

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter – Auditorium

101 8th Street, Oakland, California

June 1, 2011

Members Present:

Susan Adams, Supervisor, County of Marin, ABAG Vice President
Andy Barnes, Policy Chair, Urban Land Institute
Patricia Boyle, Bay Area League of Women Voters
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
Pat Eklund, Councilmember, City of Novato
Mark Green, Mayor, City of Union City/ABAG President
Scott Haggerty, Supervisor, County of Alameda
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club
Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez, Director of Government Affairs, City of San Francisco
Jeremy Madsen, Executive Director, Greenbelt Alliance
Andrew Michael, Bay Area Council
Nate Miley, Supervisor, County of Alameda
Ross Mirkarimi, Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco
Nancy Nadel, Councilmember, City of Oakland
Julie Pierce, Vice Mayor, City of Clayton
Laurel Prevetti, Bay Area Planning Directors Association (BAPDA)
Harry Price, Mayor, City of Fairfield
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
Jim Spering, Supervisor, County of Solano
Egon Terplan, Regional Planning Director, SPUR
Gayle Uilkema, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa
Beth Walukas, Alameda County Transportation Commission

Members Absent:

Shiloh Ballard, Silicon Valley Leadership Group
Valerie Brown, Supervisor, County of Sonoma
Diane Dillon, Supervisor, County of Napa
Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor, City of Pleasanton
Rose Jacobs Gibson, Supervisor, County of San Mateo/ABAG Immediate Past President
Janet Kennedy, Councilmember, City of Martinez
Mark Landman, Councilmember, City of Cotati
Connie Galambos Malloy, Director of Programs, Urban Habitat
Anu Natarajan, Councilmember, City of Fremont
Carol Severin, EBRPD Board of Directors

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Staff Present:

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director

Miriam Chion, ABAG Principal Planner

Danielle Hutchings, Program Coordinator, ABAG Earthquake & Hazards Program

Dayle Farina, ABAG Administrative Assistant

1. Call to Order/Introductions

- Chair Cortese called the meeting to order at 1:12 PM.
- Chair Cortese introduced new member, Laurel Prevetti, Assistant Director, Planning, Building & Code Enforcement, City of San Jose; representing BAPDA.
- Chair Cortese thanked Charlie Knox, former BAPDA representative for his two years of service to this Committee.

2. Public Comment

3. Approval of Minutes for April 6, 2011 Meeting.

Approval of the minutes was moved by Committee Member Holtzclaw and seconded by Committee Member Price.

Minutes of April 6, 2011, were approved as submitted.

4. Oral Reports/Comments

A. Committee Members

Chair Cortese brought to the attention of the Committee members the annual ABAG Growing Smarter Together Awards and the details involved in the application process. He encouraged the members of the Committee to promote the awards. Ongoing reminders of these awards will continue frequently during the year.

Committee Member Adams announced the appointment of new Marin County Supervisor Kate Sears, to replace Supervisor Charles McGlashen, who passed away recently.

Committee Member Eklund commented that at the last RPC meeting she expressed interest in having a discussion on Assembly Bill 1103. She asked how items are added to an RPC agenda as she would like to see it added to a future agenda.

In addition, Committee Member Eklund described a Transit Oriented Development (TOD)-related study describing that TOD development sometimes results in negative environmental impacts. This was raised at a recent Marin County forum by the Marin Conservation League. Ms. Eklund suggested discussing this item during an RPC meeting.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Mr. Kirkey responded that Assembly Bill 1103 went before the ABAG Legislative Committee and they recommended approval. Legislation is not typically discussed at the Regional Planning Committee, since ABAG has a Legislative and Governmental Organization (L&GO) Committee. However, at the next Executive Board it will be discussed and staff will be updated on the progress as well as the Housing Methodology. He recommended bringing the update of the Housing Methodology to the August RPC meeting, and including AB 1103 as a piece of that update.

Mr. Kirkey reminded Committee members that Senate Bill 375 and the Sustainable Communities Strategy is a law and that there are not options relative to this law. We are required to implement an SCS under that law.

B. Staff

There were no reports from staff.

5. INFORMATION: Next Steps in Recovery Planning

Danielle Hutchings, ABAG Earthquakes and Hazards Program Coordinator, presented information on the next steps in the regional recovery planning process.

