

SUMMARY MINUTES (DRAFT)

ABAG Regional Planning Committee Meeting
Wednesday, September 14, 2016

375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, San Francisco, California 94105

1. CALL TO ORDER

Pradeep Gupta, Chair and Vice Mayor, City of South San Francisco, called the meeting of the Regional Planning Committee of the Association of Bay Area Governments to order at 1:03 PM

A quorum of the committee was present.

Members Present

Jurisdiction

Mark Boucher	BAFPAA
Desley Brooks	Councilmember, City of Oakland
Diane Burgis	East Bay Regional Park District
Paul Campos	Senior Vice President, Government Affairs, Building Industry Association
Tilly Chang	Executive Director, SFCTA County of San Francisco
Cindy Chavez	Supervisor, County of Santa Clara
Julie Combs	Councilmember, City of Santa Rosa (Vice Chair)
Diane Dillon	Supervisor, County of Napa
Pat Eklund	Mayor, City of Novato
Karen Engel	Director of Economic and Workforce Development, Peralta Community College
Martin Engelmann	Deputy Executive Director of Planning, Contra Costa Transportation Agency
Pradeep Gupta	Vice Mayor, City of South San Francisco (Chair)
Scott Haggerty	Supervisor, County of Alameda
Russell Hancock	President & CEO, Joint Venture Silicon Valley
Erin Hannigan	Supervisor, County of Solano
John Holtzclaw	Sierra Club
Melissa Jones	Executive Director BARHII, Public Health
Mark Luce	Supervisor, County of Napa
Eric Mar	Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco
Karen Mitchoff	Supervisor, County of Contra Costa
Julie Pierce	Councilmember, City of Clayton (ABAG President)
Katie Rice	Supervisor, County of Marin
Carlos Romero	Urban Ecology
Al Savay	Community & Economic Dev. Director, City of San Carlos (BAPDA)
Kirsten Spalding	Executive Director SMCUCA
James P. Spering	Supervisor, County of Solano
Egon Terplan	Planning Director, SPUR
Monica E. Wilson	Councilmember, City of Antioch

Members Absent

Nancy Ianni
Michael Lane

Jeremy Madsen
Nate Miley
Carmen Montano
Anu Natarajan
Harry Price
David Rabbitt
Matt Regan
Mark Ross
Jill Techel
Dyan Whyte

Jurisdiction

League of Women Voters--Bay Area
Policy Director, Non-Profit Housing Association of
Northern California
Executive Director, Greenbelt Alliance
Supervisor, County of Alameda
Vice Mayor, City of Milpitas
Director of Policy and Advocacy, MidPen Housing
Mayor, City of Fairfield
Supervisor, County of Sonoma (ABAG Vice President)
Senior Vice President of Public Policy, Bay Area Council
Councilmember, City of Martinez
Mayor, City of Napa
Assist. Exc. Officer, San Francisco Regional Waterboard

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was public comment by Jerry Grace from People First, San Pablo, CA.

3. APROVAL OF REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 1, 2016

Chair Gupta recognized a motion by **Member Mitchoff**, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa, and seconded by **Member Holtzclaw**, Sierra Club, to approve the Regional Planning Committee (RPC) minutes of June 1, 2016.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Member Combs announced the Housing Subcommittee Meeting at 3:00 PM following the RPC Meeting.

5. SESSION OVERVIEW BY MIRIAM CHION, ABAG PLANNING AND RESEARCH DIRECTOR

Ms. Chion, Director of Planning and Research at ABAG, gave an overview of the meeting and future plans and schedules.

Chair Gupta asked Committee Members to introduce the three RPC Subcommittees.

Chair Gupta said the Economic Strategy Subcommittee had two meetings. He noticed between meeting one and meeting two that there was an increase of interest and strong attendance that enabled a great conversation about long-term and short-term issues related to economic development for the whole region. It was a very productive meeting

with diverse perspectives from business, economists, housing, and workers. It will be very beneficial for the RPC, and for future regional planning at MTC and ABAG.

