



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

*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

*Jon Rubin*  
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

*Bijan Sartipi*  
State Business, Transportation  
and Housing Agency

*James P. Spering*  
Solano County and Cities

*Vacancy*  
City and County of San Francisco

*Steve Heminger*  
Executive Director

*Ann Flemer*  
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

*Andrew B. Fremier*  
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

**MTC PLANNING COMMITTEE with the  
ABAG ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE**  
**March 11, 2011**  
**MINUTES**

**ATTENDANCE**

Chair Spering called the MTC Planning Committee meeting to order at 10:11 a.m. Planning Committee members in attendance were: Azumbrado, Giacopini, Green, Liccardo, Mackenzie, Mullin, and Rubin. Commission Chair Tissier and Vice Chair Rein-Worth were present in their ex-officio voting member capacity. Other Commissioners present as ad hoc members of the Committee were Bates, Cortese, Dodd, Haggerty, and Kinsey.

ABAG Administrative Committee members and Joint Policy Committee members in attendance were: Green, Adams, Avalos, Bates, Brunner, Cortese, Dodd, Gibson, Gingles, Gioia, Haggerty, Kinsey, Liccardo, Luce, Pierce, Spering, and Ulkema.

**CONSENT CALENDAR: a) Minutes of February 9, 2011**

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

**DRAFT COMMITTED FUNDS AND PROJECTS POLICY**

Ms. Ashley Nguyen stated that the purpose of the Draft Committed Funds and Projects Policy is to determine which projects proposed for inclusion in Plan Bay Area are not subject to discretionary action by the Commission because the project is fully funded and is too far along in project development to consider withdrawing support. It also determines which fund sources are subject to discretionary action by the Commission.

Ms. Nguyen stated that staff is proposing two options for the threshold criteria for determining committed projects: Option 1) Environmental Certification where a project has a certified Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and/or Record of Decision for Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) by May 1, 2011; or Option 2) Construction, as indicated by utility relocation or subsequent construction activities, or transit vehicle award by May 1, 2011. She noted that for both options, Proposition 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Account and Trade Corridor Improvement Fund projects with full funding and approved baseline agreements as of February 2011 are proposed to be committed. Ms. Nguyen further stated that the proposed threshold criteria for committed funds include locally generated or subvented funds over which MTC has no discretion where these funds go or how they are spent. For discretionary funds, the Commission has either complete discretion on how and where funds are spent, or can amend current policies and develop conditions to guide the expenditure of funds.

MTC staff proposes that since SB 375 does not alter MTC's authority to select projects for the Plan, a project that meets the criteria as an exempt project under SB375 may still be subject to performance assessment for inclusion in the Plan and be subject to Commission discretion based on financial constraint, policy or other considerations.

In closing, Ms. Nguyen stated that the Planning Committee is slated to review the proposed Final Committed Policy on April 8, 2011, and the Commission is to take action on April 27, 2011.

Public Comment:

- Mr. Jeff Hobson, TransForm, noted that TransForm submitted a letter expressing general support for MTC's preliminary proposal. He stated that he likes the performance-based approach that is called for in this draft policy, and offered three recommendations: 1) pursue Committed Projects Option 2; 2) add back in to the requirement that projects have full capital and operating funds by date certain, and 3) in the "under construction" definition add a more restrictive definition such as requiring projects to have signed contracts for some percent of the project cost.
- Ms. Karen Smulevitz, United Seniors, encouraged the committee to consider projects that improve the operation of AC Transit and other city public transportation services, particularly for those that are dependent on public transit.
- Mr. Jason Osujima, ACCE Riders for Transit Justice, urged the committee to make a decision about the committed project policies that will benefit the needs of the transit dependent.
- Ms. Clair Haas, ACCE Riders for Transit Justice, asked the committee to think about, when making their decision, how they can evaluate these projects to make the best decision for all of MTC projects including public transit and bus service for low-income transit riders.
- Ms. Lindsay Imai, Urban Habitat, expressed her support for the committed funding policy proposal, and stressed the opportunity to take a fresh look at the funding to see how, through flexibility and swapping, MTC can maximize transit operations funding. She also expressed support for Committed Project Option 2, and recommended stronger language around what is defined as a committed project under construction and consideration for evaluating all projects.
- Ms. Mahasin Abdul-Salaam, Genesis, encouraged the committee to make the right decisions that will benefit the needs of the transit dependent.
- Ms. Marilyn Ababio, Transportation Action Partnership, encouraged the committee to look at the committed projects and to allow for more flexibility that will increase transit.
- Mr. Art Dao, Alameda County Transportation Commission, expressed his support for updating the committed projects and funding policies. He stated his support for Option 1, and requested that voter-approved projects in county sales tax expenditure plans be considered committed projects.
- Mr. Tony Sustak, Advocate for the City of Richmond, stated that MTC has consistently cut funding for transit, which has affected Contra Costa County to the extent where weekend and night service have been eliminated.
- Ms. Stephanie Reyes, Greenbelt Alliance, stated that it's essential that there is \$65 billion over 25 years rather than just \$35 billion in discretionary funding that can be committed in a meaningful way to places that have nominated PDAs and other growth opportunity areas. She expressed support for Option 2.

