



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov  
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

*Adrienne J. Tissier, Chair*  
San Mateo County

*Amy Rein Worth, Vice Chair*  
Cities of Contra Costa County

*Tom Azumbrado*  
U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development

*Tom Bates*  
Cities of Alameda County

*David Campos*  
City and County of San Francisco

*Dave Cortese*  
Santa Clara County

*Bill Dodd*  
Napa County and Cities

*Dorene M. Giacopini*  
U.S. Department of Transportation

*Federal D. Glover*  
Contra Costa County

*Mark Green*  
Association of Bay Area Governments

*Scott Haggerty*  
Alameda County

*Anne W. Halsted*  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

*Steve Kinsey*  
Marin County and Cities

*Sam Liccardo*  
Cities of Santa Clara County

*Jake Mackenzie*  
Sonoma County and Cities

*Kevin Mullin*  
Cities of San Mateo County

*Bijan Sartipi*  
State Business, Transportation  
and Housing Agency

*James P. Spering*  
Solano County and Cities

*Scott Wiener*  
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

*Steve Heminger*  
Executive Director

*Ann Flemer*  
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

*Andrew B. Fremier*  
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

## MTC PLANNING COMMITTEE

July 8, 2011

### MINUTES

#### ATTENDANCE

Chair Spering called the MTC Planning Committee meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. Planning Committee members in attendance were: Vice Chair Halsted, Commissioners Azumbrado, Giacopini, Green, Haggerty, Mackenzie, and Mullin. Commission Chair Tissier was present in her ex-officio voting member capacity. Other Commissioners present as ad hoc members of the Committee were Bates, Kinsey, and Wiener.

ABAG Administrative Committee members in attendance were: Green, Cortese, Gibson, Gingles, Haggerty, Pierce, and Spering.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR: a) Minutes of June 10, 2011

Commissioner Mackenzie moved approval of the Consent Calendar, Commissioner Halsted seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

#### PLAN BAY AREA: a) OneBayArea Grant Proposal

Mr. Doug Kimsey summarized a proposal as an alternative to the current Cycle 2 framework that: 1) shifts more funding to locally managed OneBayArea Grant Program. The funding for the OneBayArea Grant would be based on merging many of the programs in the Cycle 2 framework into a single flexible grant program and is roughly a 70% increase in the funding distributed to the counties as compared to the Cycle 2 framework adopted by the Commission; 2) adds flexibility by eliminating program categories; 3) leverages outside funds to meet more objectives; 4) continues key regional programs; and 5) establishes a Priority Conservation Area Planning Program.

Staff also proposes a distribution formula for OneBayArea Grant funding that includes housing incentives to support the SCS and promote effective transportation investments that support focused development. The proposed distribution formula to the counties includes three components: 50% population, 25% Regional Housing Needs Allocation for 2007-2015, and 25% actual housing production. Staff also proposes to require that at least 70% of funding be spent on projects in Priority Development Areas.

In addition, staff recommends performance and accountability requirements as a condition for any jurisdiction receiving Cycle 2 OneBayArea grants.

Mr. Kimsey recommended that the Committee approve release of the OneBayArea Grant proposal for public review. Staff will seek feedback from stakeholder and technical working groups over the next several months.

Committee comments:

