

# ***INTER-REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP MEETING***

## ***Livermore Council Chambers***

3575 Pacific Avenue  
Livermore, CA

Wednesday, July 17, 2002  
12:30 p.m.

## **MEETING –MINUTES SUMMARY**

### **I. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS**

Co-chair, Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy welcomed everyone to Livermore and asked the members to introduce themselves. In attendance were:

#### **Inter-Regional Partnership Members**

Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy (Co-chair)  
Supervisor Mark DeSaulnier, Contra Costa County (Co-chair)  
Council Member Lorraine Dietrich, City of Livermore  
Council Member Millie Greenberg, Town of Danville  
Council Member Denny Jackman, City of Modesto  
Mayor Michael McPoland, City of Brentwood  
Council Member Gloryanna Rhodes, City of Lathrop  
Supervisor Jack Sieglock, San Joaquin County  
Council Member Bob Wasserman, City of Fremont

#### **Staff to the Inter-Regional Partnership**

Alex Amoroso, Principal Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments  
Andrew Chesley, Deputy Executive Director, San Joaquin Council of Governments  
Gary Dickson, Executive Director, Stanislaus Council of Governments  
Wil Ridder, Regional Planner, San Joaquin Council of Governments  
Stephen VanDenburgh, Senior Regional Planner, San Joaquin Council of Governments  
Christy Riviere, Regional Planner, ABAG  
Michael Smith, Regional Planner, ABAG  
Gerald Raycraft, Planning Director, ABAG  
Donna Gomez, Office Assistant, San Joaquin Council of Governments

### **II. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

Co-chair Bilbrey asked for questions/comments regarding the May 15, 2002 meeting minutes. There were none, so he entertained a motion to approve the minutes. Approval was moved and seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

### **III. IRP STATUS REPORT/PROGRAM REVIEW**

Mr. Alex Amoroso referred members to the IRP activity schedule included in the agenda packets. The schedule highlights what has been accomplished in the IRP's on-going work plan. Mr. Amoroso briefed the members regarding the potential additional IRP dollars as discussed at the last meeting. Those dollars have since been deleted from the State Budget, so there is no additional money to go towards IRPs. Mr. Amoroso also highlighted the semi-annual report that goes to the Department of Housing and Community Development, which is in draft form now and is available to bring to the next meeting for members to review. The report explains what the IRP has accomplished so far with respect to opportunity zones and incentives. Co-chair Bilbrey felt it would be appropriate for the IRP Members to review this document at the next meeting.

### **IV. IRP PROGRAM/NEXT STEPS**

Mr. Amoroso reviewed items brought up at the last meeting as future discussion subjects: Air quality, economic development, water issues, and transportation issues. He asked for any that were missed, acknowledging that Supervisor DeSaulnier had brought up urban growth boundaries as another future item. Mr. Amoroso then asked that the members prioritize these issues so the focus is on one or two of the more important issues. Once they have been identified, in-depth studies can be done and information can be brought back on these subjects and how they relate to the IRP. Co-chair Bilbrey asked for comments.

Co-chair DeSaulnier explained that he raised the issue of urban growth boundaries, stating past discussions talked about doing vacant\nderutilized GIS studies for the whole region. He acknowledged that Supervisor Scott Haggerty, Alameda County has an interest in this as well, and it goes to the next agenda item: to partially cut down the number of interregional trips across the Altamont Pass, and the projected growth of that, which also has an air quality implication for both regions. He stated that the idea the IRP has talked about in theory is how to deal with the residential housing growth in the Valley and the jobs continuing to be in the Bay Area. He stated the IRP has reached a consensus that the Bay Area should be more cooperative in terms of economic development in getting more jobs out to the Valley, where there's more of a match with residential growth. In terms of future endeavors, he stated the IRP could set up a framework where the IRP wouldn't be dictating where urban growth areas would be, but at least would look at in the Valley, where there is more room to grow. He suggested doing a vacant\nderutilized land study to see where Valley counties could direct future growth and build a county urban growth boundary. He inquired if anyone thought discussing this issue would be a good idea.

Council Member Lorraine Dietrich, City of Livermore, agreed that it would be a good idea. She stated a discussion should occur with those folks who currently have urban growth boundaries. She stated each county could share their own

experiences and why the Central Valley might want to think about that now and benefit from others' experience.

Mr. Amoroso stated that, regarding trips over the Altamont, transportation management agencies could be surveyed, but that should wait because there is a possibility a comprehensive transportation plan might be required by the legislature for the Bay Area. A second action of identifying public transit projects is of significant importance and bears further discussion because no matter how well we do with the housing/jobs match folks are going to be going in both directions. Mr. Amoroso stated that IRP staff could compare and discuss growth boundaries, interregional transportation and transit and how that relates to reverse commute issues and whether we're going to get into the evolving air quality discussions from that.

