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

Scott Haggerty, Chair
Alameda County

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. Giacopini
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

Policy Advisory Council
October 13, 2010
Draft Minutes

Chair Paul Branson called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. Members in attendance were Naomi Armenta, Cathleen Baker, Richard Burnett, Carlos Castellanos, Bena Chang, Richard Hedges, Dolores Jaquez, Linda Jeffery Sailors, Randi Kinman, Federico Lopez, Marshall Loring, Evelina Molina, Cheryl O'Connor, Lori Reese-Brown, Gerald Rico, Frank Robertson, Dolly Sandoval, and Egon Terplan. Excused: JoAnn Busenbark, Wilbert Din, Allison Hughes, and Kendal Oku. Absent: Carmen Rojas.

Minutes

The minutes of the September 8, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved after a motion by Ms. Jeffrey Sailors and a second by Ms. Baker.

Subcommittee Reports

Regional Advisory Working Group Ad Hoc Subcommittee
Members reported that the subcommittee is working on understanding Transportation Demand Modeling; the two types of targets, proxy and true; and economic performance evaluation. Mr. Terplan noted that it was important to understand the role of Policy Advisory Council members on the subcommittee and to make sure they can provide feedback to the process. Ms. Chang asked to make sure that the information from the subcommittee is shared with Council members.

Equity and Access Subcommittee
Chair Branson announced that Ms. Armenta was elected chair and Ms. Kinman was elected vice chair of the Equity and Access Subcommittee. Ms. Armenta reported that preliminary work plan discussion topics for the subcommittee are: TIP investment analysis, recap of existing data sets, RTP/SCS equity analysis, funding process overview, lifeline funding, outreach and best practices, project timelines, and available surveys. Members also discussed the next Bay Area Travel Survey and the TIP investment analysis methodology.

RTP/SCS – Performance Targets and Indicators

The Council received the report from Lisa Klein of MTC planning staff. Ms. Jeffrey Sailors asked if targets will be better explained. Ms. Klein said yes, adding that staff will explain how targets will be measured. Mr. Hedges noted the importance of preserving industrial land because of the jobs they can provide. Ms. Reese-Brown asked if there were targets used in the past that were successful in meeting goals. She also asked if targets/indicators could be changed in the future. Ms. Klein noted that it was too soon to

– more –

RTP/SCS – Performance Targets and Indicators (continued)

gauge the success of the targets in the last regional transportation plan and added that targets could be changed because they are voluntary targets. Ms. Armenta suggested having some health outcome measure related to obesity and said that the region should preserve access improvement as a goal. Ms. Baker asked if mode share was still under consideration as a health-related target. Ms. Klein said it is still being considered, and there is no predisposition to choose mode split as opposed to time spent walking or biking. Ms. Baker also noted that in the future it would be good to include life expectancy at the zip code level.

Ms. Molina suggested looking at models outside the U.S. She added that taking a public stance in support of walking and bicycling is also important. Mr. Terplan asked that staff make sure there is a feedback loop at the end of the process and that the ideas fundamental to the SCS are not dropped from the process. He cautioned that the pollution reduction target could hinder infill goals and noted that a more in-depth discussion is necessary to address this conflict. Ms. Jeffrey Sailors requested that the goal to reduce particulate matter focus on hot spots in general because there are pollution hot spots outside of low-income areas. Ms. Kinman asked that agricultural land preservation not be lumped together with open space. She asked that urban and suburban be balanced appropriately when looking at the targets and cautioned against focus on the urban core. Ms. Kinman added that MTC should not take on something that they have no control over, for example, fine particulate matter emissions as it relates to diesel yards. She noted there are no targets for open space in infill development, for example urban parks. Mr. Rico said safety should be considered before promoting walking and bicycling. Chair Branson suggested having a target relating to the rapidly aging population of the region and their ability to age in the community where they currently live and maintain their current quality of life. Specifically, a target to increase access to transportation options for the region's elderly residents, to improve their ability to obtain essential services, and thereby enable them to age in place as active members of their communities. Ms. Molina suggested changing the wording of the overall goal category to "Healthy, Safe and *Happy* Communities."

Chair Branson recognized a member of the public:

Lindsay Imai of Urban Habitat stressed the relevancy of the Snapshot Analysis. She noted the Transportation Demand Model has some real flaws. She encouraged Council members to continue asking questions about the model, performance targets, and indicators.

Draft Title VI Report

The Council received the report from Denise Rodrigues of MTC staff. She pointed out that the report is a summary of MTC's Title VI activities from 2006-2010, highlighting more recent activities related to the adoption of a Limited English Proficiency plan and issuance of the draft Public Participation Plan. She also commented that the appendices for the report are available in the library and online at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/participation_plan.htm.