- Commissioner Spring stated that he is disappointed that the Planning Conservation Area Planning Pilot is proposed to be a \$2 million program. He was expecting it to be a higher number for the counties with less than 500,000 population. He asked if that can be changed. Mr. Kimsey responded that staff can change it upon the Committee's direction. Staff is looking at it more as a placeholder for further discussion as to whether it should be higher than \$2 million.
- Commissioner Kinsey stated that the North Bay communities have agricultural and open space assets that are recognized as a balance of the PDA, which is now proposed at 70%. He proposed to shift that to 65%, and put 5% towards the Planning Conservation Area.
- Commissioner Green stated that he likes the proposal to base funding on actual housing production, and an emphasis of money going to the PDAs.
- Commissioner Mullin expressed CCAG's concerns with the 70% figure for the PDAs being too high, given the 3-year time frame for implementation.
- Commissioner Haggerty expressed support for the Priority Conservation Planning, but has a problem with money being set aside only for counties with populations under 500,000. He would like staff to consider expanding eligibility to counties with voter-approved urban growth boundaries.
- Commissioner Spring responded to Commissioner Haggerty's comment and stated that larger counties are getting a much larger share of funding overall, and could flex some of that money into PCAs. He also noted that this is a pilot program, and if this works then Commissioner Haggerty's comment should be Step 2.
- Councilmember Pierce stated that in order to reduce the potential for sprawl in some of the targeted areas in the smaller counties, staff may need to increase the size of the pot. She also is hopeful to maximize the flexibility of these dollars within the guidelines of where the money comes from.
- Commissioner Cortese stated that the San Jose Deputy Director and Planning Director expressed concern about the PDA calculations. He also asked about the growth opportunity areas that are tentatively considered as PDAs until ABAG completes final PDA designations next fall, and asked if that was intended to give them an opportunity to figure out what their real numbers are? Mr. Kimsey affirmed that was correct.
- Commissioner Weiner expressed support for giving resources and incentives to smaller counties to stay compact.

Public Comment:

- Mr. Rich Napier, Exec. Director San Mateo CMA, stated it is important to provide flexibility.
- Scott Haywood, SCVTA, expressed support of the concept of moving more discretionary funding to the local level and for the additional flexibility to address the transportation needs. He expressed concern on the practical implementation of the PDA minimum requirement. He expressed support of the Priority Conservation Area Planning Program, and encouraged staff to make it as flexible as possible.

- Duane DeWitt, Sonoma County Advocacy Group, stated that the 70% for PDAs is very feasible, but will only work if there is enforcement and monitoring. He asked staff to avoid the airport, airfield and urban services area of Sonoma County.
- Stephanie Reyes, Greenbelt Alliance, expressed support for the OneBayArea Grant Program concept. She stated that this is essential to support those cities that are stepping up to do their part, and the program should be bigger. She encouraged staff to bring back some options for other sources of funding that can go towards the grant in addition to the STP/CMAQ funds.
- Sam Tepperman-Gelfant, Public Advocates, expressed support for this program. He commented on affordable housing and displacement, and stated that those stepping up and building the affordable housing that is the most difficult to build should be rewarded for doing that.
- Jeff Hobson, TransForm, expressed support for this program. He stated that it should be bigger by thinking beyond the next STP/CMAQ funding cycle. He is pleased to see a performance based approach, and that some of the funding is based on production of housing. He likes to see a requirement that 70% of the funds be used in the PDAs, as well as the requirement of the supportive transportation and land use policies including the housing elements.
- Tilly Chang, SFCTA, expressed support for this program, and would like to see it expanded. She expressed support on the 70% recommendation for the minimum level of spending in the PDAs. She also expressed support for the policy conditions.

Commissioner Tissier made a motion to support the release of the OneBayArea Grant Proposal with the modification to increase the pilot program to \$5 million and to allow any county the flexibility to set aside a portion not to exceed 5% for PCA planning. Commissioner Haggerty seconded. Motion passed unanimously by the MTC Planning Committee.

Commissioner Cortese moved the same recommendation for the ABAG Administrative Committee, Councilmember Pierce seconded. Motion passed unanimously by the ABAG Administrative Committee.

### **b) Defining the Alternative Scenarios**

Mr. Ken Kirkey, ABAG, presented the details on the land use transportation infrastructure and policy initiatives assumed under each of the five scenarios, how the components of the proposed equity focused scenario are reflected in the five scenarios, and provided details on the proposed equity focused scenario based upon consultation with equity stakeholder groups. Mr. Doug Kimsey presented the Transportation Assumptions. He noted that scenarios 2 and 4 are the ones that will be increasing transit the most.