- Ms. Tilly Chang, SFCTA, commented on the new and small starts funding sources that are listed as committed and urged that this really refers to those projects that the region has already committed to in terms of Resolution No. 3434. In terms of the committed projects policy, she supports drawing the line closer to the construction phase.
- Ms. Parisa Fatehi, Public Advocates, supported Option 2 and recommended going further on the definition of “under construction” to be defined. She also urged the committee to consider an analysis of all projects, including those that are ultimately considered committed.
- Mr. Tim Frank, Center for Sustainable Neighborhoods, stated that it’s useful to evaluate all the projects and to err on the side of allowing that analysis to govern the allocation of discretionary funds. He expressed his support for Option 2.
- Mr. Paul Campos, Building Industry Association, expressed his provisional support for Option 1, and requested staff create a table showing which projects, that are currently considered committed, would no longer be considered committed.

#### Committee comments:

- Commissioner Dodd commented on a handout showing cost changes to projects after the environmental phase and asked if any of the numbers included any of the benefits from the economic downturn and the resulting favorable bids in other areas of construction. Response: Mr. Heminger stated that staff tried to use actual costs, and under a normal economic environment, the cost increase would have been greater.
- Commissioner Green commented on a letter from the Alameda County Transportation Commission submitted to the committee, expressing support for Option 1.
- Commissioner Cortese asked how staff will define a project. Response: Mr. Heminger stated that a project can be defined in many ways and staff tends to look at segments – not at the entire project, so there may be instances where one segment may be committed but additional segments may not be.
- Commissioner Rein-Worth commented on transit funding and TDA and asked, in light of the Transit Sustainability Project, how do we know what the criteria might be for allocating those funds – how do we provide an assurance that agencies will be able to plan for stabled transit funding. Response: Mr. Heminger stated that we are proposing that the committee uncommit these funds so there can be this discussion. He noted that he fully expects the committee to re-commit the funds to transit, and consider changes to performance requirements that operators have to meet to get the funds.
- Commissioner Liccardo expressed his concern with the federal 5307 & 5309 funds being moved to discretionary. He also commented on the Regional Express Lane, and stated that it’s important that if staff is going to create incentives for the local CMAs to step up and build the infrastructure to get express lanes up and running that there should be a strong emphasis on return to source in the corridors that are building those lanes.
- Commissioner Spring expressed his support for Option 1. He also expressed his concern that if a project is not yet to construction then the investment up to that point could be lost.
- Commissioner Mackenzie expressed his support for Option 1.
- Commissioner Halsted expressed her support for Option 1.
- Susan Adams, Supervisor County of Marin, expressed her support for Option 2, and noted that staff needs to take a look on how to enhance the funding available for operations.