Member Chang expressed appreciation for staff and Chair Gupta for having a very well-rounded conversation. All of the right people were at the table at these meetings, a lot of those interests were represented. There was a definite interest to engage local jurisdictions at a later stage.

Chair Gupta said staff from the U.S. Economic Development Department said the discussion was the best they ever heard from a group preparing that kind of study.

Member Spalding said this is going to be a useful process not simply for creating an economic development district, but it is also a forum for robust conversation about our priorities and our vision around economic development for the region.

Chair Gupta asked **Member Mitchoff** to give a brief synopsis of the activities in the infrastructure subcommittee.

Member Mitchoff said there were two meetings, one in July and again this morning. The focus of these meetings has been around the resilience of water delivery and the removal of wastewater in the event of a catastrophe. They have a lot of the stakeholders at the table from water districts and sanitation districts, as well as participation from the U.S. Department of Homeland. **Member Boucher** from Contra Costa has been to both meetings as well.

Member Mitchoff went on to described the discussion as eye-opening, as the committee has explored the disconnect between local government staff and their utility partners. If the region experiences an earthquake, water districts will be triaging badly damaged water systems while cities try to provide temporary water. This could go on for weeks in many communities. In our day-to-day maintenance, more could be done to coordinate. It is a really fascinating conversation; and the committee wants to come back to you with some recommendations. The next meeting will be on October 12th to discuss the possible recommendation to be brought back to the RPC in December of a San Francisco Regional Lifelines Council.

On November 10th, ABAG will host the Bay Area Confluence, and **Member Mitchoff** encouraged RPC Committee Members, as elected officials, to attend.

Member Combs said the second housing subcommittee meeting will be after the RPC meeting. The committee is pursuing the three P's of housing: protection from displacement, preservation of existing housing units that are affordable, and production of new housing units and committee members are looking for high-impact, high-consensus items they can bring forward to help solve our regional housing crisis.

6. REGIONAL TRAILS AND OPEN SPACE

Information/ACTION

Laura Thompson, Bay Trail Project Manager at ABAG, reported on significant regional trail progress and highlighted gap closure projects that are well-positioned to receive funding from several sources.

Member Eklund asked to clarify whether approval for this item is of the list of projects or the process whereby each of the lead agencies would apply for the grants.

Ms. Thompson replied we are asking you to approve the strategy. The list will change over time as projects are completed or funded. We are looking for your feedback and support on this approach as a regional agency working with local jurisdictions to ensure that projects move forward.

Member Eklund asked for a definition of “lead agencies” and asked whether these lead agencies identify this segment of the Bay Trail that needs to be completed or is this what ABAG has identified.

Ms. Thompson answered that the lead agency is the land manager that would be responsible for applying for the grant and also as the agency that raises an interest in seeing the project completed.

Member Eklund asked if committee members want to work with the lead agency, can they ask for contact information from ABAG.

Ms. Thompson answered yes.

Member Rice said the strategy is to position all those projects around potential funding sources and identify those potential funding sources. It does not speak to prioritization, she asked is that a next step. Identifying criteria for prioritizing projects may help the region attract additional funding if the Bay Area can show there is agreement about regional priorities.

Ms. Thompson replied that could be a next step. Certainly there are some sections of the Bay Trail that would see a lot more use than others, and some sections of the Bay Trail where a lot of work has already been done and they are almost ready to go. Identifying criteria is a task that we could put some thought into. However, it is important to recognize that every gap is an important gap. Some projects will be ready to go quicker than you imagine. If we can frame it in a way that identifies how it might benefit the entire region, then we are not saying that the others are not important or are not eligible.

Member Rice agreed and said a prioritization list that is not static would be a good idea, and also recognizing when there are multiple projects of value applying for the Measure AA funds.

