



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

Cbris 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

Policy Advisory Council
January 12, 2011
Draft Minutes

Vice Chair Dolly Sandoval called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. Members in attendance were Naomi Armenta, Cathleen Baker, Richard Burnett, JoAnn Busenbark, Carlos Castellanos, Bena Chang, Wilbert Din, Allison Hughes, Dolores Jaquez, Linda Jeffery Sailors, Randi Kinman, Federico Lopez, Marshall Loring, Cheryl O'Connor, Kendal Oku, Lori Reese-Brown, Gerald Rico, Frank Robertson, and Egon Terplan. Excused: Chair Paul Branson, Richard Hedges, and Evelina Molina.

Minutes

The minutes of the December 8, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved after a motion by Ms. Busenbark and a second by Mr. Loring.

Subcommittee Reports

Regional Advisory Working Group (RAWG) Ad Hoc Subcommittee

Ms. Jeffery Sailors and Mr. Burnett reported there were changes to the proposed targets, and the subcommittee had an extensive discussion about the adequate housing goal. The subcommittee only went over three of the proposed targets during their meeting, but a full update would be given to the Council as part of Agenda Item 4.

Equity and Access Subcommittee

Ms. Kinman reported that the subcommittee received an update regarding the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) designation. She added that further discussion of some Title VI questions will come back to the subcommittee in the future. She announced that the subcommittee will make a recommendation to the full Council regarding issues of transit-dependent seniors and disabled. Ms. Kinman also mentioned that the subcommittee will be working in conjunction with the Regional Equity Working Group on the equity analysis for the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

SCS/RTP Performance Targets

Lisa Klein of MTC staff went over the revisions to the ten proposed performance targets and the next steps in the process. Regarding Target 9, Mr. Din expressed concern that decreasing travel time for transit riders may unintentionally increase wait time. Ms. Klein clarified that the time includes door-to-door travel. Mr. Loring suggested adjusting the activity that is going on in order to meet each of the targets. Ms. Klein agreed. Ms. Kinman asked for clarification on the use of PM₁₀ for Target 3. Ms. Klein noted that

SCS/RTP Performance Targets (continued)

PM₁₀ was included because it is a state requirement, and added that PM₁₀ cannot be modeled causally. Ms. Kinman expressed concern about the limitations of using the term “premature deaths” for Target 3 and suggested focusing on measuring other health factors related to PM₁₀.

Mr. Terplan noted that jobs would be a better indicator than Gross Regional Product (GRP). He also expressed concern that mode share and proximity of development to transit infrastructure were left out as targets/indicators. He explained further that leaving out proximity of development as an indicator would not get at the vision of the region we are working towards. He wondered how shifting more of our regional travel away from the automobile could be part of the targets. Ms. Klein noted that the discussion on indicators is just beginning. She added that mode share will be included in the data summary and as a way to understand the scenarios. In terms of location efficiency, she said that will be looked at as work continues on the scenarios. Mr. Terplan noted that the entire framework of the Priority Development Areas (PDAs) is precisely to achieve location efficiency; its explicit absence within the SCS process makes it much less effective. Executive Director Steve Heminger responded that the two indicators Mr. Terplan mentioned are means and not ends in the process, and the final targets are intended to reflect end objectives.

Mr. Robertson asked how soon there would be outcomes available from the analysis. Ms. Klein said the initial analysis of the scenarios will be looking at the 2035, but progress will be evaluated with each SCS/RTP update that occurs every four years (and there may be some targets that can be evaluated more often than that). Ms. Reese-Brown cautioned against having targets that are too aggressive and may be unrealistic. She also stated the importance of creating policy and programs that assure the goals are met. Ms. Baker requested that the exposure data be available in the data summary. Ms. O’Connor asked why staff is recommending that Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) be invited to develop a separate detailed vision scenario. She also asked if Governor Brown’s idea to dismantle redevelopment agencies would be taken into account. Mr. Heminger responded that a coalition of NGOs asked for the opportunity to prepare an alternative scenario. Ms. Klein said staff will be monitoring the effects of the governor’s budget. Mr. Castellanos asked if it will be up to the equity analysis to evaluate impacts by mode split. Ms. Klein said the starting point for the equity analysis will be to break down all the targets by income. The equity analysis will be the place to understand how travel time changes are doing by income level, and an overlay of mode will also occur. The target dealing with equitable access will evaluate cost changes for low-income populations. Really the equity analysis and the targets need to work in tandem to give a more complete picture.

Mr. Terplan reiterated that location efficiency should envision a region where much of the activity in many of the destinations is connected through a network of transit, but this vision is not reflected as a target. Vice Chair Sandoval asked what will happen to the input from NGOs. Mr. Heminger said that NGOs, rather than staff, will put together an alternative scenario and the scenario evaluation will include that alternative. Vice Chair Sandoval asked how the addendum information for the various targets will be presented. Ms. Klein said that staff will publish a data summary and any additional data not included can be requested. Vice Chair Sandoval led a discussion regarding clarifying language for Targets 3 and 9, as well as the concerns members felt are not addressed in the targets. The discussion yielded the suggestion that the Council

SCS/RTP Performance Targets (continued)

endorse the recommended targets, but suggest Target 3 be modified to include “and other health hazards,” and Target 9 be modified to include “door-to-door.” The Council also wanted to include a comment to the Commission that since there is no target related to regional growth planned around the transit infrastructure, some sort of analysis should be ensured during the scenario process. A motion was made by Ms. Kinman and seconded by Ms. Armenta.