Ms. Armenta asked if the Title VI report would have an impact on whether BART will round up or down five cents as it relates to their discounted fare media. Ms. Rodrigues will follow up with Clipper™ staff. Mr. Terplan asked if there are aspects of the report where the Council should be concentrating and asked how the report will be used by the Commission. Ms. Rodrigues noted that the report serves as a single source describing the Commission's Title VI work. It also

Draft Title VI Report (continued)

allows the Commission to see where there is room for improvement. Ms. Sandoval asked if the report is continuously reviewed or if it is only reviewed and updated every four years. Ann Flemer, MTC's Deputy Executive Director for Policy, said this specific report is required every four years, however, the activities described in the report are updated more frequently than every four years. Ms. Baker asked if there are specific actions for improvement in the areas noted in the Public Participation Plan evaluation. Ms. Rodrigues will confirm this with public information staff.

Chair Branson recognized a member of the public:

Ms. Imai expressed concern about what the Commission is doing to prevent the disintegration of transit service versus the funding of expansion projects. She noted that Urban Habitat filed a Title VI complaint against MTC.

Mr. Rico asked if the pending complaints are listed in the report for the four-year period. Ms. Rodrigues said they are included on page 14 of the report and in the appendices. Ms. Reese-Brown asked what corrective measures are taken when a complaint is filed against MTC and if any policies are set to address shortcomings. Executive Director Steve Heminger noted that there is a lawsuit pending, which MTC has already won but is under appeal. He noted that when complaints are legitimate they will be corrected. He added that issues would be best debated before the Commission, rather than in other forums where the final outcome is up to other decision makers such as the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Ms. Baker asked how previous complaints have been addressed. Mr. Heminger noted that only one past deficiency was cited by the FTA regarding public participation and staff took corrective action. Chair Branson concluded that the Title VI report is very useful as a tool that provides historical information about MTC, and he encouraged Council members to use it for that purpose.

Key Drivers

Chair Branson asked the Council to consider creating a subcommittee to address the issue of key drivers. Mr. Terplan asked for a clearer definition of key drivers. Chair Branson said key drivers are the values that guide decisions and should be determined to provide the Council with an overarching mission. Ms. Sandoval noted that the Council should have a philosophical statement about its purpose to ensure the group's vision is accurately represented by the members. Mr. Terplan noted there is merit in the discussion but believes it should involve the whole Council, not a subcommittee. Also, he felt the discussion Chair Branson described is already happening during the target discussion. Ms. Baker agreed that the discussion should involve the entire Council. Mr. Loring said the Commission should be defining the key drivers; the Council serves as advisors to the Commission. Ms. Kinman and Mr. Hedges agreed that the Council reports to the Commission. Ms. Chang noted that the SCS process could serve to define the vision of the Council. Chair Branson agreed that the Council advises the Commission, but noted that their role is also to question what values drive the decisions. Ms. Kinman opposed using a Council meeting to create a vision statement. Pam Grove of MTC staff noted that the Council's work plan outlines key elements that could focus the key drivers discussion. Mr. Robertson said it would not be

Key Drivers (continued)

counterproductive to have an overarching mission. Mr. Hedges made a motion to table the idea for now. Mr. Loring seconded the motion and there was no dissenting opinion.

Staff Liaison Report

The Council received Ms. Grove's report. In addition, she reminded the Council that the TIP is scheduled to go before the Commission for potential adoption at its October 27th meeting.

Council Member Reports

Ms. Armenta raised concerns about Clipper™ customer service and rules, as well as discontinued use of paper fare media and lack of information about passes being eliminated. Ms. Jeffrey Sailors also noted that she never received her discount Clipper™ card. Ms. Chang announced that the Bay Area Council is co-sponsoring an affordable housing tour of the Peninsula/South Bay on October 23 at 9 a.m. and members are welcome to attend. Ms. Molina announced that the City of Santa Rosa held its first car-free Sunday Street Scene. Ms. Jaquez raised concern over the service cuts at AC Transit. Mr. Hedges announced that he and Mr. Loring will make a presentation to the Housing Leadership Council regarding accessible housing near transit hubs. Mr. Terplan announced that SPUR was supporting San Francisco's measure to improve work rules at Muni in order to improve service. Chair Branson announced that Marin County is working to improve mobility for seniors through a Mobility Consortium and a Mobility Management Center, which was launched on October 1. Ms. Baker announced that San Mateo County held an Active Public Spaces event on October 12.

Public Comment/Adjournment/Next meeting

There was no public comment. The next meeting is scheduled for November 10, 2010. The meeting was adjourned at 3:19 p.m.