

INTER-REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP

Town Meeting Hall
201 Front Street
Danville, CA 94526

September 27, 2000

MEETING SUMMARY

I. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Millie Greenberg, Mayor City of Danville called the meeting to order at 12:40 p.m. After a brief overview of the IRP, she welcomed the attendees and asked each to introduce themselves. In attendance were:

Inter-Regional Partnership Members

Supervisor Mark DeSaulnier, Contra Costa County
Mayor Rich Dodds, City of Patterson
Council Member Lorraine Dietrich, City of Livermore
Council Member Bob Wasserman, City of Fremont
Council Member Mike Serpa, City of Modesto
Council Member Gloryanna Rhodes, City of Lathrop
Becky Hatler for Supervisor Nick Blom, Stanislaus County
Council Member Trish Dixon, City of Milpitas
Mayor Quintin Kidd, City of Brentwood
Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy
Mayor Millie Greenberg, City of Danville
Supervisor Scott Haggerty, Alameda County
Council Member Tom Reitter, City of Livermore
Council Member Charlotte Powers, City of San Jose
Mayor Cathie Brown, City of Livermore
Supervisor, Robert Cabral, County of San Joaquin
Supervisor Pete McHugh, County of Santa Clara

Staff to the Inter-Regional Partnership

Alex Amoroso, Senior Regional Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Gary Dickson, Executive Director, Stanislaus Area Association of Governments
Julia E. Greene, Executive Director, San Joaquin Council of Governments
Stephen VanDenburgh, Senior Regional Planner, San Joaquin Council of Governments
Christy Riviere, Regional Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Michael Smith, Regional Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Cheryl Creighton, Office Assistant, San Joaquin Council of Governments

Also Present

Bruce Kern, Executive Director, EDAB
Richard LeGates, Consultant to the IRP
James King, Consultant to the IRP

In light of a potential lawsuit between Alameda and San Joaquin Counties over development projects in Mountain House, Mr. Scott Haggerty of Alameda County expressed his concerns that his working relationship with Mr. Robert Cabral would be perceived as damaging to the IRP. Mr. Haggerty explained that this was not the case and equated it to two companies with differences talking. Mr. Cabral added that the relationship between Mr. Haggerty and himself was an improvement to the area and that the interests of the IRP come first.

Mr. Alex Amoroso announced that Mr. Gary Binger had left ABAG and therefore he would be acting as the main ABAG staff to the IRP. He also stated that IRP would begin meeting quarterly, on the last Wednesday of each month.

II. BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM

As a result of the approval of State funding for the IRP Pilot Program, the IRP must now set a work program and budget. Staff prepared a preliminary budget for the IRP members to review and comment. Mr. Amoroso briefly discussed the budget and work program. Two action items were voted on:

- Provide IRP staff with general direction regarding the budget and work program
- Authorize IRP staff to finalize budget and work program, and contract with the State Department of Housing and Community Development

A motion was made and seconded (McHugh/Cabral) to authorize both action items. Motion passed with a unanimous voice vote.

III. DISCUSSION OF INCENTIVES

One facet of the Pilot Program will be developing a set of incentives to be used to attract economic and/or housing development to the Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zones. Mr. Amoroso introduced two consultants who will be working on developing these incentives. Professor Richard LeGates, of San Francisco State University, prepared a preliminary set of housing related incentives and Mr. James King, of Applied Development Economics, is working to create a list of economic development incentives. Both consultants made a brief presentation to the IRP.

Professor Richard LeGates presented a list of housing related incentives for review and initial discussion. Housing incentives presented by LeGates included:

1. Predevelopment funding from the California State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)'s rental housing construction fund, the California State Housing Finance Agency (CHFA)'s HELP program, or other sources; and
2. Payment of environmental assessment and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) preparation costs; and
3. Funding from the State jobs-housing balance improvement program; and
4. Infrastructure funding to support housing from the State Infrastructure Development Bank. The California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS), Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) & Metropolitan Transportation Planning organizations (MPOs); and

5. First time homebuyer programs; and
6. Master planning using specific plans, Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), development agreements, floating zones, vesting tentative subdivision maps and other planning tools; and
7. Low income housing tax credits; and
8. Federal and state subsidies for very low, low and moderate-income households; and
9. Local housing trust fund funding; and
10. Transfer of development rights (TDRs) and land swaps; and
11. Upzoning, and density bonuses; and
12. Permit fee reductions and waivers; and
13. Tax-increment financing based on the redevelopment model; and
14. Pooling of redevelopment funds; and
15. Return of state property tax for development in housing opportunity sites – ERAF tax shift relief.

Mr. James King then presented his findings on economic development incentives. King discussed the following:

1. Carrying capacity in housing deficient areas; and
2. Growth in job deficient areas; and
3. Almost 1000 separate economic development incentives are currently available and in use; and
4. Three categories of incentives include:
 - Direct assistance to a business
 - Infrastructure assistance
 - Operational support services (*i.e.*, training of employees)
5. The three most important things to remember:
 - Incentives must be directly related to specific business expansion and attraction targets.
 - Incentives must also reflect the specific site location requirements of firms in those industries.
 - The interests of all jurisdictions in the IRP area must be addressed in concert, not separately.

Discussion followed regarding different strategies to accomplish the above incentives. Ms. Julia E. Greene (San Joaquin Council of Governments) cautioned that when formulating these incentives they need to be directly related to the law as passed and they must be specific to the opportunity zones

Mr. Bob Wasserman asked how the zones to be established would deal with the major issue of transportation. He suggested that the areas (zones) be decided upon and determine how those areas impact the larger picture, then use that information to formulate the incentives.

Mr. Bruce Kern itemized three important items:

- The process needs to be thoroughly thought through, the strategy must relate to the selection process
- Time is of the essence

Professor LeGates stated he was very optimistic regarding the program. He stressed the importance of having good data and staff in place (with the amount of new, flexible dollars) so when the applications came in the IRP would beat out others.

Mr. Amoroso stated he would be distributing a report to members along with draft criteria for establishing the various zones. There would be more detailed information coming at the January meeting.

IV. NEXT MEETING REMINDER

The next meeting will be January 31, 2001 (last Wednesday of the month)

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Linda Brown from California Alliance for Jobs encouraged all those members from Alameda County to vote for Measure B transportation sales tax.

There being no further public comments, the meeting was adjourned until January 31, 2001, meeting place to be announced.