

INTER-REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP

Dublin Civic Center – Regional Meeting Room
Pleasanton, CA

January 31, 2001

MEETING SUMMARY

I. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Mark DeSaulnier, Supervisor, Contra Costa County called the meeting to order at 12:40 p.m. Mr. DeSaulnier welcomed two new members to the IRP: Jack Sieglock, Supervisor, San Joaquin County and Mike McPoland, Mayor of Brentwood. Following were self-introductions. In attendance were:

Inter-Regional Partnership Members

Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy
Supervisor Nick Blom, Stanislaus County
Supervisor Mark DeSaulnier, Contra Costa County
Council Member Trish Dixon, City of Milpitas
Mayor Rich Dodds, City of Patterson
Mayor Millie Greenberg, City of Danville
Supervisor Scott Haggerty, Alameda County
Mayor Mike McPoland, City of Brentwood
Council Member Lorraine Dietrich, City of Livermore
Council Member Gloryanna Rhodes, City of Lathrop
Supervisor Jack Sieglock, County of San Joaquin
Council Member Mike Serpa, City of Modesto

Staff to the Inter-Regional Partnership

Alex Amoroso, Senior Regional Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Gene Leong, Executive Director, 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

II. IRP OVERVIEW/UPDATE

Mr. Alex Amoroso gave a brief overview of the Interregional Partnership. He also mentioned a contract for the pilot program should be forthcoming.

III. JOBS/HOUSING OPPORTUNITY ZONE CRITERIA

Selecting 5 to 10 jobs/housing opportunity zones in the IRP region has the potential to be an extensive process. The IRP will be responsible for ensuring that zones are equitably distributed through the region and that both the location and development projects proposed for the zone meet the minimum criteria found in AB 2864. The zones and their proposed development must also address the jobs/housing imbalance.

To simplify and formalize the selection process, staff suggests an application procedure for selecting zones. Examples of the information requested and specific questions include:

- Provide a detailed description of the zone location and development proposal. Include total acreage, percent of land that is vacant, underutilized, and zoned for urban use. Provide a map, including a general plan and zoning map, detailing these elements.
- Describe existing or planned transit services available in the proposed zone and the service's ability to support proposed development within the zone.
- Describe existing or planned infrastructure within the proposed zone, including water, roadways, sewer, etc.
- Why is this property an ideal location?
- What barriers have prevented this property from being fully developed as proposed? How would the opportunity zone designation help this location overcome these barriers?

To address the jobs/housing balance component, staff proposes including a series of questions in the application. Applicants would be asked to address (at a minimum) the following:

- Describe the existing jobs/housing imbalance faced in the jurisdiction where the proposed zone is located. Address how that imbalance impacts the jurisdiction and the region, in terms of transportation, air quality, and quality of life.
- How will the proposed zone location and development within the zone address the imbalance of jobs and housing in the region?
- What barriers have prevented this property from being fully developed as proposed? How would the opportunity zone designation help this location overcome these barriers?

The nature of the jobs/housing zones, 50 to 500 acre sites of commercial and/or housing development, suggests that those agencies responsible for regulating such development will make up the applicant pool. These agencies will also be responsible for ensuring that these sites are eligible to receive both fiscal and non-fiscal housing and economic

development incentives. Therefore, staff suggests that applicants for a jobs/housing zone be at least one jurisdiction or more jurisdictions working in collaboration with private companies, quasi-public, or public agencies.

Mr. Richard Dodds expressed concern as to why HCD (Housing & Community Development) was assigned to monitor this legislation and how they could assist in ensuring that Stanislaus County become an economic area vs. housing area. Ms. Julia Greene suggested that the reason HCD was assigned was that Senator Torlakson chaired the Speaker's Select Committee on Jobs Housing Balance, and legislation coming out of this committee is usually implemented by HCD. Ms. Greene had met with HCD staff at CalCOG and they expressed interest in having IRP give them direction. It was suggested, and agreed to that a letter be sent to Senator Torlakson asking his consideration of having Trade and Commerce manage the program.

Following some discussion it was decided to form a Legislative Committee consisting of the following members: Richard Dodds (Stanislaus County), Scott Haggerty (Alameda County), Dan Bilbrey (San Joaquin County), Mark DeSaulnier (Contra Costa County), and Trish Dixon (Santa Clara County).

IV. JOBS/HOUSING OPPORTUNITY ZONE INCENTIVES

Because of various problems involved with a limited set of incentives, staff recommends that the IRP develop a comprehensive set of incentives that can be made available to jurisdictions, developers, and homeowners. Offering a complete set of incentives would allow the IRP to pick and choose those incentives that fit the exact needs of the above groups. Therefore, staff requests that the IRP:

- Direct staff to evaluate eligibility of existing funding sources such as CDBG, brownfields funding (enterprise zone) to determine needed legislative changes.
- Request a legislative earmark of \$25 million for the IRP from the proposed \$200 million.
- Apply for funds from the \$100 million budgeted in AB 2864.
- Develop a comprehensive incentives plan that includes both housing and economic incentives to be made available to jobs/housing zones.

Mr. Richard Dodds stated that there was a lot of information in the reports provided by the consultants. He stressed the need for regional cooperation and suggested that staff make sure that the application show it originated from IRP. Ms. Julia Greene suggested that incentives be incorporated into packages – make our mission fit their mission – and have successful applicants.

V. INTER-REGIONAL GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM

AB 2864, the jobs/housing legislation, offers much detail as to what the integrated GIS should entail. The IRP integrated GIS will include: Available data resources in the five-

county IRP region; and Required information needs of the IRP State Pilot Program. Using GIS, the IRP may also illustrate to the State the need for additional zones in the IRP region, beyond those that are called for in AB 2864. Specifically AB2864 calls for the following:

- Demographic data, including population and employment by census tract; and
- Projected population and employment growth data over a 20-year period; and
- Transportation data, including traffic capacity and usage, transit access and usage, and journey-to-work data; and
- Land use information, including general plan layers and zoning designations; and
- Environmental data, including floodplains, slopes, and contamination.

To further ensure that the integrated GIS is affordable and timely to create, the GIS should not be used to perform analysis of individual zones. Data related to individual zones can be gathered through traditional and more affordable means such as through General Plan designation and zoning maps. Staff will identify existing uses in all five counties, and identify potential sites. As GIS information for zones becomes available it will be used to identify future sites.

The IRP should also direct staff to hire a GIS consultant to begin work on the GIS component of the pilot program. At the April 2001 IRP meeting, staff will have a draft list of layers and an analysis of how they will be utilized in the GIS program available for the IRP's consideration.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned until April 25, 2001. Mr. Jack Sieglock requested the meeting be held in Lodi, to be announced.