Ms. Hutchings encouraged Committee members to attend and invite City/County Staff to attend the “Shaken Awake” workshop on June 13.

Ms. Hutchings announced the release of the Regional Resilience Initiative and presented information on the program and proposed formation of a Resilience Council.

Chair Cortese asked if there is a way that the nine counties could appoint a representative to the Resilience Council rather than making a sub-committee from the RPC. Perhaps people with more expertise related to disaster recovery.

Ms. Hutchings responded that the RPC was a natural fit simply due to the broad geographic representation of its members.

Chair Cortese added that he would like to see a “sub-committee” of the RPC which does not encompass the entire RPC membership.

Committee Member Haggerty asked if it is the intent of the Hazards Program to expand the focus to include disasters other than earthquakes.

Ms. Hutchings responded that the intent is to indeed expand the program to include other disasters, although she stated that recovery planning for other disasters would be similar to earthquakes in most cases.

Mr. Haggerty recommended exploring the possibility of being more involved in Urban Shield. Mr. Haggerty also recommended preparing for other disasters such as terrorist attacks.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Ms. Hutchings responded in agreement stating that long term recovery for a terrorist attack would be very similar to that of an earthquake.

Committee Member Richardson suggested taking a count, by county, to find how many RPC members are interested. If the interest is not strong from the RPC, then perhaps we could open the group up to other appropriate parties from the counties, such as the Emergency Preparedness Coordinator.

Committee Member Adams supported the comments from Mr. Haggerty about having the Resilience Action Plan include other disasters like terrorism and pandemic. Ms. Adams asked if the issue papers referred to in the presentation, have the most critical issues listed in them.

Ms. Hutchings responded that they are short papers which have high-level outlines. At the end of the papers there are recommendations which can be taken on at a regional basis.

Committee Member Bryant voiced concern about the lack of information seemingly being distributed to the local jurisdictions and recommended involving some representatives from the local jurisdictions as members of the Resilience Council.

Ms. Hutchings responded that the Council would be comprised of elected leadership and some key stakeholders. There would then be a broad-based partnership with the experts from cities and counties, utilities, non-profits and business to round out the efforts on regional issues.

Ms. Bryant commented that it would be helpful to have this charted on paper in a way that would make it easier to understand who the players would be in this effort.

Committee Member Holtzclaw recommended including the media into the partnership.

Committee Member Uilkema noted there is expertise within each county, who are already involved in a similar effort for each county. She also would like to see a call for expertise, (i.e. doctors, veterinarians, etc.) after the initial meeting of the Council.

Committee Member Green asked for clarification on the specifics about the composition of the Council.

Ezra Rapport, ABAG Executive Director, responded that out of SB 1205 came the desire for a Policy Board for proactive planning purposes, which would be the Resilience Council. The Resilience Council will be comprised of the RPC with four additional members representing utilities, hospitals, universities and mass care/social services. Under the Resilience Council would be a sub-structure with a broad set of stakeholders.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Green asked, additionally, what the process for appointing members of the sub-structure groups will be.

Ms. Hutchings responded that there would be a call for volunteers rather than an appointment process. The actual structure has not been resolved.

Committee Member Madsen commented that he would agree that too much involvement with the RPC could take focus away from the SCS.

Committee Member Miley agrees that the region is not as prepared as we should be. The Resilience Council needs to be focused on the aftermath rather than other items. Resilience includes the intangibles as well and Mr. Miley recommends including the Faith communities and schools, for example, and making the Resilience Council even broader to include those softer components of the region.

Committee Member Price commented that the Contingency Response Wing at Travis Air Force Base is one of the more experienced resources available in the Bay Area.

Committee Member Ross suggested that the basic expectation and knowledge of the public may be just as important as that of infrastructure, deployment, and technical aspects of recovery.

Committee Member Haggerty suggested that additional members of the Resilience Council might be a Fire Chief and a County Sherriff.

Committee Member Pierce asked for clarification; that what we are discussing is building on what's been done by others for the initial disaster response. What we're planning is the long term recovery with this Resilience Council and that the RPC expanded committee would be the Policy Board. There would be sub-sets of others who would feed information to the policy makers to make the decisions.

