

- Mr. DeSaulnier replied that there is no model. It is something each region needs to look at, discuss and learn. This body was the compromise between merging ABAG and MTC. Perhaps one of the solutions is to improve the JPC.
- Ms. Pierce stated that the agencies have worked well together in the last few years on SB 375. A better level of collaboration and trust has been built.
- Ms. Tissier stated that the agencies are working together better now on Plan Bay Area. There was a firestorm in San Mateo County when they saw SB 1149. It is seen by cities as another level of bureaucracy. There was great concern that the public and other agencies were left out of the bill discussions. The agreement on Plan Bay Area by two agencies jointly last night is a good example of what we need to do. We do not need more bureaucracy.
- Mr. Spring stated that without withdrawing bill, opposition will continue to grow. What is your concern and opposition to moving the agencies to one building in San Francisco. This change will help the agencies by putting them together under one roof.
- Mr. DeSaulnier stated that he is withdrawing the bill, but there could be another one. Understands there is some tension over this. You can go to court and get a ruling on the building. As a representative of the East Bay where most tolls are generated, tolls are for seismic retrofit, maintenance and administration, but administration is proportional to administering toll funds. Maybe that problem can be solved as well.
- Chair Bates stated that we should confine ourselves to structure of JPC. The bill does not address the building.
- Mr. Spring stated that we need to use this opportunity to talk about the building as well. The bill does include language about the building.
- Mr. Wasserman noted that the proposed principles tie into what the JPC has started doing. There is a need to be more concrete and clear about that and we are discussing this later in the meeting. An economic plan should be integrated into regional planning. This needs to a major focus of this group.
- Mr. Mackenzie noted, along with other members, that he appreciates the discussion offer and wants to be a part of the dialogue.
- Mr. Haggerty stated that the building needs to be talked about. Was against the move to San Francisco, but having everyone together in one building has real value. We fought for staying in Oakland and lost. It is now time to move forward. We should be allowed now to have a discussion at ABAG and vote to go forward without interference.
- Mr. DeSaulnier stated that the bill says to stop the process until the state auditor is done. Agrees that all four agencies, or even five, should be housed together.
- Mr. Cortese noted that he served with Mr. DeSaulnier in the 7-on-7 discussions that lead to formation of the JPC. There has been a natural evolution that has superseded the mechanisms that were set up by legislation. We have really integrated planning efforts at MTC and ABAG. Plan Bay Area is the perfect example of this. My hope is that you can start working with us to figure out ways to facilitate the natural way for things to move

towards better regional cooperation. Use legislation to help this natural process continue on a practical level.

- Mr. Mar asked that the long process that agencies went through to pick the building site be respected.
- Mr. Luce stated that we have a collaboration of diverse interests now with the Sustainable Communities Strategy. We are figuring this out and are actually working towards similar objectives as your bill.
- Ms. Worth stated that we need to discuss these issues. Each region is unique and government is organic. The principles you have identified are the right ones. We need to do business differently. However, we have been troubled by this bill for the last month. We need mutual trust. We need side-to-side and face-to-face discussions, not top-down solutions. We can do many things better and we need to do so. Let's work together.
- Chair Bates stated that the JPC is evolving and emerging. The executive directors are now meeting together and coordinating work plans. There has been a lot of progress in the last 3 years and more trust. Also, we have good staff at the JPC with new roles we will be discussing later. One of the needs is a real economic development plan. Also, we have a good new Executive Committee.
- Chair Bates proposed that we refer this discussion to the Executive Committee. We should also bring in others to join the discussion, principally the business community. They need to be at the table and we need to hear their concerns. We need the building to go forward because that provides the best opportunity for trust, communication and planning. If there is legislation, it should help to further these improvements, not interfere with them. Discuss at Executive Committee how to structure the talks with Senator DeSaulnier and then bring that process proposal back here for full discussion.
- Mr. Haggerty stated that he disagreed. There is lots of experience around this table that should be included. Don't exclude people that have lots to contribute. Let the Senator pick who is at the table. Put it on the agenda for the full JPC to discuss how to proceed.
- Chair Bates stated that the Executive Committee will take the referral and decide how to proceed between now and next full JPC meeting.
- Mr. Haggerty requested that the issue be put on the JPC agenda to discuss.
- Chair Bates replied that he will agendize the issue for next meeting, but Executive Committee will decide how to proceed.
- Mr. Green stated that business should be at the table. My view is more radical. This is going to be a watered down, tepid, modest step forward. Not bold enough. I would like to have the opportunity to voice my opinion.
- Chair Bates replied that the Executive Committee is a Brown Act meeting and is open to all to come and to participate. The matter will come back to this committee.
- Mr. Haggerty stated that this direction is already a disaster. He made motion that nothing is done until it comes back to this committee.