Member Burgis was really happy to see a lot of East Bay Regional Park District Projects listed. These water, hiking, and biking trails are very popular, not only for recreation, but they help create healthier communities. They are routes people use to get to work, for services that they need and recreation. East Bay Regional Park District is committed to helping find funding and they are really excited about Measure AA.

Member Pierce thanked Ms. Thompson for her guidance of this project and suggested adding an extra column for “potential resources” to the chart. Several counties have transportation measures on the ballot and local funding can be added as well. Almost all of them have trails as a category in their transportation measures. Together with East Bay Regional Parks they can get the trail approved in difficult places. There are other sources of funding; an "other" category would be helpful.

Member Spring said as future funding starts to become available he would like Bay Trail staff to consider a matching fund program for local jurisdictions. For certain segments, if the jurisdictions puts up fifty percent, Bay Trail puts up fifty percent. That will get twice as many projects done. It is something to be consider as it might stimulate some of the interest in the local jurisdictions.

Ms. Thompson took a moment to mention that Save the Bay is launching a new holiday about San Francisco Bay on October 1, 2016, called “Bay Day.” You can look at the website, www.bayday.org to find a list of events going on that day. She is working to get resolutions of support passed by all 109 cities and counties recognizing Bay Day and requested committee members’ help to make that happen.

Chair Gupta recognized a motion by **Member Mitchoff**, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa, and seconded by **Member Dillon**, Supervisor, County of Napa, to approve staff’s request for action for RPC feedback and support on this strategic approach to positioning key Bay and Water Trail projects for funding from multiple sources.

The motion passed unanimously.

7. PLAN BAY AREA 2040, DRAFT PREFERRED SCENARIO

Information

Miriam Chion, Planning and Research Director at ABAG, was joined by Ken Kirkey, Planning Director at MTC, to present the Draft Preferred Scenario, which includes the land use growth allocation, transportation investments, performance targets, and implementation policies and strategies.

After the presentation, **Chair Gupta** took public comments:

David Zisser of Public Advocates asked whether the Draft Preferred Scenario focuses growth in high opportunity cities or allocates it to places already vulnerable to gentrification, especially low-income African-American and Latino communities. He also asked how many households are likely to be displaced. He stated that inclusionary zoning is a strange, aspirational choice as a housing policy because of the Palmer decision, which makes this policy illegal for rental developments. Rent control and impact fees are more appropriate policies, and the upcoming Countywide housing bonds

could also be taken into account. He asked if there would be a meeting between the October 14 feedback deadline and the November 17 adoption target. He also asked for clarification about whether the implementation actions included in the packet would be part of the Plan, or just a supplement.

Josh Switsky of the San Francisco Planning Department indicated that he would like to provide an informed response to the Draft Preferred Scenario, but has not received information that has already been requested that would allow him to do that, including PDA-level allocations as well as sectoral breakdowns for jobs. He stated that October 14 is a very constrained deadline given that he has not received this material. He stated that San Francisco's housing numbers are ambitious and that the city does not want to be penalized for this if it does not reach these targets. He suggested financial support to provide front-end infrastructure for major projects such as Hunter's Point that are expected to take on a large share of San Francisco's growth, and that the implementation actions could reflect this need.

Chair Gupta then asked for comments from Committee Members:

Member Savay thanked ABAG and MTC staff for their hard work. He recognized the importance of reality checks based on specialized knowledge in our communities. There is a significant difference in the regional plan versus San Carlos' local land use plan. There is about 65 percent reduction in housing in the regional plan compared to our general plan and about a 40 percent reduction in jobs. He just heard from the public speaker that there is a 40 percent increase of housing in San Francisco. How did the model capture the local plans?

Mr. Kirkey said that in their regional plan and regional model, there is a lot of art, not just science. Looking at employment growth, most of the jurisdictions in the region are heavily zoned for employment growth. If the plan went with the local plans for employment it would go way beyond the regional control total. The model attempts to look at where growth has happened and how likely it is to happen in the future based upon the local plans and trends. We are not saying that the distribution is absolutely correct. We already found an error. We want input from local jurisdictions.