Committee Member Green raised the issue of diversity in the Bay Area. The Bay Area has a constant influx of people who don't know what to expect with any disaster, let alone an earthquake.

Mr. Kirkey thanked the Committee for their input and reminded the Committee that staff will be sending a survey to the Committee Members for more input from them which will be reviewed at the July Executive Board meeting.

6. INFORMATION: Sustainable Communities Strategy – Alternative Scenarios Concepts

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Ken Kirkey, ABAG, Planning Director provided an update on the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and an overview on the development of the proposed Alternative Scenarios Concepts.

Committee Member Adams raised a question on Slide 6. In the Initial Vision Scenario, housing targets were met but not targets for greenhouse gases (GHG). The GHG targets are not addressed in the other scenarios. Will the GHG targets be met in the other scenarios?

Mr. Kirkey responded that the Initial Vision Scenario is the only scenario which is completed. In that scenario we were able to meet the housing targets but not the GHG targets. We reached 12 percent but not the 15 percent target. Scenarios 2-5 are scenarios going forward; we are working toward meeting the GHG targets and in scenarios 3-5 given constraints it is possible that we will not make the housing targets which would mean that we could not meet the GHG targets through housing exclusively.

Committee Member Campos asked if the data is isolated by variable according to individual impact in terms of GHG and other targets.

Mr. Kirkey responded that this slide is not showing this alignment of data. He explained that it is important to understand the implications of land use development patterns before applying the appropriate transportation measures to support the land use development patterns.

Mr. Campos suggested showing how transportation investments, as a variable, as well as Transportation Demand Management (TDM), impacts the GHG reduction for each of the five scenarios relative to the three different variables.

Committee Member Eklund asked, relative to the Policy Initiative, what CARB (California Air Resources Board) is assuming in terms of electric vehicles? Are you assuming that we will go beyond that in the region?

Mr. Kirkey responded that he understands that electric vehicles can be included as part of the progress. It will take time for electric vehicles to take up a huge share of the region's fleet.

Committee Member Prevetti proposed that if we are trying to drive sustainable development more toward the inner bay area, our analytical time would be better spent considering an alternative that puts growth where it makes more sense? She would rather see a hybrid between land use Option 2 and 3 as opposed to Option 5.

Ms. Prevetti was surprised not to see road pricing initiatives and strategies in the Policy Initiative.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Mr. Kirkey commented that pricing will be included broadly and road pricing will be part of that.

Committee Member Bryant expressed concern over the aggressive schedule. She wondered if the process is moving forward without the input from local jurisdictions since City of Mountain View, for example, just heard the presentation of the Initial Vision Scenario one week ago.

Mr. Kirkey responded that, as this process moves forward, and into the Fall, he believes the local jurisdictions will see that their input was included and it will be part of the discussion going forward as a preferred scenario is adopted.

Ms. Bryant added that she is hoping that there will be transportation options, with price tags, evaluated.

Mr. Kirkey responded that they will be released in the coming months. There is a OneBayArea Block Grant proposal, which will tie some of the discretionary funding in the Regional Transportation Plan to development.

Committee Member Madsen asked if he understood correctly that the modeling-related chart was saying the majority of GHG reductions are coming from land use and pieces from T-2035 and transit expansion. If so, what did we learn from the modeling from the Initial Vision Scenario?

Mr. Kirkey responded that the Initial Vision Scenario assessment was missing some key components which will be included in the other scenarios going forward.

Mr. Madsen asked about percentages on the related chart; Is transportation 8-9 percent and the remaining 3-4 percent is the other two criteria?

Mr. Kirkey responded that the additional split of the forecast is a mix between the additional land use and transportation.

Mr. Madsen commented that he would like one of the alternative scenarios to specifically state that no open space should be developed. He called attention to the note under policy issues asking if transportation improvements are affordable which support land use patterns and commented that, as a region, we should be thinking about how we can best plan for the transportation expansion needed to support the projected growth of an additional two million people.

Committee Member Ross stated that, since a large percentage of the GHG emissions in our region comes from automobiles, there should be a price for carbon. Within the Alternative Scenarios, there should be the ability for a Carbon Pricing Scenario, (i.e., local jurisdictions could be afforded a credit for having a housing element which decreases GHG or be charged for it if their housing element increases it.)

