

INTER-REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP

City of Livermore
1110 S. Livermore Ave.
Livermore, CA

Wednesday, June 20, 2001
12:30 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Lorraine Dietrich, City of Livermore called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. Ms. Dietrich welcomed everyone to Livermore and gave a brief overview of the new Livermore Police Station. Following were self-introductions. In attendance were:

Inter-Regional Partnership Members

Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy
Mayor Mike McPoland, City of Brentwood
Council Member Lorraine Dietrich, City of Livermore
Council Member Gloryanna Rhodes, City of Lathrop
Mayor Millie Greenberg, City of Danville
Supervisor Mark DeSaulnier, Contra Costa County
Supervisor Scott Haggerty, Alameda County
Supervisor Nick Bloom, Stanislaus County
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
Christy Riviere, Regional Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Gerald Raycraft, Planning Director, Association of Bay Area Governments
Gary Dickson, Executive Director, Stanislaus Council of Governments
Stephen VanDenburgh, Senior Regional Planner, San Joaquin Council of Governments
Lori Fowler, Regional Planner, San Joaquin Council of Governments
Cheryl Creighton, Office Assistant, San Joaquin Council of Governments

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Millie Greenberg requested the minutes of April 25, 2001 be changed to reflect the word "placing" instead of "playing" on page 2, first paragraph, eighth line. This was noted and the change will be made. It was moved/seconded (Rhodes/Bilbrey) to approve the minutes as amended. Motion passed.

Items III and IV were postponed for discussion until the arrival of Council Member Mark DeSaulnier.

V. LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

There was not a Legislative Committee Meeting preceding the IRP meeting, but material from the Legislative Committee packet was discussed.

The 2001/2002 proposed budget for the State Housing and Community Development Department (HCD) would have added an additional \$200 million to the existing Jobs/Housing Improvement Program which currently makes available \$100 million in incentive payments to local governments. In the May budget revision, the \$200 million augmentation was eliminated. It was suggested to work with Senator Torlakson regarding this money. Mr. McPoland requested IRP members be kept up to date on the budget process.

Ms. Rhodes ask if there were any criteria established for the Central Valley Infrastructure Grant program, which has a proposed HCD budget of \$20.2 million. Mr. VanDenburgh stated that anyone interested could apply for this grant, it was not specific to IRP projects. Ms. Rhodes stated that many San Joaquin County areas do not have an existing infrastructure and this could pose a problem for them.

At the January 31, 2001 meeting, staff was directed to draft a letter to Senator Torlakson asking his consideration of having the Department of Trade and Commerce co-manage the IRP Pilot Program. It was moved and seconded (Greenberg/McPoland) to approve the letter as shown and mail to Senator Torlakson. Motion passed.

III. CO-CHAIR DISCUSSION

Mr. Scott Haggerty supported Mr. DeSaulnier's suggestion that the IRP establish a co-chair structure for meetings. He suggested the term be one (1) year, with the chairs split between a county and a city. He then nominated Supervisor DeSaulnier and Mayor Bilbrey to serve as the first co-chairs of the IRP. Councilman Mike Serpa, City of Modesto, suggested that the terms be staggered and staff will bring recommendations on this to the next meeting.

Mr. Alex Amoroso clarified that the term would be one (1) year, co-chairs staggered and there could be city/county representatives from each side of the Altamont Pass. It was then moved and seconded (Haggerty/Rhodes) to adopt the co-chair structure. Motion passed.

IV. DRAFT JOBS/HOUSING OPPORTUNITY ZONE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

At the April IRP meeting, staff presented a draft Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zone Request for Proposals (RFP). In response to this presentation, the IRP directed staff to make minor changes to the RFP, make changes to the Incentive Program and recommend a process for evaluating responses to the RFP.

Jobs-Housing Opportunity Zone Request for Proposals Changes

Three significant changes are shown below:

- ◆ Push the time line back to after the next IRP meeting
- ◆ Scoring criteria – total points increased from 70 to 100, the additional 30 points being Jobs/Housing
- ◆ Timeframe to complete now 5 years

Economic/Housing Incentives Program

It has been determined that a comprehensive set of incentives which provides the IRP with the flexibility to ensure that the incentives accurately match the development needs of the Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zones is needed. As described in the draft RFP, a list of specific incentives will not be developed until after the proposals have been evaluated and the Zones are selected, thus allowing staff to meet with jurisdictions to determine the exact incentives needed. If zone applicants seek incentives that require legislative change, legislative advocacy would need to occur immediately.

