

INTER-REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP

City of Livermore
3575 Pacific Avenue
Livermore, CA

Wednesday, August 15, 2001
12:30 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY

I. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS

Co-chair, Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m. Mr. Bilbrey welcomed everyone to Livermore and asked the members to introduce themselves. In attendance were:

Inter-Regional Partnership Members

Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy
Mayor Mike McPolland, City of Brentwood
Council Member Lorraine Dietrich, City of Livermore
Council Member Gloryanna Rhodes, City of Lathrop
Mayor Millie Greenberg, City of Danville
Council Member Mike Serpa, City of Modesto
Vice-Mayor Bob Wasserman, City of Fremont
Mayor Richard Dodds, City of Patterson
Supervisor Jack Sieglock, San Joaquin County
Supervisor Pete McHugh, Santa Clara County

Staff to the Inter-Regional Partnership

Julia E. Greene, Executive Director, San Joaquin Council of Governments
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
Gary Dickson, Executive Director, Stanislaus Council of Governments
Stephen VanDenburgh, Senior Regional Planner, San Joaquin Council of Governments
Michael Smith, Regional Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Lori Fowler, Regional Planner, San Joaquin Council of Governments
Betty Garcia, Senior Office Assistant, San Joaquin Council of Governments

II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

It was moved/seconded (Greenberg/Dietrich) to approve the minutes of June 20, 2001. Motion was passed unanimously by voice vote.

III. IRP STATUS REPORT

Mr. Alex Amoroso gave an update on the following items; request for funding from the State for an enhanced GIS, new plans for the IRP brochure; highlights from the updated IRP calendar, and potential relationships with other IRP's.

- Mr. Amoroso stated that there may be some additional monies from the original \$5,000,000 million IRP fund that was set up throughout the state. There is a second RFP going out for new IRP's around the state. He informed the committee that there may be monies available to do things such as work on the GIS enhancement and anything else that the committee may want to apply to the state for. He told the committee that he would keep them informed about the situation.
- Mr. Amoroso told the committee that sometime around November staff expected there to be available an existing land use database put together by ABAG. This information would be available to all the COG's involved in this process, as well as the other counties outside the bay area. He explained that the database would contain parcel map information, with overlays of satellite level photographs of land use. He suggested that the data base could be used a tool for part of the GIS discussion.
- A new design for the IRP brochure was the next item that Mr. Amoroso discussed. He said that the current folder had served its purpose and that at the next meeting ABAG staff would present the new tri-fold style of brochure.
- Previously there had been some discussion of having a Statewide IRP meeting. Mr. Amoroso informed the committee that there are now seven other IRPs throughout the state. He asked the committee if they would be interested in having the chairs from this group get together with IRPs around the state. He suggested that it might be of value to coordinate the IRP efforts in terms of going after incentives with groups from around the state. If there was any interest in this, Mr. Amoroso explained that ABAG could provide a list of contacts and membership of these IRPs.
- Lastly, Mr. Amoroso gave an update to the IRP calendar and said that there were meetings scheduled for October 17th and 19th. He would like the committee to set up meetings with legislators to discuss Zones. He stated that they were still lacking information for the GIS overall, but that they were well on their way to a completed GIS data base for all five counties involved in the IRP. Mr. Amoroso informed the committee that Supervisor Mark DeSaulnier, of Contra Costa County had mentioned that the IRP should be involved in Air Quality discussions and issues that had come up between the valley and the Bay Area and recommended that the Air Quality issues be discussed at future IRP meetings.

Ms. Millie Greenberg agreed that it was an excellent idea to contact the other IRPs to share information, especially when the committee wanted additional incentives. To have the groups statewide advocates together would be positive.

Co-chair Dan Bilbrey asked if there were any other comments in regards to future discussions on Air Quality issues and encouraged the committee members to think about items to discuss at their next IRP meeting.

IV. LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. Alex Amoroso called the committee's attention to a brief report that listed background information on a few programs where administrative remedies may serve as incentives for the IRP. Mr. Amoroso informed the committee that staff was looking into these programs including the

appropriate contacts at the agencies that administer the programs. He told the committee that he would bring more information back to them later on this subject.

V. GIS APPLICATION AND DEMONSTRATION

Mr. Amoroso began by explaining that the GIS was an item that had been visited a couple of times by the committee. He introduced a report that summarized how Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zones might be evaluated and scored pursuant to IRP and state law intent. In the information presented, he discussed the two opportunities for GIS use:

- To use GIS mapping as a preview of the IRP study area which would show where Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zones might best be located. He also explained that the preview exercise could be useful in reviewing the IRP study area as a whole. While zones may be proposed anywhere in the study area, the previewing will help to show applicants what areas best reflect the goals and interest of the Jobs/Housing balance.
- To use the GIS to evaluate the zones as they come through. He explained that 50 points had been added to the scoring system that relate to the GIS. He suggested three options for scoring proposed zones. Weigh each GIS layer as to its relative importance in the Zone selection process; group layers into headings that reflect IRP goals; then weighting the groups allowing the scoring to be guided by the goals.

