

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter – Auditorium

101 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Oakland, California

December 1, 2010

### Members Present:

Susan Adams, Supervisor, County of Marin, ABAG Vice President  
Shiloh Ballard, Silicon Valley Leadership Group  
Andy Barnes, Policy Chair, Urban Land Institute  
Patricia Boyle, Bay Area League of Women Voters  
Ronit Bryant, Mayor, City of Mountain View  
Dave Cortese, Supervisor, County of Santa Clara/RPC Chair  
Pat Eklund, Councilmember, City of Novato  
Rose Jacobs Gibson, Supervisor, County of San Mateo/ABAG Immediate Past President  
Mark Green, Mayor, City of Union City/ABAG President  
Scott Haggerty, Supervisor, County of Alameda  
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club  
Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor, City of Pleasanton  
Charlie Knox, Director of Public Works & Community Development, City of Benicia  
Jeremy Madsen, Executive Director, Greenbelt Alliance  
Nate Miley, Supervisor, County of Alameda  
Ross Mirkarimi, Supervisor, City and County of San Francisco  
Nancy Nadel, Councilmember, City of Oakland  
Cheryl O'Connor, Acting CEO, Home Builders Association of Northern California  
Julie Pierce, Vice Mayor, City of Clayton  
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 Sperring, Supervisor, Solano County  
Egon Terplan, Regional Planning Director, SPUR  
Beth Walukas, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency

### Members Absent:

Susan Bonilla, Supervisor, Contra Costa County  
Valerie Brown, Supervisor, County of Sonoma  
Diane Dillon, Supervisor, County of Napa  
Dan Furtado, Councilmember, City of Campbell  
Kasie Hildenbrand, Councilmember, City of Dublin  
Veronica Jacobi, Councilmember, City of Santa Rosa  
Janet Kennedy, Councilmember, City of Martinez  
Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez, Director of Government Affairs, City of San Francisco  
Connie Galambos Malloy, Director of Programs, Urban Habitat Program  
Andrew Michael, Bay Area Council  
Carol Severin, EBRPD Board of Directors

### Staff Present:

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Dayle Farina, ABAG Administrative Assistant  
Justin Fried, ABAG Regional Planner  
Lisa Klein, MTC Senior Transportation Planner  
Marisa Raya, ABAG Regional Planner  
Gillian Adams, ABAG Regional Planner  
Sailaja Kurella, ABAG Regional Planner

### 1. Call to Order/Introductions

- Committee Chair Cortese called the meeting to order at 1:17 PM.
- Chair Cortese introduced and welcomed new member Ronit Bryant, Mayor, City of Mountain View.

### 2. Public Comment

### 3. Approval of Minutes for October 6, 2010 Meeting.

#### The following corrections were made to the minutes:

1. Pg 3. Paragraph starting with “The regional agencies”... third line. Goal is to build of and... the ‘of’ should be deleted.
2. pg 4. Paragraph 7 starting with “Committee Member Eklund”... second line... not going to be a factor... should read: not intended to be a factor
3. pg 4. Paragraph 8 starting with “Committee Member Eklund” first line... Marin County the cities do not feel should read: Marin County, the cities have not discussed, nor does she feel
4. pg 4 Paragraph 10 (last paragraph) starting with “Committee Member Eklund” first line... commented that the City of Novato supports affordable... should read: commented that the community seems to support affordable

Approval of the minutes was moved by Committee Member Haggerty and seconded by Committee Member Richardson,

Minutes of October 6, 2010, were approved as corrected.

### 4. Oral Reports/Comments

#### A. Committee Members

#### B. Staff

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director, announced that ABAG and MTC have been recommended by the Strategic Growth Council for a \$1,000,000 grant award This will be announced soon. This money will be used for projects around SB 375 and implementation of the Sustainable Communities Strategy

### 5. ACTION: Priority Development Area submitted by the City of Livermore

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director, presented information on and sought committee approval of a new Priority Development Area (PDA) submitted by the City of Livermore.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Chair Cortese clarified for the Committee that this is a Potential Priority Development Area (PDA) rather than a Planned PDA, therefore will have to go through another stage prior to being an approved Planned PDA.