Ms. Baker suggested clarifying language for Target 4 to read “severe injuries.” Ms. Klein noted that the distinction cannot be made in the technical analysis.

Vice Chair Sandoval suggested moving forward by splitting the motion; the makers of the motion agreed. The motion to endorse the targets with the language clarifications for Targets 3 and 9 was unanimously approved.

The second motion (moved by Ms. Jeffery Sailors and seconded by Ms. Baker) was to include a statement – to be wordsmithed later by Mr. Terplan, Vice Chair Sandoval and staff (and whoever else would like to work on it, not to exceed half the committee) – that would raise the question to the Commission of whether the targets move us closer to where we want to be and how we can ensure that is a goal during the scenario process. The motion was unanimously approved.

Vice Chair Sandoval clarified that a memo with language regarding the above motions would be forwarded on behalf of the Policy Advisory Council to this Friday’s joint meeting of the MTC Planning Committee, ABAG Administrative Committee and the Joint Policy Committee.

PDA Assessment

The Council received the report from Therese Trivedi of MTC staff, and Gillian Adams and Sailaja Kurella of ABAG staff. Ms. Jeffery Sailors asked if the assessment would involve schools. Ms. Adams said staff will address that as part of the completeness portion of the assessment. Ms. Kurella noted that there was a memorandum to the Regional Advisory Working Group that also raised the issue, and it can be found on the One Bay Area web site. Ms. Jeffery Sailors expressed doubt that the environmental impact report (EIR) can be streamlined since past attempts have been unsuccessful. Ms. Adams noted that it is an issue that keeps coming up. Ms. Baker asked how the findings of the survey would influence the growth allocation. Ms. Adams said that the initial goal is to understand the strengths and weaknesses of a particular PDA in each of the categories, as well as the PDA’s ability to accommodate growth.

Ms. Jaquez asked how the assessment would address future transit needs. Ms. Kurella said staff is assessing the current state of transit in the PDAs, and the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) will be looking more at future transit service. Ms. Trivedi added that the RTP process will also address the needs of transit operators. Ms. Kinman noted that access to transit should also be of concern. Ms. Adams said the assessment includes a walkability analysis. Ms. Kinman also expressed concern about providing sufficient low-income housing. Ms. Adams said staff is analyzing local governments’ plan to produce affordable housing in the PDAs. Ms. Kinman suggested tracking the affordable units actually within the PDAs (as opposed to relying on developers’ claims of affordable units that aren’t within the PDA). Mr. Terplan asked if the

PDA Assessment (continued)

information provided by the local jurisdictions would be verified by the regional agencies. Ms. Adams said they would take the suggestion under advisement, and part of the SCS process does include some clarification from local governments. Ms. Trivedi added that the Station Area Planning grant program requires an infrastructure budget and plan, which would also serve to verify the information from local governments. Mr. Din asked if the assessment would take into account improving paratransit service. Ms. Trivedi noted that the analysis to be conducted as part of the TSP has a paratransit element. Mr. Lopez asked if the assessment would include an evaluation of displacement of the existing low-income population. Ms. Adams said yes, they do plan to study the issue. Ms. Reese-Brown suggested relaxing parking standards so jurisdictions are not required to provide as much parking per number of units. Ms. Kurella noted there will be analysis of parking requirements as part of the assessment, and Ms. Trivedi added there are funding strategies surrounding parking as well.

Update on Title VI Activities

Denise Rodrigues gave the Council an update on MTC's Title VI activities. Ms. Jaquez asked where the data for the demographic profile of the region came from. Mr. Heminger said it is data from the 2008 American Community Survey. Ms. Jaquez requested the demographic information by age. Ms. Baker asked if primary subrecipients would be CMAs and transit agencies and if they would be required to adhere to Title VI requirements. Ms. Rodrigues noted that everyone is required to adhere to Title VI. Some subrecipients have their own supplemental agreement with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) which requires them to report directly to the FTA, and non-transit providers would be the subrecipients that MTC will actively monitor. Mr. Robertson asked why some of the subrecipient language was struck out in the final version of the JARC/New Freedom Program Management Report. Vice Chair Sandoval noted that his question would be further discussed at the March Equity and Access Subcommittee meeting.

Staff Liaison Report

Ms. Grove pointed the Council to the items in her written report. She also reminded advisors to complete their ethics training, and asked them to assist MTC in identifying community-based organizations in their counties who might be interested in an upcoming SCS outreach RFP.

Council Member Reports

Ms. Kinman announced that VTA will begin using the Clipper system. Mr. Terplan announced that the San Francisco Planning + Urban Research (SPUR) Association just published a report on high-speed rail in California. Ms. Chang reminded members to attend the Silicon Valley Leadership Group's *Save Caltrain Summit* at Stanford University on Friday, January 21.

Public Comment/Adjournment/Next Meeting

There was no public comment. Vice Chair Sandoval closed the meeting in honor of the victims of the Tucson, Arizona attack.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 9, 2011. The meeting was adjourned at 3:14 p.m.