

INTER-REGIONAL PARTNERSHIP MEETING

*City of Livermore
City Council Chambers
3575 Pacific Avenue
Livermore, CA 94550*

Wednesday, June 16, 2004
1:00 p.m.

MEETING-MINUTES SUMMARY

I. Welcome, Introductions

Mayor Dan Bilbrey called the meeting to order with no quorum at 1:20 p.m. and welcomed everyone. He asked those in attendance to make self-introductions: In attendance were:

Inter-Regional Partnership Members

Mayor Dan Bilbrey, City of Tracy
Councilmember Lorraine Dietrich, City of Livermore
Councilmember, Bob Wassermen, City of Fremont
Councilmember, Julia Miller, City of Sunnyvale
Councilmember, Linda LeZotte, City of San Jose

Staff to the Inter-Regional Partnership

Christy Riviere, Regional Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Alex Amoroso, Principle Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Lark Downs, Stanislaus Council of Governments
Mike Swearingen, Senior Regional Planner, San Joaquin Council of Governments
Rosie Vargas, Office Assistant, San Joaquin Council of Governments

Public Attendees

Andrew Malik, City of Tracy
Linda Mauer, City of Tracy
Shanae Todd-James, City of Tracy
Bob Paternoster, City of Sunnyvale
David Early, Design, Community, & Environment (DCE)
Sarah Pullyblank, Project Planner, Design, Community, & Environment (DCE)
Kenneth Ryan, Sierra Club

II. Approval of the Meeting Minutes

Since there was no quorum, no action was taken.

III. IRP Pilot Project Evaluation

Ms. Riviere stated Phase I is completed of the final evaluation of the project and the ongoing monitoring of the Zones. She stated they condensed the number of data items and have given our data to the Consultants. Ms. Riviere stated we have a good relationship with each Zone and we are working closely with them on getting the final evaluation to the State.

Mr. Alex Amoroso stated the baseline information is not only these that limit availability, but there has not been a lot of development in the Zones. This is giving us a ground zero look that will be built and we won't see significant results for a couple of years.

Phase II – Mr. David Early stated we have come close to finalizing the report and presenting it to the Committee for comments. The report is due to HDD on July 30, 2004.

Mr. Early stated the overall scope of work has been a two part evaluation. The first phase is about the methodology collection analysis of data to show the effectiveness of the IRP. That data collection protocol was submitted to you in March. Staff has been working to assemble that data and will be concluding the results in the final report. He stated one of the major changes in this report is the reorganized chapter on Jobs/Housing Strategy. We moved on and looked at the Opportunity Zone and concluded with the chapter Pilot Project Design and Implementation. This has allowed us to put all the recommendations in the entire report into the final chapter. There is also going to be an appendix which has all the background that explains the data from Chapter three and will be submitted to HDD when the document is completed.

Mr. Early stated one of the changes is a revision for Methodology that we are using for building analysis. He said in the past we assumed that the Jobs/Housing to be added through the IRP were in addition to Jobs/Housing that would occur else where in the region. You suggested we assume the new jobs to be created in the job poor areas and the new housing to be created in the housing poor areas will actually take away from the demand for the Jobs/Housing within the job and housing rich areas. Mr. Early stated there is no County in which the change in Jobs/Housing Balance is really tremendous.

Mr. Early stated there are a number of barriers in achieving a good Jobs/Housing Balance. You will never create a situation where people will commute shorter distances, where congestion can be diminished, where quality of life can increase if we have a poor Jobs/Housing Balance in our individual sub-regions. We would encourage you to stay on this course in trying to create a good Jobs/Housing Balance in individual sub-regions.

Ms. Pullyblank stated that Chapter 4 includes the recommendations about the Pilot Project and some of the things the IRP might want to consider in improving the results of the program in the future. The topics included were:

- Interregional Cooperation
- Geographic Information System
- Opportunity Zone Selection Process
- Incentives
- Opportunity Zone Approach
- Overall Jobs/Housing Balance Strategy

Ms. Pullyblank stated the Interregional Cooperation has been one of the most interesting and largest accomplishments of the IRP; it's a strong benefit for the region as a whole and should be continued. She stated the Geographic Information System is an accomplishment. You are working with data which is quite complicated. Figuring out what data is available, how to get it into a certain format and to bring all that together into a system that can become a public tool is a challenge. Two recommendations are getting more detailed data and developing those connections.

She stated it appeared to us looking at the Opportunity Zone that job growth got the most emphasis. We looked at ways to bring the other kinds of goals into the process to modify opportunities on site requirements. We are looking at the percentage of vacant land and under utilized land that's required on those sites. The second thing is to add criteria that reflects those other goals, to integrate more into the process and to figure out how to emphasize housing or protecting open space. The third thing is to establish an eligibility requirement by taking the criteria you have and saying the only way we can accomplish this is by eliminating areas in which the Opportunity Zones can be located based on that criteria. The fourth thing is to use the GIS system more to emphasize the data that is entered. The last thing is to look at the Job/Housing Analysis area and go back to setting eligibility requirements as to what can be built in the Opportunity Zones. Ms. Pullyblank stated it took significant work to get incentives for the Opportunity Zones. In the initial legislation there were no guarantees which became a barrier as budget priorities shifted and different people came into office. She stated future legislation should include incentives for the program.

Ms. Pullyblank stated they found the Jobs/Housing Balance Strategy to be most effective in the areas that have the Opportunity Zones. She said the Jobs/Housing Balance Strategy does not affect the region as a whole and that site by site basis is not going to be as effective at changing commute patterns or adjusting goals that you illustrated. We recommend shifting the focus from site by site approach to the regional strategy which implements the incentives.