Mr. Kirkey confirmed that this is the case and explained that the City of Livermore would be eligible for planning funds at this point. They would have to go through a planning process to be eligible for the capital infrastructure funding which is being directed to the PDAs.

Committee Member Terplan asked if the city gave indication of the boundaries of this PDA or is this something that is determined after funding to create the plan is approved.

Mr. Kirkey responded that he understands that the City is focusing on a half-mile radius; however, the area will be refined during the planning process.

Committee Member Terplan commented that it appears the existing residential neighborhoods are included in this area.

Mr. Kirkey stated that his understanding is that the intent is that many of those areas would not be impacted by development but that including these neighborhoods is viewed as a very important part of the planning process.

Mr. Terplan then asked if the Committee should recommend, due to the fact that there is currently no BART station in the area, changing the name of the PDA to remove the BART reference.

Mr. Kirkey deferred the decision to the Committee members.

After some discussion of the Committee members, it was determined that the title of the PDA should be left to the City of Livermore.

It was then moved by Committee Member Haggerty and seconded by Committee Member Hosterman to approve this "potential" PDA.

Chair Cortese asked Mr. Haggerty if he would have objection to noting a potential name change to the City.

Mr. Haggerty responded that he had no objection to noting a possible name change but, since there are future plans that the ACE train will go to BART, he would like to leave the title of the PDA to the local jurisdiction.

The motion carried.

Chair Cortese raised awareness, at this time, that we have added an hour to the agenda and explained the reasoning behind this decision. He then asked for staff to limit their presentation time to 15 minutes. He indicated he would be facilitating and limiting the question and answer time.

Committee Member Ballard added that she would encourage the Committee members to be concise with their questions and comments as well.

Chair Cortese welcomed Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director, to present the next item.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

### **6. INFORMATION: Development of the Initial Vision Scenario for the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)**

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director, presented the development process for the Initial Vision Scenario and coordination with the County/Corridor Working Groups.

Committee Member Nadel asked how sea level rise will be addressed.

Mr. Kirkey responded that this item, along with the CEQA guidelines have been raised repetitively. There will be a genuine effort to make the Bay Plan and CEQA guidelines work as an integrated part of the SCS.

Vice Chair Richardson noted that the timeline doesn't really work with the schedules of all cities and their City Council meeting calendars. (i.e. some only meet once each quarter). How will this impact the timeline of the SCS?

Mr. Kirkey responded that the initial input period is very short and noted that we are building on existing work and that there will be time for input on the detailed scenario as we move forward.

Committee Member Eklund followed-up by asking how the information about the timeline and expectations of the Cities is getting out to the City Councils.

Mr. Kirkey responded that this is being handled through the County/Corridor roundtable meetings which have/are occurring as well as Agency-level meetings. Also, the Planning Directors and the Regional Advisory Working Group (RAWG) have been involved in the process.

Ms. Eklund requested copies of what has been distributed to the Planning Directors so that she can make sure it gets distributed to the City Managers

Mr. Kirkey stated that those items are online but can be sent out to the Committee Members.

Committee Member Eklund asked how the community vision will be incorporated into "the region's vision of future land uses" as stated on page 1 of the Staff Report for this agenda item.

Mr. Kirkey answered that the jurisdictions have the opportunity to input areas that they feel are appropriate for growth based on their community processes to date.

Ms. Eklund asked if there are plans to check back with each jurisdiction to get feedback on whether or not the input was recorded in the Initial Vision Scenario accurately.

Mr. Kirkey responded by explaining that, while MTC and ABAG probably don't have the resources to follow-up with each jurisdiction in the region directly, he hoped to get validation on the input from Agency-level members from each county to engage the other elected officials.

Committee Member Eklund asked for clarification on how the county corridor working groups would function on behalf of the entire county; stating that some cities require input for regional issues from the entire council and not just one representative.

Mr. Kirkey explained how the process was developed so that enough ground will be covered adequately to receive enough input. He also stated that there is willingness to present the

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

information to specific city councils in trying to creating a level of connectivity to ensure the necessary level of work occurs.

Committee Member Pierce asked about the outreach to water agencies or other special districts.