Supervisor Jack Sieglock requested that, with regard to growth boundaries, that the discussion not be limited to the boundary, but also land use availability countywide. He also stated that in San Joaquin County, a countywide Transportation Impact Fees is being analyzed and asked that the Bay Area share their experiences in terms of what you charge regionally in terms of fees.

Council Member Denny Jackman asked whether the group had discussed high speed rail, and the proposed routing of the proposed service. He also stated that he is the author urban growth boundary initiatives that he is proposing for the ballot in Stanislaus County and Modesto, and cities within Stanislaus County.

Mayor Bilbrey stated that staff could use the good feedback on the item to prepare a future agenda, and closed discussion on the item.

## **V. SMOG CHECK II**

Gary Dickson described the Smog Check II program. He stated that Assemblyman Dennis Cardoza was primary sponsor of AB 2637, which would require that the Bay Area implement Smog Check II. He introduced Mr. Will Gonzales, a lobbyist for the Sacramento Air District who was working closely with Assemblyman Cardoza's office on the legislation.

Mr. Gonzales explained the SMOG Check II program in detail and how it differed from the air quality testing that Bay Area autos are currently subjected to. He stated that air quality districts downwind of the Bay Area are supporting AB 2637. He stated that the bill had been referred to the Senate Transportation Committee to be heard on August 6<sup>th</sup>. He stated it would probably be necessary to add language to the bill to give the Bay Area more assurance that AB 2637 won't be implemented before testing and reporting infrastructure is in place.

Mayor McPoland asked if older cars would be exempted from Smog Check II. Mr. Gonzalez stated there are exemptions right now for car from 1974 or older. Starting January 1, 2003 the 1974 or older exemption is replaced with an exemption that for

cars that are 30 years old or older. The other cars that are exempt from the Smog Check are cars four model years or newer. Their failure rate is less than 1%.

Co-Chair DeSaulnier stated that the Bay Area should support ozone containment with the caveat that the stations should be protected from making large capital investments in testing equipment when the testing technology is evolving. He also stated that he had concerns that the amount of pollutants being discussed that are impacting other counties or would be reduced by Smog Check II keeps changing, and that the bill should accommodate changing numbers over time. His third concern was how interregional trips are incorporated into the legislation.

Mr. Gary Dickson requested that the Board of the IRP support AB 2637, stating that the IRP's opinion may actually make a difference in whether the Senate supports the bill.

Co-Chair DeSaulnier made a motion to direct staff to prepare a letter from the co-chairs to the legislature stating the IRP supports AB 2367 and including comments about interregional trips, the use of the correct emissions numbers as those numbers change, and accommodating technological advances in testing as advances occur. Mayor McPoland seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

## **VI. JOBS/HOUSING OPPORTUNITY ZONE DESIGNATION**

Mayor Bilbrey reported on the selection of the tenth Opportunity Zone for Mayor Rich Dodds of Patterson, the Evaluation Committee Chairman, who was not present. He stated that the opportunity zone in Union City emerged as the Evaluation Committee's preference and recommendation. He stated that the committee evaluated the Union City Inter-modal station in Alameda County, a project in the City of Pittsburgh in Contra Costa County, from San Joaquin County the City of Manteca Tara Business Park, and from Stanislaus County the Salida project. He stated the scoring was relatively close as it relates to Union City and the City of Manteca project. While the Manteca project ranked high in the listing, the Union City project was selected as the top project by the evaluation committee. He stated that it was the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee to the full IRP board that the Union City project be selected as the 10<sup>th</sup> zone. He stated that members of the audience had requested to address the IRP before the Evaluation Committee's recommendation was acted on.

Mr. Terrence Grindall, Redevelopment Manager, City of Manteca, explained that Manteca was disappointed at not being selected as the 10<sup>th</sup> zone. He stated that Manteca was concerned that the recommendation of Union City would worsen the jobs\housing imbalance that Senator Torlakson's legislation was trying to reduce. He stated that Manteca's proposal corresponds with what the legislation had in mind by providing jobs where they're needed most the infrastructure to provide for the jobs.

Mr. Ken Ryan, Union City Planning Commission stated that Union City was happy to see that the Evaluation Committee was recommending awarding Union City the 10<sup>th</sup> opportunity zone. He stated that zone would be a balance of housing, some jobs, some retail, and a transit center and urged the IRP to adopt the Evaluation Committee recommendation.

Council Member Gloryanna Rhodes, City of Lathrop, asked how many jobs were included in the project in addition to the 1,000 housing units proposed. Mr. Ryan explained that the plan designates one million square feet for commercial uses and a business center, but he did not know the exact number of jobs. She expressed concern that the project included such a large job component. Mr. Ryan explained that a later phase of the project, not part of the Opportunity Zone proposal, would be 100% residential, and the project as a whole would be over 111 acres.

Council Member Millie Greenberg stated that she was disappointed that the IRP did not receive more applications for housing zones from Bay Area jurisdictions. But, she stated, the Union City application was a fine example of a transit-oriented development.

