

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter – Auditorium

101 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Oakland, California

June 6, 2012

### **Members Present:**

Susan Adams, Supervisor, County of Marin  
Ronit Bryant, Councilmember, City of Mountain View  
Paul Campos, Sr. Vice President of Government Affairs, BIA Bay Area  
Dave Cortese, Supervisor, County of Santa Clara / RPC Chair  
Linda Craig, Bay Area League of Women Voters  
Diane Dillon, Supervisor, County of Napa  
Pat Eklund, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Novato  
Mark Green, Mayor, City of Union City/ABAG Immediate Past President  
Scott Haggerty, Supervisor, County of Alameda  
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club  
Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor, City of Pleasanton  
Janet Kennedy, Councilmember, City of Martinez  
Jeremy Madsen, Executive Director, Greenbelt Alliance  
Nate Miley, Supervisor, County of Alameda  
Anu Natarajan, Councilmember, City of Fremont  
Julie Pierce, Vice Mayor, City of Clayton, ABAG Vice President  
Laurel Prevetti, BAPDA  
Tiffany Renee, Vice Mayor, City of Petaluma  
A. Sepi Richardson, Councilmember, City of Brisbane / RPC Vice Chair  
Mark Ross, Vice Mayor, City of Martinez  
Carol Severin, EBRPD Board of Directors  
Allen Fernandez Smith, President & CEO, Urban Habitat  
Jim Spering, Supervisor, Solano County  
Egon Terplan, Regional Planning Director, SPUR  
Beth Walukas, Alameda County Transportation Commission

### **Members Absent:**

Shiloh Ballard, Silicon Valley Leadership Group  
Andy Barnes, Policy Chair, Urban Land Institute  
Valerie Brown, Supervisor, County of Sonoma  
Rose Jacobs Gibson, Supervisor, County of San Mateo  
Nancy Kirshner-Rodriguez, Director External Affairs, San Francisco MTA  
Mark Luce, Supervisor, County of Napa, ABAG President  
Andrew Michael, Bay Area Council  
Nancy Nadel, Councilmember, City of Oakland  
Harry Price, Mayor, City of Fairfield  
Pixie Hayward Schickele, California Teachers Association  
Linda Seifert, Supervisor, County of Solano

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

### **Staff Present:**

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director  
Miriam Chion, ABAG Principal Planner  
Hing Wong, ABAG Senior Planner  
Mark Shorett, ABAG Regional Planner  
Dayle Farina, ABAG Administrative Assistant

### **1. Call to Order/Introductions**

Chair Cortese called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM.

Chair Cortese asked for minute of silence in memory and honor of Committee Member Supervisor Gayle Uilkema, Contra Costa County, who passed away on May 19, 2012.

### **2. Public Comment**

### **3. Approval of Minutes for April 4, 2012**

Approval of the minutes was moved by Committee Member Eklund and seconded by seconded by Committee Member Bryant.

1 correction, noted by Committee Member Holtzclaw on page 5, buses is misspelled.

It was also noted that on the same page Mr. Holtzclaw's name was misspelled.

Minutes of April 4, 2012, were approved as corrected. Corrections will be posted on the website.

### **4. Oral Reports/Comments**

#### **A. Committee Members**

Committee Member Eklund asked why the EIR alternatives are not part of the agenda for this body to discuss.

#### **B. Staff**

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Director of Planning & Research, reported that on May 17, 2012 at a joint meeting of the MTC Commission and the ABAG Executive Board the, both the transportation and land use pieces of the Draft Preferred Scenario of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) were approved.

At the same meeting, the ABAG Executive Board approved the Draft Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) methodology. The final methodology will be raised at another joint meeting on July 19.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

The SCS EIR Alternatives will be discussed at the joint MTC Planning Committee & ABAG Administrative Committee on Friday, June 8. This will be followed by a number of public scoping meetings.

In addition, on May 17, at the joint meeting, MTC adopted the One Bay Area Grant as well.

