



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Agenda Item 2

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

Scott Haggerty, Chair
Alameda County

**JOINT MTC PLANNING COMMITTEE/
ABAG ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING OF MAY 14, 2010
MINUTES**

Adrienne J. Tissier, Vice Chair
San Mateo County

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

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

Dean J. Chu
Cities of Santa Clara County

Dave Cortese
Association of Bay Area Governments

Chris Daly
City and County of San Francisco

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacomini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sue Lempert
Cities of San Mateo County

Jake Mackenzie
Sonoma County and Cities

Jon Rubin
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Amy Rein Worth
Cities of Contra Costa County

Ken Yeager
Santa Clara County

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

ATTENDANCE

Commissioner Spering called the Joint MTC Planning Committee/ABAG Administrative Committee meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. Planning Committee members and other Commissioners in attendance: Azumbrado, Bates, Chu, Daly, Dodd, Giacomini, Glover, Haggerty, Halsted, Kinsey, Lempert, Mackenzie, Rein-Worth, Rubin, Tissier, and Yeager.

ABAG Administrative Committee members present were Susan Adams, Rose Jacobs Gibson, Dave Cortese, and John Gioia.

CONSENT CALENDAR: Minutes of April 9, 2010

Commissioner Mackenzie moved approval, Commissioner Lempert seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

**MTC PLANNING COMMITTEE/ABAG ADMINISTRATIVE
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

Commissioner Spering set the context for this meeting and other joint meetings that are contemplated as ABAG and MTC develop a Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)/RTP as required by SB 375 that will be adopted by the two agencies in March 2013. He mentioned that the Joint Policy Committee (JPC) recommended these joint meetings be held when key milestones require the attention of both agencies. He noted the agenda includes three main discussion topics related to SCS development: greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets; regional housing targets; and public outreach planning.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Targets

Mr. Doug Kimsey noted that MTC is working closely with other regions and CARB to provide detailed and consistent data that will assist CARB with its target setting process. He noted that CARB is required to submit draft GHG targets for 2020 and 2035 by June 30, 2010 and final targets by September 30, 2010 per SB 375. MTC and the other regions have developed several target-setting scenarios to provide CARB a potential range to consider when setting GHG targets; this information was shared with the committee members. Mr. Kimsey noted that SB 375 allows regions to submit their own GHG targets to CARB for its consideration; he noted that the committees will discuss whether MTC should submit its own GHG targets depending on whether we concur with CARB's draft targets.

Committee members offered the following questions/comments:

- Commissioner Spering asked how much do other regions invest in transportation capacity in their respective RTPs? Response: the larger region's RTPs invest almost twice the share of total revenues on capacity expansion compared to MTC's RTP – MTC invests about 80% of its RTP in maintaining and operating the existing system, about twice what the other regions invest.
- Commissioner Spering asked if the other region's RTPs include road and transit maintenance shortfalls? Response: Most of them do not carry the magnitudes of shortfalls that we include in our RTP, primarily due to the age of the Bay Area's transit and road infrastructure.
- Commissioner Spering also asked how can freeway expansion provide for greenhouse gas reductions? Response: Increasing congested speeds to the 35-45mph range can result in reduced greenhouse gas emissions and ozone precursor emissions.
- Ms. Susan Adams asked if staff is assuming continued use of fossil fuels in autos and trucks? Response: CARB assumes reductions in auto/truck fossil fuel use per capita over the next 10 -15 years as a result of imposing fuel efficiency and clean fuel standards through its rule-making process. However, SB 375 allows MPOs to only take credit for GHG emission reductions as they relate to transportation infrastructure investments and land use and pricing mechanisms.
- Staff should consider how the SCS can encourage more rapid deployment of fuel efficient cars and other clean energy programs.
- Commissioner Kinsey stated that Caltrans requires 70mph design speeds. He asked if we are going to promote aggressive greenhouse gas reduction strategies, we need to consider design standards that promote lower freeway speeds.
- The SCS should focus on infrastructure improvements, pricing mechanisms, and aggressive land use to achieve GHG reductions. Response: The 2009 RTP, which uses ABAG's 2007 projections, results in GHG per capita emissions increasing 2% compared to a 2005 base year. When applying more current forecasts that reflect a more prolonged recession, we forecast GHG per capita emissions to decrease 3% - a 5% swing related exclusively to reduced economic activity. The road pricing and the land use patterns have a far more powerful influence over GHG emissions than the infrastructure.
- Commissioner Mackenzie stated that it would be helpful to have data that shows how pricing policies would impact commuters, and how the pricing revenues could offset costs to build out the transit network so that those people would have a viable option to driving.
- Commissioner Rein-Worth asked what staff is doing about the initiative to suspend AB 32? Response: The AB 32 requirements do not affect the SB 375 requirements – we are still required to prepare an SCS regardless of the AB 32 outcome in November.
- Commissioner Cortese asked if there has been discussion on integrating all this into local planning – how do we get some buy-in at the local level? Response: The RTP/SCS will need to incentivize local agencies to develop more focused land use plans. While the RTP is likely to keep spending 80% of the money towards maintenance, funds could be used

to incentivize development in the urban core, and support good infill strategies. Transit expansion funding will need to be supportive land use strategies.