Committee Member Green responded that this is being addressed and after meeting with representatives in Alameda County, he thought it would be important to seek input from organizations in each county, such as the Silicon Valley Leadership Group in the South Bay or the East Bay Economic Development Alliance, as to what a sustainable community looks like from business standpoint.

Chair Cortese added that he would like to hear from the other members of the RPC, regional planning representatives who are not elected officials, about what we can do to make sure that you are constantly in the loop.

Committee Member Terplan commented that many of the organizations are in the loop. He added that he feels it is the responsibility of the members of the RPC to get the word out to their respective networks. Mr. Terplan also asked what they, the civic organizations and advocacy groups, can do to ensure they are invited to the county corridor meetings to ensure their input is heard.

Mr. Kirkey responded that, while it is understood that the non-government organizations (NGO) input is very important in this process, the intent of the regional agencies is to leave it up to the local jurisdictions at the county corridor level to decide what they want the NGOs role to be in this process.

Chair Cortese suggested that the regional agencies compile a list of every NGO which has expressed interest or participate at the regional level and distribute it to the county groups and ask that they be added to the invitation list of the county meetings.

Committee Member Adams suggested ABAG take the lead in creating templates which include who the different players could be and what venues might be considered for the county gatherings, along with providing a “how to” list.

Mr. Kirkey commented that similar steps have been taken already, which has resulted in creating more momentum from some counties and very little from other counties.

Ms. Adams asked for guidance on how to address questions related to “one-job equals one house”. She also asked if the overview of the SCS has been sent to City Councils in November, as promised.

Mr. Kirkey responded that it is available for Planning Directors to use and that the Power Point presentation will be available on December 2.

Committee Member Adams also requested an email with materials to the Committee members to help move the process forward.

Committee Member Madsen feels it is critical to have the NGOs involved in the process at the county corridor level. He added that he encourages Committee members to reach out to community-based organizations.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Mr. Madsen encouraged engaging the park districts and open space districts who may have interest as well.

Committee Member Ross commented that ownership is needed in this process and suggested a stewardship program to get these items on city council agendas.

Committee Member Eklund indicated the need to engage private citizens in this process as well.

Committee Member Ballard commented that it sounds like some counties are in a better position to proactively handle the request. Ms. Ballard recommended providing examples of how counties, which are currently engaged, are handling the process to give to those which are not engaged. She suggested sharing ideas on how similarly structured counties are handling the process.

Committee Member Spring commented that if we are not able to get buy-in from the city councils we will have trouble engaging the general public. It is often difficult to get the local elected officials, more so than the NGOs, engaged in issues and meetings.

Committee Member Jacobs Gibson commented that it would be helpful, given the infrequency of the RPC meetings and the volume and complexity of the information, having a flow-chart or map of how the parts to this all fit together and a timeline of each piece on a separate graph.

Mr. Kirkey responded that a timeline is available already and he will make sure that this will get sent along with the other items the Committee has requested.

Ms. Jacobs Gibson recommended sending the information documents out with each RPC packet. It may be redundant but it is better to have too much information than not enough.

Chair Cortese added that a “virtual toolbox” should be made available, reiterating Committee Member Adams template idea.

Committee Member Pierce added that we need to get big media involved.

Vice Chair Richardson commented that timing in sharing information with local elected officials is critical. Ms. Richardson added that preparing a fact sheet would be very helpful.

Chair Cortese summarized the discussion.

Committee Member Eklund commented that it would help her if the language was changed to reflect that the regional vision is based on individual communities’ visions as received. Ms. Eklund added that schools need to be involved as well.

### **7. INFORMATION: Performance Targets for the Sustainable Communities Strategy**

Lisa Klein, MTC Senior Transportation Planner, and Marisa Raya, ABAG Regional Planner, presented and sought feedback on the final draft of Performance Targets.

Committee Member Adams asked why we were still only focusing on cars and light trucks in the decrease in CO2 Emissions. Ms. Adams feels that a lot of reductions will come from household energy reduction.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Ms. Klein responded that under SB 375 it is a requirement that the RTP and SCS have to meet; that is the language that the ARB adopted; we will want to achieve other reductions.

Ms. Adams suggested that our region take a broader look at the Greenhouse Gas Reductions and break it out. It may show that we're doing better than reflecting only cars and light trucks.

