

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter – Auditorium

101 8th Street, Oakland, California

March 12, 2012

Members Present:

Susan Adams, Supervisor, County of Marin
Linda Craig, League of Women Voters Bay Area
Diane Dillon, Supervisor, County of Napa
Pat Eklund, Councilmember, City of Novato
Mark Green, Mayor, City of Union City/ABAG Immediate Past President
Scott Haggerty, Supervisor, County of Alameda
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club
Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor, City of Pleasanton
Janet Kennedy, Councilmember, City of Martinez
Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez, Director of Government Affairs, City of San Francisco
Mark Luce, Supervisor, County of Napa/**ABAG President**
Jeremy Madsen, Executive Director, Greenbelt Alliance
Nate Miley, Supervisor, County of Alameda
Nancy Nadel, Councilmember, City of Oakland
Julie Pierce, Vice Mayor, City of Clayton/**ABAG Vice President**
A. Sepi Richardson, Councilmember, City of Brisbane/**RPC Vice Chair**
Mark Ross, Councilmember, City of Martinez
Pixie Hayward Schickele, California Teachers Association
Linda Seifert, Supervisor, County of Solano
Carol Severin, EBRPD Board of Directors
Allen Fernandez Smith, President & CEO, Urban Habitat

Members Absent:

Shiloh Ballard, Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Andy Barnes, Policy Chair, Urban Land Institute
Valerie Brown, Supervisor, County of Sonoma
Ronit Bryant, Councilmember, City of Mountain View
Paul Campos, Sr. Vice President of Government Affairs, BIA Bay Area
Dave Cortese, Supervisor, County of Santa Clara/**RPC Chair**
Rose Jacobs Gibson, Supervisor, County of San Mateo
Andrew Michael, Bay Area Council
Anu Natarajan, Councilmember, City of Fremont
Harry Price, Mayor, City of Fairfield
Laurel Prevetti, Bay Area Planning Directors Association (BAPDA)
Tiffany Renee, Councilmember, City of Petaluma
Jim Spring, Supervisor, County of Solano
Egon Terplan, Regional Planning Director, SPUR
Beth Walukas, Alameda County Transportation Commission
Gayle Uilkema, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Staff Present:

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director
Miriam Chion, ABAG Principal Planner
Dayle Farina, ABAG Administrative Assistant

1. Call to Order/Introductions

- Vice Chair Richardson called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM.

2. Public Comment

Committee Member Eklund reported that the Novato City Council's agenda for their next meeting, there is a letter to be signed by the Mayor which requests a peer review by ABAG and MTC of the economic basis for the SCS.

3. Approval of Minutes for December 7, 2011

2 Corrections were brought to the table by staff; Committee Member Hosterman was noted as absent—she was present. The meeting was adjourned at 2:56 pm and adjournment time recorded was 3:56 pm.

Approval of the corrected minutes was moved by Committee Member Eklund and seconded by Committee Member Pierce.

Minutes of October 5, 2011, were approved as corrected.

4. Oral Reports/Comments

A. Committee Members

Committee Member Nadel raised concerns over the numbers coming out of the housing methodology.

Committee Member Adams would like bring the comments received from the City of Palo Alto on the housing methodology, to the Executive Board.

Committee Member Dillon passed out copies of a letter, addressed to Mr. Kirkey, regarding Housing Methodology Numbers.

.

B. Staff

5. INFORMATION: Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) draft Preferred Land Use Scenario

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Ken Kirkey, Director, ABAG Planning and Research, presented and sought input on the draft Jobs-Housing Connection Scenario for the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in compliance with Senate Bill 375 (SB 375)

Vice Chair Richardson requested that when power points are being presented that they be posted on the website prior to the meeting.

Vice Chair Richardson reminded committee members that this is an information item and that no action is required at this time.

Committee Member Hosterman asked if there is more data about employment information and the background of said information, available online.

Miriam Chion, ABAG Assistant Planning Director, responded that the spreadsheets, which indicate how the job growth was allocated, will be posted online. There is also a summary of the information in the appendix of the report.

Committee Member Hosterman's jurisdiction passed Measure D, keeping them out of the development arena. How does this work with the now increasing RHNA numbers?

Mr. Kirkey responded that RHNA assumptions, such as this one, need to be fixed in the SCS Scenario, not in the RHNA Methodology. Additional comments on items like this will be helpful in achieving this.

Committee Member Eklund asked that if the Board is approving the draft preferred scenario in May, how will they respond to additional community input *before* the release of the Draft SCS in November.

Mr. Kirkey responded that Draft SCS is the revision, which would include community input.

Ms. Eklund raised that the economic report done by Stephen Levy was not posted online.

Mr. Kirkey responded that this report is part of the information, referred to by Ms. Chion, which will be posted in the next week.

Ms. Eklund also raised the issue of RHNA credit and how it is being used in the formula for the methodology. She asked that staff take a look at this prior to the next Housing Methodology Committee meeting.

Committee Member Dillon asked how to convey to her constituents that she will be influencing change in the draft documents of the SCS.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Mr. Kirkey responded that, through September, there should be time to develop venues in each county for additional input.

Committee Member Madsen raised concern over planning for housing production in order to accommodate jobs projected and where the housing may end up being produced.

Committee Member Adams raised that if we're looking at the Green House Gas element of SB 375, what will happen to the numbers when the population has more electric vehicle, solar energy, etc. Also with the growth of the population there will be more VMT. However, what kind of cars will there be and are we addressing VMT in an environment where transit is always losing funding.

Ms. Adams also raised concern over communicating to local government as well as the public, what the SCS is and why we are focusing on this effort, in a clear and concise manner. She commented that if we are still getting questions from the public after that, then perhaps we need to go back to the State and let them know the concerns we are running into at a local level.