- Commissioner Azumbrado stated that the SCS should consider the change in working conditions; in particular, telework.
- Commissioner Kinsey stated that if MTC and ABAG consider aggressive changes in pricing and land use, we have to be realistic about what local agencies will need to do if we want to be these visionary champions.
- Commissioner Bates stated that pricing is the key. Local governments, through their parking requirements, have got to get the pricing at a true cost so that people start changing their behavior.

Commissioner Spring asked what the implications are of choosing an aggressive greenhouse gas target with respect to land use.

Mr. Heminger stated that the RTP is still subject to federal requirements, financial constraints, reasonable land use assumptions, air quality conformity and the like, so our targets need to reflect this reality. Litigation is another possibility if GHG targets are not met; however, there is a fallback in the law that says if a target cannot be met, MTC and ABAG can develop an alternative planning strategy.

Housing Target

Mr. Paul Fassinger summarized the housing target. The SCS states that the region needs to house its entire workforce growth by income category. The State Dept. of Housing and Community Development gives us regional housing targets covering the next years that will be allocated to local jurisdictions.

He stated that the regional housing target requires extensive local government engagement, which will continue through the Fall 2010. The current T2035 regional funding commitments that can incentivize local agencies to take on more population and housing growth include: 1) Transportation for Livable Communities; 2) Climate Initiative Program; 3) Local street/roads maintenance, and 4) Regional Bike Plan Program.

In closing, he proposed two questions to the committee: 1) how can the RTP/SCS help local agencies that want to implement more focused growth?, and 2) should those willing to take on more housing growth get more regional discretionary funding?

Committee comments:

- Commissioner Spring stated that we need to consider the impact of more jobs in rural counties.
- There needs to be a regional approach to where jobs are located.
- Commissioner Rein-Worth suggested considering policies that aggressively work with the jobs discussion.
- Commissioner Mackenzie and Commissioner Kinsey agreed that local agencies willing to take on a larger share of housing growth should have access to a larger share of the RTP/SCS regional discretionary funding pot.

Public Participation and Local Government Engagement

Ms. Ellen Griffin stated that MTC is working with ABAG to develop a draft public participation plan that will be ready for review in June, and adoption in September 2010. Staff has planned a whole range of public participation elements working with a variety of stakeholders, and is talking about the key role local governments will play in this. She noted that existing and new advisory groups will be involved as well.

The Regional and Local Government engagement structure includes an Executive Group including the Executive Directors of the regional transit agencies, CMAs and City Managers. There will also be a new Regional Advisory Working Group, which includes stakeholder interests as well as planning staffs from local governments, regional agencies, transit agencies, and CMAs.

BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT CEQA GUIDELINES UPDATE

Mr. Henry Hilken responded to comments and concerns that came up at the February Planning Committee meeting regarding the CEQA guidelines.

He noted that the Air District staff has conducted extensive outreach throughout the region on the proposed guidelines. The primary concerns heard about the thresholds related to potentially creating another barrier to infill and transit oriented development and a lack of technical resources within local governments to conduct the air quality assessment. To address these concerns, the Air District has developed an extensive set of on-line technical support tools and methodologies to assist lead agencies in evaluating a project's potential impacts.

He stated that the Committee requested that MTC and the Air District staff address questions on how the guidelines might affect the Regional Transportation Plan. The Transportation 2035 EIR, pursuant to CEQA, includes a two-pronged test for determining significance of plan impact: 1) Cumulative Impact, which compares existing emissions vs. projected future year population and jobs, plus project emissions; and, 2) Plan-related contributions, which compares projected future year without project emissions vs. projected future year plus project emissions.

He reported that the guidelines are scheduled for adoption on June 2, 2010.

Public comment

- Carli Payne, TransForm, agreed that land use and pricing are critical strategies, but there needs to be early discussions about how money will be prioritized to follow the housing allocations. She also stated that the impact of pricing in the modeling seems massively underestimated.
- Stuart Cohen, TransForm, stated that failure to meet a GHG emission target would affect proposed CEQA exemptions for local agencies provided for in SB 375. He also stated that there is a major issue with the model – it underestimates land use and transportation demand management strategies.

- Scott Zengel, Bay Area Council, stated that jobs and economy is missing from the SCS discussion. He noted that the Bay Area Council is working on the economic impacts and offered to provide some specific detail.

OTHER BUSINESS/PUBLIC COMMENT

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m. The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Friday, June 11, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. in the Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland, CA.