Member Savay asked how the model chooses housing over office development in a mixed use zone.

Mr. Kirkey replied that he cannot speak to that specifically. In general they try to look at local plans and projects approved in a given community.

Member Romero said that the presentation gave the perception that there is a machine back there that is turning out these numbers. In the previous plan there was significantly more conversation with local communities and plans. Still, one of the criticisms we had was that we failed in our public engagement. It is a concern that UrbanSim is producing and analyzing this scenario, prior to the local input. Menlo Park is considering approximately 6 million square feet in new development, 6,500 units of housing. This probably has not been calculated by UrbanSim because it is in a General Plan that has not been adopted yet. It is a concern that relying this deeply on UrbanSim is going to lead us to the same path that we wound up in last time. Local input is important. The other issue is the equity piece. It is very sad to see that we are moving backward on

housing plus transportation. What we are doing is not good enough. We have to figure out a way where communities of color can move up over these next 20 years. Displacement is a major issue even in communities that are producing 40 units of housing over 20 years.

Member Regan said the presentation was very informative and very sobering at the same time. He indicated that there is a good description of the problem: it is a critical supply problem in the Bay Area. There have been voices in the very recent past, whose solution to this problem is to stop economic growth. Groups like the RPC, that are tasked with regional planning, ought to take those messages and theology very seriously and be concerned about it. The reason for having regular revisions to Plan Bay Area is to look at lessons learned. With PDAs we should meet the targets by 80%, in 2035 we only met 53%.

Mr. Kirkey said this was a limited and focused update to Plan Bay Area. He indicated that UrbanSim output is based on inputs that people are putting into it, including input from local jurisdictions. He indicated that whether it is a regional plan or a local plan, it is only as good as the policies and the implementation actions that exist. The plan needs to be based on reality. Even with a higher level of growth, even with the changes you have identified, we still do poorly. Particularly for lower income households in this region. The Implementation Actions would require a lot more work.

Chair Gupta asked staff to take notes and respond to questions in writing after the meeting due to time.

Member Campos said the presentations were very informative. He asked for a breakdown of housing by ownership and rental.

Member Combs is concerned about how housing and job numbers will impact future RHNA numbers and how this is built on or not built on past planning. Even within this document there is a disconnect between employment and housing numbers and a disconnect between the projected salaries and the RHNA housing affordability requirements. She wanted to know the relationship between the salaries and housing cost. She also wanted to know how this plan either informs or affects grant funding and eligibility criteria, and how does the plan differ in those criteria with regard to big cities, key nodes, and small cities. There are substantial differences between Santa Rosa's plan and this plan but we do not have parcel-level data yet. It would be nice to receive parcel-level data in a timely manner so we can make comments about how the two plans interact. As another pitch for coming to the housing subcommittee meeting, looking at the equity issues and talking about an aggressive housing policy, we are trying to juggle an aggressive housing policy with high consensus, and that is often a very difficult thing to juggle. She is looking forward to the committee's help in the following meeting.

Mr. Kirkey mentioned that on Thursday September 15, 2016 there will be a meeting in Santa Rosa about the Plan Bay Area 2040 Draft Preferred Scenario.

Member Pierce thanked staff for working together on this presentation and for the openness to look at our housing numbers regionally in a slightly different way. She

asked that staff double check the base data to address mistakes and the actual interpretation of local zoning. The model takes what is written down, not what everybody locally is thinking is going to happen. She indicated that this Draft Preferred Scenario is a market analysis; a reality check on our aspirational plans. We chose to use UrbanSim, instead of doing the projections the way we always have in the past. There is a benefit for us to apply that economic test of how viable our aspirational plans are in between RHNA cycles. We had this presentation at ABAG Administrative Committee and the MTC Planning Committee last Friday where members suggested another meeting to provide some more opportunities for discussion.