Chair Cortese asked if the comment period for the RHNA methodology would be the appropriate time to comment on the SCS Preferred Scenario.

Clarification was made by Mr. Kirkey that the SCS and RHNA methodology Are not yet connected and this comment period should not be used to comment on the EIR Alternatives.

Committee Member Eklund expressed frustration over the absence of the SCS EIR alternatives at the meetings(s) of the Regional Planning Committee.

Chair Cortese commented that perhaps Mr. Kirkey and Ms. Eklund could meet after this meeting to further discuss how the RPC can become more involved in the EIR process.

Committee Member Eklund asked who it was that made the decision that the EIR Alternatives would be taken to the Administrative Committee and not to the Regional Planning Committee.

Mr. Kirkey responded that with the joint MTC Planning/ABAG Administrative Committee, both agencies are represented and where many items related to SB 375 are being presented. This will also be presented to the Commission and Executive Board, in the evening, so the public can attend.

Chair Cortese requested that the Committee Members be kept informed, throughout the SCS process and through all means of communication, of all opportunities to be heard about SCS-related issues.

Committee Member Campos also expressed disappointment in this information not being presented to the RPC and the Regional Advisory Working Group, with request for input from these two bodies.

### **5. ACTION: Bay Area Regional Energy Network (REN)**

Gerald Lahr, ABAG Energy Programs Manager, presented information and sought a recommendation on a resolution ratifying the submittal of a proposal to the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) for the creation of the Bay Area Regional Energy Network (REN)

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Hosterman asked for a clearer definition of the Regional Energy Network. She further inquired on projected cost for the development of said network.

Mr. Lahr responded with some examples of tasks which have been completed in the past and would fit under the umbrella of a REN and the type of programs which would be implemented. He further explained that, while the dollar amounts had not yet been determined, grants of up to 160,000,000 could help to support these programs. Possibly in the tens of millions of dollars for this region.

Committee Member Eklund asked what specific proposed projects would be implemented in the residential housing arena?

Mr. Lahr responded that they are still compiling the proposal. An example would be providing incentives for energy efficient retrofits in homes.

Ms. Eklund asked who the Marin County representatives are on the Steering Committee and asked to be provided with the member list of the Committee.

Mr. Lahr provided those names and said he will get the list to the members.

Committee Member Adams asked how this inter-relates to communities which are community choice aggregators. Will it allow those communities to utilize these resources?

Mr. Lahr responded that it is not the intention of this network to duplicate efforts in communities with such programs, nor is it their intention to take funding opportunities away from those communities.

Committee Member Craig asked for clarity on the difference between the program currently in existence where 8 counties are participating and this program which will include all 9 counties.

Mr. Lahr clarified that there were 8 counties participating in the 'Retrofit Bay Area' program; Napa County opted out of that program. Napa has indicated interest in participating in this program.

Committee Member Eklund commented that her understanding is that funding would go to counties and asked if funding will be available for individual cities as well.

Mr. Lahr responded that ABAG would act as Lead Contractor and we would then contract with a single agency within each county. The funding for individual cities would be in the hands of each lead contract agency within each county.

Committee Member Hosterman asked for a more detailed package to gain clarity on how the program would roll out. She continued that she would take a more detailed package and present it to others in her jurisdiction.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Natarajan asked if this is funding other than what the counties and cities will already have available to them?

Mr. Lahr responded that there is limited funding that the state allocations for energy efficiency programs. This is the same pool of money for which jurisdictions will be applying.

Committee Member Campos commented that it sounds like jurisdictions are not happy with the way PG&E is administering grant monies.

Mr. Lahr commented that the money being promoted by the Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition (LGSEC) has many restrictions on how the money can be used. Therefore, this network would have more authority on how the programs are run.

Committee Member Green asked what the time constraints are on this proposal.

Mr. Lahr responded that the proposal needs to be submitted by July 2.

Chair Cortese asked for clarification on the process. Will this program be delegating the implementation process to the counties?