- John Avalos, Supervisor City/County of San Francisco, expressed his support for Option 2, and stated that having discretion over the decisions that will be made is going to be vital to achieving the plans of environmentalism in the Bay Area.
- Commissioner Haggerty expressed his support for Option 1 and the inclusion of transportation sales tax projects in the committed definition because people voted for these projects. He also expressed his concern with the urban core getting more funding than more suburban areas.
- Julie Pierce, Councilmember City of Clayton, agreed with Commissioner Haggerty and expressed her support for Option 1.
- Commissioner Tissier expressed her support for Option 1 plus the sales tax projects.

Mr. Steve Heminger stated that staff will work on both options, and bring them back to the committee in April.

### **INITIAL VISION SCENARIO FOR PLAN BAY AREA**

Mr. Ken Kirkey stated that the Initial Vision Scenario (IVS) is the starting point to develop the Sustainable Communities Strategy. It proposes a future development pattern that depends upon a strong economy, sufficient funding for affordable housing and supportive public infrastructure and transportation investments.

Mr. Kirkey presented a summary of the SB 375 requirements and future demand for housing and employment in Bay Area jurisdictions. Ms. Lisa Klein summarized the proposed IVS transportation network and reviewed the IVS performance target results.

In conclusion, Ms. Klein stated that the Initial Vision Scenario reflects additional progress towards the sustainability of the region. Bay Area communities can accommodate housing in sustainable locations given adequate resources and transit. Although the 2020 GHG target is met, the 2035 GHG target and some other targets have yet to be met. Achieving these targets still requires additional land use, transportation and non-infrastructure strategies, and employment location, and its relationship to housing and transit is a key issue requiring further analysis.

She noted that public input on the IVS will begin later this month and will continue through July 2011. Staff will continue to work on detailed SCS scenarios definitions April through December 2011. Additional analysis will take place starting in April. The Transportation Investment Strategy will begin in October 2011, while the Regional Housing Needs Allocation is currently underway, with final adoption in September 2012.

#### **Public Comment:**

- Ms. Stephanie Reyes, Greenbelt Alliance, stated that the Initial Vision Scenario is a great start towards meeting the regional goals, and stated that it will be a huge cost savings if we better direct our growth and development to areas that rely on existing infrastructure.
- Ms. Tilly Chang, SFCTA, stated that San Francisco can really not take for granted that this growth will happen in San Francisco. She noted that she would like to see a performance measure on transit crowding.
- Ms. Parisa Fatehi, Public Advocates, would like the future iterations of the Initial Vision Scenario to identify the housing by income level and where it's located so that everyone can understand where the affordable homes will be located. She also noted that she looks

forward to working with the Regional Equity Working Group and staff to refine the way the results of the equity analysis are presented.

- Jeff Hobson, TransForm, stated that there needs to be incentives for the PDAs and the future growth opportunity areas.

Committee comment:

- Gayle Ulkema, Supervisor Contra Costa County, suggested including the job growth or job locations as part of the analysis.
- Commissioner Dodd commented that it is incorrect to say that we are paving over the entire Bay Area, and not enough investment is going to transit. He stated that the Transit Sustainability Project will determine the type of transit system that the region can afford to operate.
- Julie Pierce, Councilmember City of Clayton, suggested that staff look at moving job locations closer to housing. She also stated that the unconstrained housing target is very troubling, when based on history we built 20,000-25,000 housing units per year and now we're looking at 36,000 per year. She stated that instead of that look at the pricing of fuel and filling the vacant homes.
- Susan Adams, Supervisor County of Marin, expressed her support of Julie Pierce's comments, as well as Commissioner Dodd's comments. She also stated that we need to consider a large senior population might be leaving their single family dwellings to move into a more supportive type of environment. This will impact the number and types of kinds housing that will be built.
- Jane Brunner, Councilmember City of Oakland, stated that the inner cities cannot achieve the housing numbers without the dollars. She also stated that staff needs to look at jobs, housing and transportation to make this real.
- Commissioner Green suggested that staff revise Target 9. He also stated that the current Census Bureau seemed to show about 15-20 cities around the Bay Area with population decreases.

ABAG Committee Chair Green asked the ABAG Administrative Committee for approval to release the Initial Vision Scenario. Ms. Julie Pierce moved approval, Scott Haggerty seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS/PUBLIC COMMENT**

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m. The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 8, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. in the Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland, CA.