Committee Member Adams also commented on Attachment A. She asked if it is required that we reflect the Above Moderate housing. If so, Ms. Adams recommended that in counties which tend to have more Above Moderate housing, it should reflect that they need more Affordable Housing. She asked, "How does this nuance get addressed?"

Ms. Raya responded that this conversation might be an appropriate during the RHNA process and with the Housing Methodology Committee.

Committee Member Green made several comments:

- He agrees with Committee Member Adams that we need to look at other things besides cars and light trucks in order to reduce GHG emissions.
- Adequate Housing: the phrase "without displacing current low income housing" needs to be restated to add the word "replace" in the phrase.
- #4 Reducing 50% injuries and fatalities...Is this on a per mile basis?
- #7 Decrease by 10% of the share...Needs clarification
- #10 He would like to see a number attached to dollars where the PCI is referenced.
- What does distressed lane miles mean?

Committee Member Haggerty feels we should engage the Air District to see what they are doing with Shore side power; take a look at the airports; and continue to work with them in regard to eliminating old generators in the agricultural industry by offering grants to help them replace old equipment.

Committee Member Eklund asked for clarification in the Adequate Housing area. She is unclear what "without displacing current low income housing" means. Does it mean removing it?

Ms. Eklund also commented about the target related to Open Space Preservation – there is open space within Urban Growth Boundaries Target is misleading. She is concerned that having this target gives the impression that open space within urbanized area is not as valuable as the open space outside of the urban growth boundary.

Committee Member Eklund also commented on the Equitable Access Target -- it is unclear how we can measure this. How do we get the information to ensure there is a 10% decrease?

Ms. Eklund then commented on the Economic Vitality target; she suggested looking at a different target that captures the relationship between where the economic growth is in relation to the housing for those jobs and related GHG.

Committee Member Eklund commented on targets 9 & 10 – She would like to see a target which reduces vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increases frequency and convenience of public transit.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Bryant commented on the Healthy and Safe communities targets: Reduce injuries and fatalities from collisions. How is this directly connected in attaining the SCS? Under Healthy & Safe Communities, targets should be added about building green or open space.

Ms. Bryant added that she agrees with previous comments on Targets 9 & 10 – She would like to see the targets more directly related to public transit.

Committee Member Madsen also commented that as we engage the communities there should be more narrative around the targets.

Mr. Madsen added that on Target #6 he would like to see, prior to adoption of targets, a map showing the land being considered and the resources within those areas (i.e. farmland, habitat land, etc).

Mr. Madsen asked why target #9 was modified.

Ms. Klein responded that the version of the targets which went out in the packet had a placeholder as they searched for the target to improve transportation effectiveness. Several options were considered. Ultimately; it was decided that the travel time target was the best technically and is the recommendation.

Committee Member Madsen indicated he was curious about relationship between the SCS process and implementation of SB 375 and the broader process occurring in terms of implementation of AB 32. It would be helpful for this Committee to see a presentation on the State's regulation around climate.

Committee Member Spring stated that there needs to be an explanation on some of these strategies. On target #6 he had some concern about including "Urban Growth Boundaries"; "Spheres of Influence". It should say "Direct new development within urbanized areas".

Committee Member Terplan supported comments about the need to bring up transit in these targets, especially related to development around transit.

Mr. Terplan was concerned in target #5 about the absence of mode-split goal – public health will be a co-benefit but the primary target should be transit and land use connectivity.

Mr. Terplan added that in target #9, land use was missing. It could be the percentage of future employment growth within a half mile of regional transit or some criteria that relates to land use.

Committee Member Haggerty asked if we have looked at other regions that are setting targets for this category. How does this region compare?

Ms Klein responded that no other regions are setting voluntary targets. Other MPOs are setting performance measures. We are limiting to 10 because we are trying to set numeric targets, which is different from what other regions are doing.

Committee Member Nadel commented that in target #1 the goal percent should be higher. She added that in target #2 the language might be better stated "without reducing units of low income housing but re-accommodating low income residents whose current low income housing is substandard." Ms. Nadel also noted that the Economic Vitality target is unclear about the value

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

of GRP measures to the percent of unemployment. She would like percentage of unemployment added to the target.