The motion failed.

- Mr. DeSaulnier stated that a statute or an action in a civil proceeding could stop the building. He noted that the last few months have strained personal and professional relationships. Maybe what will come out of this is that we will eventually become a model for regional governance.
- Mr. Gioia noted that there was lots of tension when BCDC was formed. Cities and counties were not supportive but communities came together to demand change. He notes that he is in favor of more radical restructuring.
- Ms. Worth stated that government evolution is a natural process. The elephant in the room is still the building. Can we come out of today with some idea on how to proceed on the building issue? Is there a pathway forward to work with you?
- Mr. DeSaulnier replied that we could schedule another meeting after the auditors report.
- Ms. Brunner stated that non-profits should be at the table too, not just business. The committee should have different viewpoints.

Scott Peterson, East Bay EDA, provided public comment that the business organizations are interested in how this body can be more effective. He noted that the Bay Area Business Coalition is now meeting with agency staff on a quarterly basis. The discussions ahead can help the region and improve its governing roles. It is good that the bill forced a discussion to start on these issues. He has concerns about regulatory agencies being involved in economic development planning.

3. Approval of the Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of March 16, 2012

The minutes of the January meeting were approved with a clarification that the JPC Executive Committee created in January will be composed of the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of BCDC, MTC and BAAQMD, the President and Vice President of ABAG, and the Chair of the JPC.

4. Briefing on Adapting to Rising Tides (ART) Project

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Lindy Lowe (BCDC) provided a briefing that updated the JPC on the Adapting to Rising Tides Project. ART is a collaborative project lead by BCDC to study how sea level rise and storm events will affect our shorelines and how to address these challenges. The goal of the project is to increase preparedness and resilience in Bay Area communities while protecting ecosystems and community services. The project area is from Emeryville to Union City on the east side of San Francisco Bay.

The project is attempting to answer two questions. How will sea level rise and storm events affect Bay Area infrastructure, economy and ecosystems? What approaches can we take regionally and locally to reduce and manage risks? ART is following a 4-step process with funding from NOAA, FHWA, MTC and ICLEI. The project Working Group is made up of a broad range of stakeholders who provide advice and feedback.

ART has analyzed 12 key asset categories (parks, airports, roads, etc.) in the target areas, looking at them individually and how they relate to each other. This impacts assessment

phase is now completed. In addition, there have been other complementary project activities. MTC, Caltrans, and BCDC have analyzed the vulnerability of the ground transportation system. The Pacific Institute has conducted an analysis of social vulnerability and demographics. ERG has conducted an economic analysis of the loss of park and recreation resources. BCDC is developing white papers on equity issues and governance issues in relationship to sea level rise and storm events.

Now, ART is moving into the assessment phase to look at projected impacts, vulnerabilities and risks. ART is using 6 climate scenarios and two sea level rise projections—16 inches and 55 inches. Five impacts are being studied—more frequent flooding, longer duration of flood events, more frequent and permanent inundation, overtopping of shoreline protection, and groundwater salinity intrusion. New maps have been developed for the project that show high tide and storm event flooding with 16 inches and 55 inches of sea level rise.

Next steps will include issuing the draft report in June, developing draft strategies and options this summer, and developing adaptation strategy options in the fall. More information on the project is available at www.adaptingtorisingtides.org.