Mr. Andrew Chesley stated that the proposal for Union City included 8,100 jobs.

Council Member Greenberg made a motion that the IRP approve of the Evaluation Committee's recommendation. Mayor McPoland seconded.

Council Member Dietrich asked if the ACE train stopped in Union City. Mr. Chesley stated that there are no plans to stop in Union City. Mr. Ryan stated that no discussions had taken place with ACE over such a stop, but that ACE had proposed to run a train out of the transit center. Council Member Wasserman stated there were no plans to run ACE through the Union City transit center.

Mayor Bilbrey asked for a voice vote. Members Greenberg, DeSaulnier, McPoland, Jackman, Dietrich, Wasserman and Bilbrey voted "Yes". "No" votes were cast by members Rhodes and Seiglock. Motion carried 7-2.

Mayor Bilbrey stated that he was in support of the Manteca project but voted yes for the Evaluation Committee recommendation to acknowledge the spirit of partnership that had emerged from the IRP, as shown by the earlier action on air quality.

## **VII. IRP PROGRAM & ZONE EVALUATIONS**

Mr. Amoroso explained that the pilot project requirements include an evaluation of the pilot project overall, to see if it has met the goals of the Interregional Partnership and the goals of the legislation that created it. In addition, he stated, the IRP has to evaluate the jobs/housing opportunity zones against the criteria that the IRP established in the past. He stated the IRP needed to better define the five goals created early in 1998, which included things like achieving a more equitable

job/housing balance, transportation and air quality. He explained that IRP staff needed to be very clear on how those five goals were defined before the evaluations could be written. For example, How does the IRP want staff to define jobs/housing balance? Inter-regionally, along 580 and 680 corridor between the Bay and the Valley, and does it also include the relation of jobs/housing balance within San Joaquin County to the selected zone? Do you want to look at improvements of transportation on-site specifically, or on a zone-by-zone basis?

He asked if IRP members had any comments or wanted to provide any input before the evaluations were written. Co-chair Bilbrey asked the group for comments, and hearing none, moved the meeting to the next agenda item.

## **VIII. INCENTIVES REPORT**

Mr. Amoroso explained that AB 499, which would have provided incentives for the opportunity zones, didn't survive the legislative process. He stated that Assembly Member Codgill did amend AB 499 and move it as far as he could, with fairly limited support from some membership in the legislature. He stated that AB 499's failure was probably due to amending AB 499 at very end of a two-year session without time to garner support for the amendment. Letters of opposition from the Dept. of Housing and Community Development and the State Treasurer's office also hurt the effort. He stated that the AB 499 effort was a useful learning experience, but that in the new legislative session, incentives are still going to be tough to come by with the state of the California budget.

Gary Dickson stated that he believed the timing of the effort was a problem, with the IRP having approached Assemblyman Codgill relatively late in the legislative process. But he warned against overemphasizing timing as the reason the bill was not supported. He stated that he believed the IRP missed a real opportunity because Mr. Codgill amended his bill and put in exactly what the IRP wanted. He expressed disappointment at the letters of opposition that were included in the packet, especially the letter from HCD.

Mr. Amoroso stated that IRP staff planned to bring some draft language back to the group at the next meeting that would be part of the next legislative session.

Mayor McPoland suggested that an educational process be conducted with the legislators and key members of committees, explaining what the IRP is trying to accomplish.

Supervisor DeSaulnier stated that the IRP has to have a full consensus on the matter before going to the legislature. Mr. Chesley assured the group that there would be in the next effort.

## **IX. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Co-chair Bilbrey asked if anyone from the public was interested in addressing the IRP.

Mr. Ken Ryan stated that his previous comments to the IRP had been made representing the Planning Commission of Union City and as a resident of Union City. He now addressed the IRP as Transportation Issue Chair for the Sierra Club of California. He stated he also was a member of the Growth Management Policy Committee of the State. He stated that his group was concerned about voter initiatives but supported urban growth boundaries and in-fill of brownfields. He stated that his group would probably support Tracy's efforts to develop the old Southern Pacific site in downtown Tracy as a multimodal site. He said his group would also like to see stronger support for open space conservation as part of the general planning process. He stated he wanted to work with the IRP on development that relates to in-fill development, and that he would pass along to others in his organization the serious discussion the IRP had regarding urban limit lines. He offered to work with the IRP as it drafts legislation for Senator Torlakson.

Mr. Rich Pifferetti, representing Tracy Gateway, summarized an economic study of the Gateway by Economic Planning Systems, stating that at build-out over 25,000 jobs will be located at the site. The total number of jobs at build-out, including direct, indirect and induced are over 42,000 jobs. He recommended that each opportunity zone sponsor prepare something similar to assist in getting the legislature to support the IRP's next incentive initiative.

Mr. Tom Benigno, spoke representing Citizens Voice, and expressed his concerns about AB 2637.

## **X. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made (Sieglock\DeSaulnier) to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m. until September 18, 2002.