Committee Member Miley commented that we need to take into consideration unintended consequences.

Chair Cortese summarized the discussion.

Chair Cortese would like to see Education put in a target. Chair Cortese also commented that target #8, as it was changed, is important.

### **8. INFORMATION: Assessment of Priority Development Areas – Input into the Vision Scenario**

Gillian Adams and Sailaja Kurella, ABAG Regional Planners presented and sought feedback on the Assessment of Priority Development Areas that will inform the development of the initial Vision Scenario.

Committee Member Green commented that there needs to be some priorities of the metrics. Proximity to Jobs, Transit Access, Housing Unit Growth and Planned Affordable Housing should score higher than ease of entitlement, planning committed to date.

Committee Member Haggerty: commented that the CEQA guidelines are making Filter 1 and 2 difficult to happen. He then asked if these filters have been put up against the CEQA guidelines to see if they are doable.

Ms. Adams responded that the filters have not yet been put up against the CEQA guidelines.

Committee Member Haggerty commented that this should be done before we get too far.

Mr. Kirkey reiterated that the CEQA Guidelines and the Bay Plan have to be integrated into what will become the Sustainable Community Strategy. There will be more exchange on that issue.

Committee Member Richardson would like to see something about how people not near transit will get to transportation centers.

Committee Member Eklund noted that having jobs within 30 minutes of residence opens commuters from areas where there is not connecting transit. Affordable housing needs to be in close proximity to lower paying jobs.

Ms. Adams responded that this is what they were trying to explain in the third bullet under housing choices. Perhaps clarity around that is what's needed.

Committee Member Sperring commented that Filter 3 needs discussion about a delivery date. There also needs to be a strategy that talks about urban areas and more rural areas.

Committee Member Ballard indicated she would like an initial screening on the PDAs to see how the PDAs score in this process.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Spring noted that Non-Profit Housing is running their projects through the Air District screening process and some of their projects are not qualifying. We need to be looking at this as we may be finding ourselves in the same category.

Committee Member Terplan would include transit use criteria or percent of all trips taken on transit in the Transit Access filter. Employment growth within the PDAs needs to find its way back into this process.

Committee Member Bryant commented that, in the text, we need to clarify that the PDAs are planned and not actually in place. Therefore, we don't know where the people will be working.

Committee Member Knox noted that transit is one way to get to GHG reduction but don't miss places where rail is an option and bringing jobs closer to them can still reduce the GHG.

Hayward Schickele finds the data interesting in Filter 4; 12 percent of trips in Bay Area are school-based. She thinks that will increase. As choices for schools are broadened trips to school will become longer.

Committee Member Eklund noted that density is relative to the area where people live. More rural areas may not find 30 units per acre appropriate for their communities.

Committee Member Green expanded on his prior comment about prioritization. He feels the priorities should be as follows: Highest: Transit Access, Job Proximity, Housing Unit Growth and Planned Affordable Housing Units; Medium: Schools, Parks, Walkability and Future Residential Density; Lowest: Housing Choices, Ease of Entitlements, Investment Attraction and Planning Completed.

Committee Member Ballard agrees that there should be prioritization placed on these. Ms. Ballard added that in the schools component – schools shouldn't get in the way of plans that are ready to go.

Committee Member Haggerty reiterated his concern with CEQA Guidelines. He feels that this should be taken care of before the work happens on placing the priority on these metrics.

Committee Member Spring commented that Project Delivery is important and that we've got to identify projects which can go forward to get experience of what we're developing. In his opinion Planning Completed should be a higher priority.

Committee Member Pierce agrees with Committee Member Spring about Planning Completed being important and that part of the metric is financing because there will not be enough outside resources to pay for them all. Ms. Pierce also added that most school districts won't plan more than 5 years out.

Chair Cortese Summarized the discussion.

Committee Member Madsen made the suggestion to engage the NGOs that we outreach to and local community foundations (i.e. Silicon Valley Community foundation).

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

**ADJOURN:**

Chair Cortese adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled on February 2, 2011.

Submitted by:

Dayle Farina

Administrative Assistant

DRAFT