Ms. Christy Riviere introduced a slide presentation of the proposed GIS using the County of Alameda as a guide. The presentation showed each of the GIS layers under certain categories. The first category was Zone Characteristics which are the same categories found in the RFP and had been recommended to evaluate by IRP staff. Other categories to be evaluated by the GIS layers were Jobs/Housing, Imbalance & Impact; Transportation/Infrastructure; Urbanized Areas and Population/Employment density. Ms. Riviere also explained that TAZ (Traffic Analysis Zones) are used in the GIS scoring.

At the end of the presentation, Mr. Bilbrey asked the committee if the suggested language that the GIS represent 50 points, which would be one-third of the total scoring, is the weight that the committee wanted the GIS component to have as we look for placement of opportunity zones.

Ms. Rhodes stated that a balance can exist, however you still have people commuting because the match between jobs and the population that lives in the community is not equal. She used Lathrop as an example and said that there are 7,800 jobs and a little over 9,000 residents. However, only a few people want to work the industrial type jobs that are there. She added that most of the people are commuters from the Bay area who will not trade those jobs for the ones in Lathrop which would result in a \$20,000 to \$40,000 cut in pay per year. She concluded that the IRP may put a little dent in the jobs/housing imbalance but not even come close to solving the issues.

Mr. Amoroso responded to Ms. Rhodes saying that her issues were about the value of the jobs versus the values of the people who live in her community and whether they want the those jobs. He reiterated that the intent with the GIS is to lay a stratification out and that is part of the reason why the suggested scoring is in only a third of the points. Mr. Wasserman questioned the assumption that the better the jobs/housing ratio, the less traffic. Ms. Riviere clarified that the assumption was when there is a particular area that currently has a job/housing balance then they don't necessarily have a problem. The IRP's goal is to put the jobs or the housing where there is a very obvious jobs/housing balance. Ms. Riviere continued by stating that the jobs/housing is only one measure. There are other things that feed into this such as infrastructure, transportation, air quality and environmental impacts. Mr. Wasserman's concern is that if the group was making judgments based on the assumption that the better the jobs/housing ratio, the less traffic; then he felt that we would be making bad judgments.

Ms. Greenberg discussed two points. The first one is does the group want to use the GIS modeling just for preview as part of the RFP process. She stated that the discussion was focusing on the job/housing balance but reminded the committee that there was a long list of categories and measures. Secondly, she suggested that the group decide on the scoring and how much weight should be given to jobs/housing balance. Mr. Dodds indicated that the GIS is a valuable tool of measurement and reminded the group that it is only one-third of the weight, which gives you two-thirds to argue your points, for example, you have a job/housing balance but nobody in your community is part of that job and housing balance.

Mr. Wasserman stated that the group needed to go back and remind themselves of how they came up with the idea of the GIS and what the IRP was trying to do. Mr. Bilbrey urged the group to cooperate and work together. He told the group that they needed to keep focused on what would be best for the five counties. He stated that the GIS is the road map to make your community successful.

A motion was made and seconded (Greenberg/Sieglock) to use the GIS previewing process and to cut the point allocation system to 25 points total. Motion passed.

VI. RFP MODIFICATION CONSIDERATION

Mr. Amoroso began by stating that there are three areas that are being proposed for modification or additions in the RFP. The following modifications to the draft Request for Proposal include those:

- that add the housing related incentives to the potential incentive list;
- describe the GIS analysis component on the Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zone selection process;
- that modify the project completion requirements; and
- that modify the definition of adequate infrastructure and transit.

Mr. Amoroso noted that the IRP staff has gathered extensive data on regional and state incentives available to promote economic and housing development and will work with the proposers to identify which incentives are most appropriate to the development proposal(s) intended for the respective Jobs/Housing Opportunity Zone. The proposed incentives are empowerment zone designation, tax increment financing, ERAF reform, and priority in the State's bond allocation process.

The next modification was the GIS scoring and he chose not to discuss this matter again as the previous discussion clearly directed the IRP how to proceed with the scoring in the context of the application.

Lastly, the third request in the application is two-fold. The first is a change to the time line. The first modification would allow for more flexibility in the timeline of development projects. The proposed language refines the completion time line from "*...five years to completion...*" to *projects that "...should ideally be completed within five years or have made significant progress towards completion."* This would add flexibility, allowing the IRP the option to consider a wider spectrum of development proposals.

The second requested change is to the existing infrastructure wording. The existing definition of "adequate infrastructure and transit" requires jurisdictions to have existing commitments to provide adequate capacity to accommodate new development. The modification would require jurisdictions, at a minimum, to demonstrate that a zone designation "*...will cause the necessary infrastructure to be secured and completed.*"

Ms. Dietrich asked Mr. Amoroso to explain by giving an example of how the proposed change to the infrastructure language will effect a project and what are the practical consequences. Mr. Dickson responded that this proposal reflects a long-standing concern in Stanislaus County that they may not have the infrastructure in place. He said that a good example might be an interchange. He explained that through some combination of local and regional incentives and funds, maybe a project has only 80% and perhaps they may need a zonal designation to get the last 20%. He does not want to be disqualified for not being at 100%. Mr. Paul Dirksen, from the State Department of Housing and Community Development, questioned the change and suggested that it might be contrary to contract language.