Member Jones asked if housing plus transportation cost is the worst possible scenario. What are the assumptions about the individual housing bonds that are currently on the ballot in that estimate? What does it assume about the attainment of our RHNA goals, considering that those goals have not been attained over time? What other considerations and assumptions are built in that may show that 67 percent number is lower than the actual housing cost for families? She also asked that staff provide more time for groups to analyze this information.

Member Holtzclaw focused on the incentives. He urged the measurement of trips rather than passenger miles to be used because in the places where transit services are very heavily used, like San Francisco and Oakland, the trips are relatively short because everything is convenient. He asked if the governor's bills on financial incentives and density bonuses for affordable housing had passed and how they would be enforced.

Member Terplan indicated that there is a difference in perspective between ABAG and MTC that needs to be worked out with consolidation of the staff. He asked for additional details about the differences between UrbanSim and ABAG's number, including which cities were affected and how substantial were the differences. Also, why did the percentage of jobs in PDAs go down so much between the first Plan Bay Area and this one; from two thirds to 55 percent? Which PDAs were affected—are they close to regional transit; close to lower frequency, local transit or not close to transit? The PDA framework is a very good one for implementation but for a modeling perspective or a projection perspective, it is harder to get your head around. What were the variables that were changed in UrbanSim to get to the land use outcome we see?

Member Spalding said on the economic vitality measures we were looking at fixed inputs to UrbanSim that were going to be the same across all scenarios. The target to increase the share of jobs accessible and congested conditions is going in the wrong direction, and that remains the same across all scenarios. On the equity measures, It looks like we are doing better in Communities of Concern even though we are going in the wrong direction across all of the measures on performance target 8, so I am not sure about that discrepancy. We said a few months ago that the way to deal with this is not really in the scenarios but in the policy measures that we are going to implement. She asked how we were going to get those policies into the plan. We need implementation measures and we may need some real incentives. For example, the OBAG program now has gone out in my county to C/CAG, the implementation agency. When they considered setting up their scoring measures, they decided not to look with any depth at either the affordability of housing or any economic development measures. We may

have to do more to make sure that the local areas really implement if we are going to see these performance targets achieved.

Member Eklund said last week at the joint MTC planning committee, she raised three questions, for which she would like to get some response in writing. She did check with the Novato Staff about an explanation for the changes in the base year and also the housing and job projections. It did not seem they had adequate information in order to analyze how they changed and what factors were adjusted. I am finding that is true of many of the cities in Marin County. It is important that the city staff and the elected officials get that information because we are also trying to bring this information to the public. She requested an explanation for why we are going down to 50 percent for the jobs in PDAs. She heard from folks that instead of just focusing the housing around transit areas, they want to do housing and jobs so you get more versatility in the movement of people. She requested more information about the assumptions and how realistic they are. For example, in Marin, not all cities have inclusionary zoning.

Ms. Chion said ABAG and MTC will be answering the questions raised in writing and would appreciate any feedback or any additional suggestions. This is an unusual schedule for the Regional Planning Committee because we wanted to hear your comments on the Draft Preferred Scenario. The next meeting is coming soon, which might be a good opportunity to continue the discussion and we will be able to provide you a more systematic summary of all of the input.

Member Eklund wanted to confirm that the next meeting will be on October 5, 2016.

Chair Gupta said as chair of this committee, he is not satisfied with the opportunity for input into the process. People around the table here have an immense amount of experience, influence, as well as knowledge that should be shared for betterment of the plan. Thank you all for spending more time than you planned for and hope to see you early in October to discuss this issue.

8. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Gupta adjourned the Regional Planning Committee at 3:23 PM

The next meeting of the Regional Planning Committee will be on October 5, 2016.

Submitted:

Wally Charles

Date: September 28, 2016

For information or to review audio recordings of ABAG Regional Planning Committee meetings, contact Wally Charles at (415) 820-7993 or info@abag.ca.gov.