Mr. Mike Locke, San Joaquin Partnership, stated that even if this process was started immediately, it would not become active until 2003 – if decisions wait until decision on zones is reached it could be 2004. Mr. Bilbrey stated the need to begin immediately. Mr. Phil Serna, Vice President, Home Builders Association of Northern California, mentioned that time would be needed to figure out complimentary incentives. Ms. Greenberg requested this information from Home Builders Association be reviewed and presented to the IRP for consideration at the next meeting.

Proposal Evaluation Process

There were three options for this process submitted by staff:

Each Council of Governments can:

- ◆ Evaluate and rank applications associated with their county/counties based upon the requirements set forth in the application
- ◆ Evaluate and provide staff analysis (and not rank) proposals based upon the requirements set forth in the application
- ◆ Evaluate all proposals for completeness only

IRP members discussed the different options available for this process. Mr. Gary Dickson believed the evaluations should be done within each county. Ms. Greenberg agreed and suggested for equitable distribution that each county analyze/evaluate and select proposals independent of others. Mr. Dickson suggested that then the selections could be brought to a new subcommittee (the IRP Evaluation Committee). Mr. Serpa stated that the selections need to be locally driven and he believed that the local desires would not be the same as the IRP. He believes the counties should do the evaluation sheet then bring those results to the Evaluation Committee, who would then bring recommendations to the IRP, Ms. Greenberg agreed. Ms. Lorraine Dietrich inquired about the distribution of the zones, stating she expected the 10 zones would be distributed 2 to each county.

For clarification Mr. Alex Amoroso outlined the intent of the previous discussion:

- ◆ Applications to COG
- ◆ COG evaluates their applications
- ◆ COG submits applications to Evaluation Committee
- ◆ Evaluation Committee review
- ◆ Evaluation Committee forward to IRP

Mr. Mike McPoland suggested that each COG detail to the Evaluation Committee the reasons each proposal was evaluated as good or bad. Mr. Amoroso stated IRP staff would have this information and the process on a flow chart for the next IRP meeting. Also at the next meeting, staff will present the distribution suggestions for the forming of the new subcommittee under the Evaluation Committee.

Motion was made and seconded (Greenberg/Bilbrey) to adopt the following:

- ◆ Authorize staff to move forward with coordination of housing group to comment on the draft RFP.
- ◆ Accept staff recommendations to extend RFP release date to September 1, 2001 to accommodate time for housing community's input and comments on the draft RFP.
- ◆ Accept changes to draft RFP as summarized in this report and detailed in the attached draft RFP.
- ◆ Accept changes to Incentives Program:
 - Consider adopting specific incentives, e.g., tax increment financing and enterprise zone status. Incentives would be identified now, rather than waiting until the end of the RFP process.
 - Direct staff to pursue legislation for specific incentives OR place-holder legislation if specific incentives are not identified by IRP.
- ◆ Evaluation Process (bring back more information at next meeting)
 - Discuss and decide on staff role in evaluation process
 - Approve the concept of and role of Evaluation Committee
 - Adopt both GIS analysis and Evaluation Scoring Sheet as presented in this report and demonstrated in Attachment 2 of this report.

VI. INTER-REGIONAL GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM

Ms. Christy Riviere updated the IRP on the status of the integrated GIS system. A Needs Assessment survey has been distributed and a majority has been received back. Training for this integrated GIS system is scheduled to occur in late June or early July. Staff hopes to have a presentation of data layers (expanded GIS) available at the August meeting.

As this was an information only item, no further action was taken.

VII. STAFF REPORT

Mr. Amoroso gave an update on developments within IRP. All the participating COG's have signed contracts with the state. HCD has applications for other IRP's from around the state.

It was noted that with council member Trish Dixon, City of Milpitas being absent there was no representation from Santa Clara County. It was suggested that if Supervisor Pete McHugh, Santa Clara County, didn't wish to attend the meetings maybe he could designate someone else to attend.

Mr. Amoroso then quickly went over the IRP time-line included in the packet, noting that meetings are now scheduled for every 2 months.

It was decided that the next meeting would be at the same location in Livermore. It was suggested to perhaps have the meeting relocate to Livermore permanently.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Linda Brown, California Alliance for Jobs read an excerpt of an article on the SANDAG website. The article detailed evaluation of growth slowing policies in the San Diego region and everyone was encouraged to access this article.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m. until August 15, 2001.