Mr. Lahr responded that if the Executive Board did not approve this resolution to proceed, the proposal would simply be retracted from the application process. It would not be delegated to the counties.

Committee Member Eklund asked what would happen if we wanted to modify the proposal after the application was submitted?

Mr. Lahr commented that he believes a proposal can be changed until the decision is made by the Public Utilities Commission (PUC).

Committee Member Renee asked how this would affect the Sonoma County Energy Independence Program and like programs in other counties. Ms. Renee also asked if this item would be presented to the Executive Board in July with greater detail.

Mr. Lahr responded that the actual proposal will be prepared in time for the Executive Board meeting and, as a result, there will be more detail available in that proposal. In relation to county energy programs, Mr. Lahr would hope to include promoting programs like the one in Sonoma County as a model to promote similar programs in other counties.

Committee Member Renee moved to support this program with forthcoming detail in the proposal to the Executive Board in July.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Eklund asked if the motion would include the opportunity to make modifications to the proposal once it is presented to the Executive Board. If so she should second the motion.

Committee Member Renee clarified her motion and amended it to allow the Executive Board to make modifications.

Chair Cortese asked if Counties would have the opportunity to opt out of the program.

Mr. Lahr confirmed that counties would have this opportunity to not participate in the program.

Committee Member Ross asked if the proposal would consider water conservation as part of the program.

Mr. Lahr explained that the PUC included in the program a Water Energy Nexus. The opportunities in the program must be directly related to energy and a water energy nexus would including the energy related to pumping.

Committee Member Adams asked for clarification about what happens after the proposal is presented to the Executive Board.

Chair Cortese clarified the entire process and confirmed with Mr. Lahr.

Committee Member Terplan asked if awarded funding from this grant would it mean that ABAG would play a major role in energy efficiency in the Bay Area and, if so, is this a role appropriate for ABAG to play.

Mr. Lahr responded that ABAG has played a role in energy efficiency in the region for a long time.

The motion carried with 6 abstentions.

### **6. INFORMATION: Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Methodology Comment Period**

Hing Wong, ABAG Senior Regional Planner, presented an information and sought committee and public input on RHNA methodology and the preliminary Subregional Shares for the fifth cycle: 2014-2022

Chair Cortese asked for Public Comment on this item.

The following members of the public commented on the RHNA Methodology

Tim Frank, Director, Center for Sustainable Neighborhoods  
Parisa Pottega-Weise, Public Advocates

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Gloria Bruce, Deputy Director, East Bay Housing Organizations

Miriam Chion, ABAG Assistant Planning Director, addressed high concentration of housing in major cities and the income distribution items which were raised at the May 17, 2012 Executive Board meeting and asked for input from the Committee.

Committee Member Madsen asked with the overall vacancies are in existing housing.

Mr. Wong replied with an approximate number of just above 200,000.

Mr. Madsen asked about sub-regional shares in cities and counties. He asked if it is possible to encourage counties to move development out of the rural areas and into the cities.

Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director, replied that some counties are moving forward with sub-regional planning and others have agreed not to do so. It is something to definitely be considered in the future and that ABAG supports.

Committee Member Adams addressed the housing issues raised by the public in Marin County.

Committee Member Green asked that in relation to Distribution by Income (median income) are these numbers based on the assumption of income patterns or is it based on not allocating the correct numbers of proper housing in the past?

Ms. Chion responded that these numbers are based on the State forecast for distribution.

Committee Member Holtzclaw asked what the median income is currently in this region.

Ms. Chion responded that we will send the information to the Committee.

### **7. ACTION: Rural Community Investment Areas and Employment Investment Areas**

Mark Shorett presented information on and sought approval of Rural Community Investment Areas and Employment Investment Areas as pilot programs consistent with a set of refined criteria. These place types will replace the Employment Center, Rural Corridor, and Rural Town Center PDA place types, responding to concerns raised by committee members, members of the public and stakeholders at the March 2012 RPC meeting. Staff also presented a proposal to institute a moratorium on applications for, and adoption of, applications for Priority Development Areas (PDAs) until 2015.