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Uilkema asked if we envision additional workplaces being located in Priority Development Areas. Has this been in the plan or are we assuming something else (i.e., are we assuming that existing workplaces will grow? Or are we assuming that the workplace is part of this plan in any form?)

Mr. Kirkey responded that the work on employment has been forecast-based. Prior to this process commencing we reduced the jobs forecast. We will be planning for new employment in PDAs.

Committee Member Nadel commented that Oakland is creating a Climate Action Plan with GHG goals higher than the Region's. It would be helpful if there was a region-wide understanding of each city's GHG goals to see how it relates to the SCS planning.

Mr. Kirkey responded that many Climate Action Plans have no connection to SB 375 and what we are trying to accomplish. There is an effort, with which ABAG is involved, in assisting with Climate Action Plans and assessing them to bring back more information about how they are incorporating land use.

Committee Member Terplan asked if ABAG will be addressing the question about enough land for both housing and jobs to be projected in the PDAs.

Mr. Kirkey responded that this is an important criteria to include in the analysis and will definitely be included going forward.

Mr. Terplan commented that shifting jobs to the outer bay area may not address the commute area as many people commuting distances are going to jobs only available in the inner bay area.

Committee Member Terplan asked why shouldn't all the Scenarios meet the housing target and meet the GHG target.

Mr. Kirkey responded that even with adjustments made, based on the Census, the housing target number is based on need for population growth. The federal government requires the numbers to be realistic in the SCS or it will cause trouble for the Region in the Regional Transportation Plan.

At this time Chair Cortese took a poll to see how many committee members would like Item 7 presented today. There was much discussion and it was agreed that some could stay to see the presentation and ask questions, since Committee Member and Vice Chair Richardson was available to chair the meeting. The presentation, along with the narrative and notes will be posted on the web to give other Members the opportunity to respond.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Adams added that she felt that it would be helpful to have historic projections “superimposed” over the actuals for the same year, added to the presentation. This would show the accuracy of the projections.

7. INFORMATION: Regional Economic Analysis – Sustainable Communities Strategy

Miriam Chion, Principal Planner, provided an overview of employment and economic trends that will help inform the development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Committee Member Green commented that the area on the map in San Ramon showing as Manufacturing is actually distribution. No Manufacturing is located in the noted area and he feels this information is misleading.

Ms. Chion clarified that the map is still showing information aggregated by zip code and/or by jurisdiction. The new database will show data being reported by establishment, so there will be more specific information available the next time the information is reported.

Committee Member Terplan added that this particular map is showing a sector rather than an occupation.

Mr. Terplan commented that some portion of the Health and Education as well as the Leisure/Hospitality sectors are clearly locally focused, as noted on the last slide, but some are export-oriented or are regional serving. He asked why we wouldn't want to split the data between the two.

Mr. Terplan also asked for an explanation of the categories. Is this aggregating the industries into four different colors?

Ms. Chion confirmed this and stated that this is employment data. For example, in the regional centers for office employment, which includes professional services, financial services, information-based services, is the highest component of regional centers.

Committee Member Nadel brought up the Bay Area Renaissance Council which focuses on succession planning.

Committee Member Eklund raised the point that more and more private sector companies have work from home programs and thinks that the analysis should include these numbers as well as satellite workspaces.

Ms. Chion responded that the next data being reported will be capturing this information.

Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Bryant commented that it would be helpful to have the slides which show the number of people who actually live in these places to find the gap between employment vs. residents.

Committee Member Pierce asked what kind of information is being received from the jurisdictions on the Initial Vision Scenario relating to the place types they are placing in their PDAs and Growth Opportunity Areas. She would like to see where the PDA and GOAs project the jobs and housing on a map.

Ms. Chion responded that we have a bigger zoning envelope for employment and business location than we have for housing. We currently have about half of the employment where we only have about one-third of the housing within PDAs. Most of the cities have accounted for employment within the PDAs.

ADJOURN:

Vice Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:35 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled on June 1, 2011

Submitted by:

Dayle Farina

Administrative Assistant