There was a motion made/seconded to adopt the suggested recommendations regarding timeline and infrastructure (McHugh/Dodds).

Mr. Dirksen from HCD stated he disagreed with what was proposed for adoption and said he would like to see different language. Ms. Greenberg said that the proposed changes were not much. She argued in favor of these recommendations and did not see a conflict in the contract language. Mr. Wasserman disagreed and felt that the existing language was fine. Mr. Sieglock also agreed that the current language regarding infrastructure was adequate.

Motion was made and seconded (Dietrich/Sieglock) to approve the following:

- To approve modifications to the project completion timeline.
- To add the housing incentives as presented in the application.

Motion passed.

A second motion was made and seconded (McHugh/Dodds) to approve the modified language of adequate infrastructure and transit as reflected on page 8. Motion passed by majority vote.

VII. EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Mr. Amoroso discussed how the evaluation committee would be made up of five members (one from each county). He explained that the committee will evaluate the proposed zones once they had been checked by the Council of Governments staff for completeness, staff had performed the GIS evaluation of proposed projects, and assigned a ranking of projects. The action requested by staff is to select one of the three options for selecting members of the Evaluation Committee as presented and to select committee members based upon chosen method.

Mr. Wasserman suggested that there might be a problem with getting committee members to perform an objective evaluation. Mr. Amoroso responded that by having one advocate from each county that each application would have potential. Mr. Wasserman again stated that an evaluation suggests objectivity, not advocating. He suggested that the whole process is going to lack objectivity. Ms. Rhodes suggests that the committee members are selected within the county and hopes that the committee can be impartial and to select the project that would be best for the county and the region. Mr. Serna, Mr. Dodds and Ms. Rhodes all agree that the selection process for projects should be decided within each county and then brought forward to the Evaluation Committee for evaluation.

Ms. Greene recommended that the COG Boards review all of the applications, make their recommendations and explain to the IRP why they made their recommendations. However, all applications would come forward to the IRP evaluation committee only with the COG's recommendation as to which project would be best for the county. Ms. Dietrich agreed it would be acceptable if the COG's received the proposals and brought them to the IRP for final decision as to what is accepted.

Mr. Bilbrey explained that as a member of the COG board, there is representation across the county and they have been able to put aside issues in their city and do what is right for the county. He informed the committee that the COG board treats people fairly and equitably and have reviewed projects across the county on an equal footing. Ms. Dietrich pointed out that there were single county COG's and then ABAG which represents nine counties, many of which are not participants in the IRP. Therefore, what works for a couple of areas, will not work for all counties. Mr. Bilbrey informed the committee that both San Joaquin and Stanislaus counties would not have a problem with ranking the projects. Ms. Greenberg questioned why couldn't the representatives from the IRP rank the projects.

Ms. Dietrich suggested that we go forward with option #2 recognizing that every county or sub-set thereof may put together whatever kind of information they wish and send that material with their representative to the sub-committee. She pointed out that as the discussion continued, the committee was getting further and further away from the IRP. Mr. Dodds disagreed and stated that the prioritizing of projects belongs to the elected officials in his county. He would like to see the prioritization of projects be done by his COG in Stanislaus county. Ms. Dietrich stated that each county could go to their local agencies to rank their projects but then the projects would have to be brought forward to the IRP to make the final decision as to which projects were selected. In this manner, the focus is that the IRP has responsibility for the project rather than shifting the responsibility outside.

A motion was made and seconded (Wasserman/Dietrich) to allow the Partnership members (as county sub-groups) to select their committee member. Motion passed.

VIII. CO-CHAIR DISCUSSION

Mr. Amoroso noted that at the last meeting, the Partnership adopted a co-chair structure to facilitate the meetings. The Partnership also determined the conditions that should be met under the co-chair structure and offered suggestions as to how successor co-chairs might be appointed.

Staff identified several issues related to the IRPs co-chair structure and is requesting clarification and direction from the IRP. Staff created a summary of issues and recommendations as follows:

- Co-chairs' terms should be staggered
- Co-chairs should represent both county and city
- Procedures for chairing of the IRP meetings need to be established
- At the end of a co-chair's term, or if a co-chair no longer wishes to serve in that capacity, the position needs to be filled by another IRP member.

Ms. Greenberg noted that it was the staggering that complicates the whole thing, and that cause the overlap. She suggests that we do away with the staggering and allow the co-chairs to rotate from year to year.

A motion was made and seconded (Greenberg/Rhodes) to eliminate the staggering of co-chairs and that the term for the co-chairs should be one year. Motion passed.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. McHugh raised the question as to why public comment was always placed at the end of the agenda. Mr. Bilbrey stated that in Tracy public comment was at the beginning and the end of the meetings. He suggested to staff that the public comment be placed at both the beginning and end of the agendas, however, with a stipulation that comment would be limited to a three minute maximum.

X. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. until October 17, 2001.