Ms. Pullyblank stated the last step is about the Overall Jobs/Housing Strategy. She recommended developing a Regional Economic Development Jobs/Housing Strategy. She suggested the IRP seek additional funding to encourage development in existing downtown.

Ms. Julia Miller stated the overall process of the Pilot program is very valuable when you are going in development zones. However, if you are doing in field

projects, it is a little difficult to look at the recommendations on a Regional basis, because each City has to look at their own land use.

Mr. Early stated there are Cities in the Bay Area that are trying to build significant amounts of housing in their downtown areas that have sites available and do not always need that 50 acre criteria. She said a program that would encourage Cities in the Bay Area to move forward with housing development in their central area would avail them some benefits from that and said it could be a very strong program.

Mr. Amoroso stated when legislation went through we did the minimums and maximums and in terms of acreage, we tried to leave those a little more open, there was a mandate by the legislated analysis that we put minimums and maximums on there, so without having those legislative upon us in the next generation we can try something different.

Mr. Amoroso asked if there are comments or discussions points that you have seen or heard today and would like for us to refine. The next step is for us to have the Consultants finalize the document and run it pass you and then it will be submitted to the State by the end of this fiscal year before our funding runs out.

Mr. Early stated one of the recommendations is we would really encourage the IRP to continue to meet even if legislature does not go through it's a benefit of an on going process of data and ideas sharing within the super Region.

Mayor Bilbrey wanted to confirm with Mr. Amoroso that he had asked two questions of the group. First he asked if there are comments, changes and/or modifications on the material that was presented today and secondly he asked the group if they were in agreement of the recommendations that were made by the consulting staff.

Ms. Dietrich gave her compliments on the lay out of the report and the references to various issues and re-emphasis on the major points. Mr. Wasserman stated the recommendations were appropriate and well done. Ms. LeZotte complimented the evaluation and said it changed for the better. Ms. Miller stated the Consultants did a good job and gave us something to work with. Mr. Bilbrey stated we developed a strong relationship and some understanding on how each community and region interacts with each other. He said we've learned a lot.

IV. Future Projects for the IRP

Mr. Amoroso stated there is a lot of activity around the State in terms of Inter-Regional Partnerships. He said although this organization has been together for five years, there are IRPs that have less than three years under their belt and started out in a different position then we did. He said they started from ground zero where we had a couple of years working together going forward while under the Pilot Project. He also said there seems to be a fair amount of emphasis around the State to look at the inter-regionalism. It is affecting things

like regional housing needs, allocation discussions, projections of growth, regional transportation needs and the assessments in the RTP's. He also said it is affecting international boundaries between San Diego, California and Baja Mexico. Mr. Amoroso stated there are a number of things to be explored such as funding, data collection issues, and to be able to provide the group with the information that you want. This report and discussion is a balance between where we want to go, what we want to focus on, and how well we can accomplish our goals.

Ms. LeZotte stated we should move the subject of transportation to August. Mr. Wasserman stated he agrees with transportation and their vision. He said he would like to see Bart going to Tracy and Stockton because it's going to affect all of us. Ms. LeZotte stated if we don't go along with Air Quality and Planning there won't be any money, it's important to work those two together. Mr. Bilbrey suggested Air Quality is the direction we should go. Ms. Dietrich suggested looking at land use patterns and projections.

Mr. Amoroso stated he will set up an informational meeting with sources from Air Quality and FPO organizations for the next IRP meeting in August 2004.

V. AB 723 Update

Mr. Swearingen stated on June 2, 2004 the Senator Local Government Committee voted in favor for the Bill. The Bill is now schedule for hearing on June 21, 2004; however there was some challenge and lobbying before the Committee. They were pushing to make sure the five opportunity zones that take advantage of the AB 723 have a back up plan to default to.

Mr. Swearingen stated the next highest scored job opportunities zone application out of the ten applications that we have right now would come into the fold and have an opportunity to move forward. and prepare to submit to the eye bank Infrastructure Financing District Plan which is the first step. Out of the current five opportunity zones if the Infrastructure Financing District Plan is submitted to the eye bank and the eye bank approves it, within one year they are supposed to convert the job opportunity zone to move the Infrastructure Finance District Plan, if this is not done within the one year the same type of default would happen, the next highest score application would come in and submit a plan to the eye bank. He stated this was a compromise recommendation by Senator Machado and has been built into the Bill. Mr. Swearingen stated the other challenge came from the Sierra Club and they recommended that certain portions of the Assembly Bill 857 sponsored by Patricia Wiggins be grandfathered into the Bill. To date, this has not been done. Mr. Swearingen stated the Bill is moving forward.

VI. Public Comment

Mr. Kenneth Ryan stated the Sierra Club has supported both publicly and in general the moves to create this committee and have it funded by the State. We have watched the Matthews Legislation and are really concerned about some of the precedents that are being set here and that you are throwing out access to

State funds by redeveloping zones. Mr. Ryan stated the Bill requires that if your Agency constructs housing, it must have 20% affordable housing. There is no such requirement if it is developed by a private sector. The Sierra Club feels this should be corrected. Mr. Ryan encouraged staff to ensure the Sierra Club's point of view is appropriately referenced in the Bill that comes through.

Mr. Bilbrey stated that staff will do what is best to make sure this is handled in an appropriate manner.

Mr. Andrew Malik stated he has worked closely with Mr. Swearingen on the AB 723. He said the overlap was simply put in there because the IFP utilizes the same funding mechanism as the Redevelopment Agency and by virtue of that you can't have both. Mr. Malik stated the City of Tracy looked at downtown with our business park as a job opportunity zone and the felt where we located it is appropriate. He stated that Business Parks should be easily accessed from the freeway.

VII. Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned until August 2004.