In closing he stated that staff does not believe the equity advocates had enough time to review staff's information; therefore, staff is requesting that no action be taken today, but will be bringing it to the ABAG Executive Committee for approval on July 21<sup>st</sup>, and the Commission on July 27, 2011.

#### **Public Comment:**

- Bob Allen would like to see more information on the IVS transit scenario.
- Sylvia Darensberg, Transportation Justice Working Group, suggested an environmentally equitable plan so communities of concern may have sustainable communities.

- Scott Peterson, East Bay Economic Development Alliance, reminded everyone that the reason the sustainable communities strategy was initiated was to address environmental issues to reduce greenhouse gas emissions – it's important to make sure that the analysis and the projections and planning that go into the scenarios take into account how business growth, the preservation of employment centers, and the growth of employment centers can help to drive these scenarios moving forward.
- Dave Campbell, East Bay Bicycle Coalition, stated that a complete community means complete streets. A complete streets policy applies to all transportation projects. A complete streets policy is flexible.
- Paul Campos, Building Industry Association, commented on the housing assumption and wanted to make sure that when staff is looking at what is feasible in terms of housing production over the life of the SCS that it is treated fairly and consistently with all others. He also stated that it is good to move the equity analysis forward, but it appears that equity is starting to elevate above the other two E's.
- Nick Bower (on behalf of Scott Zengel), Bay Area Council, expressed support for the sustainable communities strategy and noted that there is a role for social equity; however, the council is opposed to adding a sixth alternative scenario because there are existing equity components in the other five scenarios. The proposed equity scenario is not balanced in terms of its transportation decisions – focuses too much on maintenance rather than expansion. He urged the committee, at the next meeting, to reject the adoption of the equity environment and jobs scenario.
- Beth Walukas, Alameda CTC, expressed support of staff's recommendation.
- Tilly Chang, SFCTA, stated that the quality of life factors agreements on the non-PDA growth is a great approach and would like the committee to consider it for the 70% of PDA growth.
- Stephanie Reyes, Greenbelt Alliance, urged the committee to ask staff to bring back further detailed definitions of the scenarios including answers to questions about what are the total regional growth numbers, which transportation projects are going to be included in each scenario as per the initial result of the project performance assessment.
- Duane DeWitt stated that there is not equity in the way this is going forward, and recommended that there be equity for the environment, the economy, and transit users. He recommended that staff use the PDAs to seek out federal government funds in the sustainable communities partnership that was put together by the Department of Transportation, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the EPA.
- Wayne Chen, City of San Jose Housing Department, expressed support of the continued alignment of the RHNA methodology with the SCS alternative scenarios to maximize opportunities and choices in all scenarios. He supports the concept that a robust set of equity and quality of life factors be incorporated into all of the scenarios. He stated flexibility is extremely important, and would like to see the possible exploration of a higher minimum housing threshold. He supports an equitable pattern of growth that maximizes the economy of scale and return on investment of existing and future infrastructure.
- Wendy Alfsen, SF Bay Walks, stated that staff was asked to come back with the equity environment and job scenario, which they have not done. She would like staff to compare what happens if what the federal law requires was implemented and narrow that disparity and start from that and see how much difference that makes in accomplishing all of the goals for the environment economics and equity.

Commissioner Mackenzie stated that it is important that the committee get maximum amount of clarification on what these proposed growth numbers are going to be.

Commissioner Spering asked if staff will illustrate, within the various scenarios, how staff is addressing the equity issues. Ms. Ann Flemer, Deputy Director, Policy, stated that staff will be getting more clarification with the equity advocates and understanding what it is that each of the alternatives will include, and then bring it back to the Commission for consideration on July 27, 2011.

**OTHER BUSINESS/PUBLIC COMMENT**

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m. The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Friday, September 9, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. in the Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland, CA.

*J:\COMMITTEE\Planning Committee\2011\September11\1\_Final\_minutes.doc*