Committee Member Ross asked if home offices are being factored into this information and what that means in terms of housing numbers as well as jobs, (i.e. delivery jobs, etc.). What assumptions were made?

Ms. Chion responded that we do not have the specific percent but that the same ratio was used for people telecommuting as for the rest of the jobs. Specifics for share of telecommuting can be obtained.

Mr. Ross responded that the numbers should go beyond telecommuting to full-time home office workers. How does this affect the housing numbers?

Mr. Kirkey responded that the transportation assumptions include a higher percentage model of home office workers, but the specifics are not readily available. He added that he would have to get back to the committee on these specifics. Mr. Kirkey added that other criteria considered in the report are increase in retirees, demographic changes & cultural diversity.

Committee Member Luce would like to see a peer review, perhaps by the Bay Area Council's Economic Institute. Mr. Luce added that he would like to focus on the State's allocation. Are the numbers we are allocated by the state, true and reasonable?

Vice Chair Richardson commented that transparency and honesty and very important to make the message clear to the public.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

ACTION: Priority Development Area Applications Received and Recommendations

Ken Kirkey, Director, ABAG Planning and Research, presented a summary of the applications received for Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and their recommended approval of all proposed PDAs except for Rural Town Centers and Employment Centers, which were proposed for deferral until June 2012.

Committee Member Haggerty asked for clarification; are the items on the list (pages 1-6 specifically Alameda County) being recommended for adoption?

Mr. Kirkey confirmed that these are the items being recommended for adoption.

Committee Member Eklund asked Mr. Kirkey to go through the list 1-by-1 to get more clarity on which PDA applications were the changes in the recommendations.

Mr. Kirkey read the list of applications, by page, which is being recommended for deferral.

Committee Member Madsen expressed his opinion on opposing the Employment Center and Rural PDA applications and would like to suggest deferral on all of the applications until further background information is provided.

Mr. Madsen also raised awareness to a letter from Greenbelt and other organizations, which voice similar concerns.

Committee Member Seifert expressed surprise over the deferral for the City of Benicia PDA and asked for explanation as to why it was placed on the deferral list and requested it be returned to the approval list.

Mr. Kirkey explained that the reasoning had very little to do with the application and much to do with it being part of a new place type, which has raised questions. The two place types being recommended for deferral just need better clarification brought to them before proceeding with approval.

Committee Member Craig raised the possibility of changing the name from Priority Development Area for the two place types in question. She also expressed concern about the possible financial benefit of applying for a PDA.

Committee Member Dillon expressed reticence in putting forth a blanket approval for all applications without seeing background information on each of them. She also expressed concern over the possibly lack of understanding by the City of Napa related to how having PDAs would affect their housing numbers and recommends that they be deferred until Napa has the opportunity to respond to the RHNA numbers projections released last week.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Luce agreed with Committee Member Dillon's recommendation on deferring the Napa PDA applications for further discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Lennie Roberts from the Committee for Green Foothills spoke in favor of deferring consideration of Midcoast PDA application.

Mike Ferreira, Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter spoke in favor of deferring consideration of Midcoast PDA application as well as Sonoma County.

Gary Rannefeld, Solano County Taxpayers Association, spoke in opposition of the Dixon PDA application.

Shirley Humphrey, Private resident of Dixon, spoke in opposition of the Dixon PDA application.

Ginger Emerson, Old Town Neighbors in Dixon, CA, spoke in opposition of the Dixon PDA application.

Charlie Knox, Community Development Director, Benicia, CA, spoke in favor of proceeding with the adoption of the City of Benicia PDA application.

Mr. Kirkey asked to clarify that the input for designations of Rural Center Corridor and Employment Center place types came from the local jurisdictions. They felt as if they were being left out of the regional picture; that the regional picture was exclusively urban-focused.

Vice Chair Richardson asked for explanation for not receiving background information on these PDA applications.

Mr. Kirkey responded that, given the number of applications, it was felt that summary of the applications meeting the criteria might be better received than the high volume of information involved in so many applications.

Committee Member Pierce asked if there is urgency involved in making this decision now or could the background information be reviewed by committee members and brought back to the committee in June.

Mr. Kirkey responded that it would still be workable for the deferral on the small number of PDAs recommended for deferral in terms of re-allocation for the RHNA and One Bay Area Grant.

Committee Member Pierce suggests that the item and recommendation of adoption be deferred until June.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Eklund feels that the Rural designations should be examined regardless of their location in incorporated or unincorporated areas of a county.

Committee Member Dillon moved that consideration of any Rural Center/Rural Corridor place type be deferred to June and unincorporated Employment Center place types to June and the other items be deferred to April.

Committee Member Pierce seconded the motion.

Committee Member Haggerty commented that, specific to the Dixon opposition, it is a local issue. We have to rely on the local jurisdictions having done their due diligence to bring the resolution to the table.

Committee Member Madsen requested that the full applications be made available to committee members.

Committee Member Eklund asked for amendment to the motion to include all Employment Centers.

Committee Member Green does not think that those without opposition or not in those place types be approved today and would like motion amended as such.

Committee Member Seifert asked what the process will be to resolve the issues which are controversial.

Mr. Kirkey responded that, if the motion passes, the issue will be brought to the Executive Board on Thursday with the recommendation to defer these issues until June.

Vice Chair Richardson asked Committee Member Green to restate his amended motion.

Unless it is designated at Rural Town Center, Rural Corridor or Employment Center, the items should be approved today. All previously stated items will be deferred until the first Wednesday in June, 2012.

The motion carried with one negative vote.

ADJOURN:

Vice Chair Richardson adjourned the meeting at 3:25 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for February 1, 2011 with the possibility of rescheduling it to April 4, 2012.

Submitted by:

Dayle Farina

Administrative Assistant