In discussion, members of the Committee considered a number of issues:

- Mr. Spring stated that sea level rise is going to be incremental over time. It is not going to happen tomorrow. This is a long-term strategy that we are considering.
- Ms. Lowe replied that the issue is damage from storm events combined with sea level rise. Sea level rise will increase the impact of storm events. The real issue is 20-30 years from now. We have time, but we need to plan now. One of the things the current project is doing is identifying weak points for our preparedness along the shoreline.
- Mr. Spring stated his concern that this was presented as alarmist. We must present it as a long-term strategy to get more public support.
- Mr. Green asked why we are using projections for 16 inches and 55 inches and not also something in the middle.
- Ms. Lowe replied that there will be soon be a sea level rise viewer where you can choose a number along a gradient, not just two points (16 and 55) on that gradient. These were the available numbers, based on state guidance, that were used to develop the current maps.
- Mr. Wasserman congratulated the BCDC staff for this collaborative approach and stated that it is just what the region needs. This project will become the poster child for actions we need to take. It is not something that will just sit on the shelf, but will be an action plan for the Bay Area. We must plan now for the future.
- Mr. Mar noted that San Francisco is using much higher projections for sea level rise and would like to get better data from BCDC.
- Ms. Lowe replied that the methodology used for ART, while being applied now to the East Bay, could be helpful to other counties.
- Mr. Goldbeck stated that sea level rise is projected to increase slowly to mid-century, but then it is projected to accelerate after 2050. We don't have to worry about the major impacts today, but we need to start planning for them.

5. Report on JPC Responsibilities, Programs and Projects

Will Travis, JPC Consultant, provided a briefing on four topics:

- Coordination and Conflict Resolution
- Criteria for Selecting Projects and Initiatives
- Joint Policy Committee and Regional Planning Committee Roles and Responsibilities
- Engagement with the Business Community

Mr. Travis explained the consultant recommendations for each topic contained in the staff memo on pages 14-21 of the May 18 agenda packet.

Consultant's Recommendation #1: We recommend that the JPC endorse these six criteria for selecting projects and initiatives the Committee will take on.

Consultant's Recommendation #2: 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.

Consultant's Recommendation #3: 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.

In discussion, members of the Committee considered one issue:

- Mr. Green stated that the business community should be at the JPC table, not just meeting with us periodically.
- Mr. Bates replied that he will take that issue to the Executive Committee for discussion.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the three recommendations in the staff memo. The motion was passed unanimously.

6. Progress Report on Joint Policy Committee Projects

Bay Area Economic Development Strategy

Sean Randolph, Bay Area Council Economic Institute, made a presentation to update the JPC on the conclusion of the first phase of the economic development strategy project. The BACEI is now completing its work on the data analysis section of the study. Preliminary findings entitled "Bay Area Business Dynamics: Current State of Business in the Region" have been produced and were reviewed with study's Advisory Committee on May 7 and 8. The analysis looks at employment, business demographics, venture capital, business dynamics, labor pool, and economic futures. Mr. Randolph explained the methodology used to-date and reviewed some of the key findings. The full report will be presented and

discussed at the July JPC meeting. This work will also provide foundation material for the upcoming Prosperity Plan.

In discussion, members of the Committee considered a number of issues:

- Mr. Gioia asked about the findings related to job loss and regulatory issues.
- Mr. Randolph replied that there is good data on this in the survey results.
- Mr. Green asked why 2008 data was used. He would like to get the full slide deck.
- Mr. Randolph replied that the study uses the latest data available.
- Mr. Bates asked if there is data on the number of people working at home.
- Mr. Randolph replied that they do not have that data but many of the one and two-person businesses shown in the slides are working at home.
- Mr. Ross stated that he is very interested in the large and growing number of people who are working at home and that this trend is usually underestimated in these types of studies.
- Mr. Randolph replied that he would try to get that data.

Bay Area Climate and Energy Resilience Project

Bruce Riordan, JPC Climate Strategist, briefly updated the JPC on the project. There will be a half-day workshop on June 7th in the Metro Center auditorium. A major national foundation has invited the JPC to apply for a planning grant. JPC consultants are in discussions with UC Berkeley on creating a “Do-Tank” on Bay Area adaptation issues. We have formed an alliance with adaptation collaborations in Los Angeles, San Diego, and Sacramento, along with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. Mr. Riordan outlined the major challenges that these activities are attempting to address. A 3-part report will be published on research, projects, and potential strategies will be published in June.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at Noon.