Committee Member Prevetti asked if the RPC approves these Investment Areas, will they be considered PDAs in terms of the One Bay Area Grant? Ms. Prevetti also

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

added a word of caution toward the moratorium on PDAs as it could discourage jurisdictions in the midst of updating their general plans from considering PDAs as part of the plan in the future.

Mr. Kirkey responded that the moratorium on PDAs was brought forth by the Executive Board and that it is the RPC and Executive Board's decision how to proceed. Mr. Kirkey then responded that it would be the request of Staff that the Investment Areas are eligible for One Bay Area Grant funding and explained the process by which the funding will be allocated through each county.

Committee Member Campos expressed concern over the PDA moratorium, particularly a moratorium on applications.

Committee Member Spring recommended providing higher criteria for PDA applications.

Chair Cortese recommended that any input on ways to establish limits on PDAs, they can be addressed at a later date, while focusing today on the other points in this item which require action so that they can proceed to the Executive Board for approval in July.

Committee Member Bryant expressed concern over the Employment Investment Areas.

Committee Member Madsen asked for clarification on the criteria for the Rural Investment Areas; Is it within the existing footprint or the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) or comparable.

Mr. Shorett responded that it is (a) within the urban footprint and (b) within a protected area.

Mr. Madsen also asked about the rural areas in Sonoma and San Mateo counties, which state 'approved contingent on adjustments'; Are the adjustments already made or do they need to be made before the approval is in effect?

Mr. Shorett clarified that the adjustments need to be made prior to the July Executive Board meeting.

Mr. Madsen commented that he would rather vote on these after the adjustments had been made. He also suggested that the OBAG fund available for these investment areas be set in numbers.

Mr. Kirkey responded that it is up to the Committee to decide how to move on this.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Luce asked why the Napa PDA is be redesignated and why it is being accepted given the amount of housing is nowhere near what is being considered for the area.

Ms. Chion responded that Staff has been working with Staff in Napa and the guidelines are for what is expected. It does not need to be link existing conditions. It was actually the mix of uses and density which best matched the placetype applied.

Committee Member Eklund expressed concern over the lack of community support from Sonoma, Napa & San Mateo Counties.

Committee Member Green recommended, at a minimum, of approving the guidelines for the new placetypes.

Committee Member Terplan commented that the transit service side of this topic should come back to this committee, given the possibility of transit service cuts in the future.

Chair Cortese called for comments from the public.

The following members of the public provided comments on this item:

Janet Norman, City of Rio Vista

Rick Tooker, City of Napa

Tim Frank, Director, Center for Sustainable Neighborhoods

Committee Member Green moved to accept Staff recommendation to adopt the concept of Employment Investment Areas and Rural Community Investment Areas to the ABAG Executive Board with the guidelines.

Committee Member Renee seconded the motion.

Committee Member Bryant requests that the Jobs-Housing connection be determined at a broader level – not by individual city.

Committee Member Terplan requested that the Employment Investment Center have it be a goal to retain the prior FAR and Jobs-Per-Acre criteria.

The motion, as amended, carried.

Committee Member Eklund moved that the moratorium issue be brought back to the August meeting.

Committee Member Spring would like at several options for criteria.

The motion carried.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Committee Member Eklund moved that the Committee recommend adoption of the Benicia Employment Investment Area and the Dixon Rural Community Investment Area.

Chair Cortese called for objection. Seeing none, the motion carried.

Committee Member Luce moved to not recommend Napa Corridor as a Transit Town Center for adoption.

Committee Member Eklund seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

Committee Member Madsen moved to recommend adoption of the Rio Vista areas as Rural Community Investment Areas and that the Sonoma and San Mateo areas be set aside for clarification until August 1.

Committee Member Eklund seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

### **ADJOURN:**

Chair Cortese adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled on August 1, 2012

Submitted by:

Dayle Farina

Administrative Assistant