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

Policy Advisory Council
April 13, 2011
**Draft Minutes**

Chair Paul Branson called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. Members in attendance were Vice Chair Dolly Sandoval, Naomi Armenta, Cathleen Baker, Richard Burnett, JoAnn Busenbark, Wilbert Din, Sandi Galvez, Richard Hedges, Dolores Jaquez, Linda Jeffery Sailors, Randi Kinman, Tanya Narath, Tina King Neuhausel, Cheryl O'Connor, Kendal Oku, Lori Reese-Brown, Gerald Rico, Frank Robertson and Egon Terplan.
Excused: Carlos Castellanos, Bena Chang, Federico Lopez, Marshall Loring and Yokia Mason. Absent: Allison Hughes and Evelina Molina.

## Minutes

Mr. Hedges requested that the minutes be changed to better reflect his comments on Slide 6 of the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) presentation. He expressed concern over the comparison of SamTrans' in-house fixed route service and their contracted shuttle service. He noted that since they are two very different systems – vis-à-vis hours of service, routes, number of stops, etc. – they cannot be compared simply by looking at the cost per hour to run the service. An accurate comparison should include type, quality and duration of service.

The minutes of the March 9, 2011 meeting were approved with the above correction after a motion by Ms. Jeffery Sailors and a second by Ms. Sandoval.

## Public Comment

There was no public comment.

## Subcommittee Reports

*Equity and Access Subcommittee*
Subcommittee Vice Chair Kinman noted that the subcommittee met earlier and Kristen Mazur of MTC staff presented the new federal guidelines for the New Freedom Cycle 4 grants. She announced there will be a training workshop for applicants on June 28, and the deadline for applications is August 5th.

Ms. Reese-Brown asked what the grant funds can be used for. Ms. Kinman noted the funds are primarily for mobility management projects, and Mr. Branson noted that the focus of the program is on seniors and people with disabilities.

*SCS/RTP Project Performance Technical Committee*
Mr. Terplan reported that the Project Performance Assessment Technical Committee is working on criteria and a methodology for cost-benefit analysis of large projects (those

– *more* –

**Subcommittee Reports (continued)**

that will cost at least $50 million and will have a regional impact), as well as qualitative analysis for all the projects proposed in the plan. Mr. Terplan expressed concern that PDA location is not included as one of the criteria for evaluating projects. He noted that the PDA framework was not included as part of the voluntary targets and it is also missing from the project performance evaluation criteria. Ms. Kinman commented that the issue has come up in the Equity Working Group discussions. But she cautioned against focusing on PDAs in evaluating transportation investments, because it excludes a large part of the region.

**SCS/RTP Initial Vision Scenario**

The Council received the report from Lisa Klein of MTC staff and Miriam Chion of ABAG staff. Ms. Chion asked the Council to comment on whether the place types make sense as a spatial pattern of sustainability. She also asked them to suggest specific approaches or considerations that should be emphasized in the development of the alternative scenarios, or particular concerns they would like included in the analysis. Ms. Klein also suggested the Council comment on what they feel it would take at the local level to make the scenario a reality.

Ms. Jaquez asked how staff would be analyzing transit service duplication since many jurisdictions have their own transit agency. Ms. Klein noted that the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) will analyze service duplication for input to the detailed scenarios. Ms. Reese-Brown noted that local jurisdictions need to understand these place types in order to include them in their General Plans, Specific Plans and zoning ordinances; she also noted the importance of ensuring local jurisdictions have the resources to implement those plans.

Ms. Galvez asked where the regional growth overview and the employment distribution numbers came from, noting that the employment projection rates are greater than housing rates in the least dense counties. She asked if further analysis would be conducted in those counties. Ms. Chion noted that the employment analysis has not yet been connected to household growth beyond the land use model, and staff will be analyzing how the different industry sectors will perform. She added that some assumptions in certain employment sectors may have been overestimated. Ms. Kinman expressed concern about the jobs/housing balance since local jurisdictions seem only concerned about meeting their RHNA goals. She also mentioned the potential loss of urban open/park space is missing from the land use planning discussion. Ms. Chion said that the linking of the SCS, the RTP and the RHNA will more directly address the implementation challenges regarding jobs and housing. Resources need to be aligned in order to support the development of complete communities. Ms. Chion noted that while there is an inventory of open space, there is no link between expected growth and the proportion of open space. That might be an indicator to consider in the future.

Mr. Hedges asked if the Chestnut/El Camino development area in South San Francisco was a designated PDA. Ms. Chion responded it is one of the proposed or already planned PDAs, adding that how PDAs are designated is up to the local jurisdiction. Mr. Hedges asked if advisors can attend a Plan Bay Area public workshop outside of their county, and staff said yes. Ms. O'Connor noted that based on projected growth and the number of permits pulled during the past few years, the region is already behind in providing the necessary number of housing units to meet the housing goals. She added that a lot of PDAs are not economically feasible, and asked

**<u>SCS/RTP Initial Vision Scenario</u> (continued)**

how stakeholders can find resources to make the vision a reality. Ms. Chion responded that the task is large, and the discussion involves figuring out what it will take to support development in a way that is more sustainable and equitable.

Ms. Baker asked what subsidies are being considered for lower income households given that some of the demand-side strategies have not been applied. Ms. Klein notes that the IVS assumes there will be enough low-income and affordable housing; however, there is no dollar amount assigned to subsidies yet. Ms. Baker noted concern that the regional agencies provide guidance to the local jurisdictions about the local policy decisions that make the IVS more feasible. Ms. Klein said those issues will be addressed in the alternative scenarios discussion. She added that part of the discussion will also include how to incentivize communities to adopt those strategies.

Ms. Sandoval asked what the response has been from local jurisdictions and what the accuracy of previous projections has been. Ms. Chion said that housing and growth projections have been very close in the past 20 years, but employment projections were overestimated and have since been reduced. She also said that approximately 70 jurisdictions have planned and adopted PDAs. Mr. Terplan said the idea of the IVS should be to project a different vision than that of the past. He commented that the lack of employment data makes the IVS an incomplete scenario. He noted the region should develop a more urban vision, primarily grounded on the rail infrastructure. He added that the term "suburban" needs to be better defined and cautioned against a scenario that is just about balancing urban and suburban. He asked what policy assumptions would be included in the alternative scenarios. Ms. Klein said the alternative scenario discussions are just beginning and should continue through July. She added that staff is currently seeking input on what policies should be analyzed. Ms. Chion added that place type definitions will also be based on that input. Mr. Terplan suggested the suburban place type be dropped.

Ms. King Neuhausel asked how employment growth assumptions are made and what is considered sustainable when it comes to setting economic growth goals. Ms. Chion said the task going forward will be to match employment sectors to the appropriate labor supply available, rather than just reaching a jobs/housing balance. Ms. Busenbark said that the kind of businesses the region attracts will determine some of the alternative scenarios. She added that if this information does not flow ahead of the planning, the kind of industry that comes into the region will depend on who is courting those industries and not on the planning. She noted that there are major gaps between providing good transit services to the senior population because the shift from private to public transportation is not there. Ms. Busenbark also said the SCS is an opportunity to be more creative.

Ms. Reese-Brown asked if the jobs/housing balance analysis takes into account the current economic crisis. She also asked what results were expected from the discussions with local elected officials. Ms. Chion said that a jobs/housing balance has not been accomplished. She added that the business sector wants regional agencies to address the housing affordability issue and noted that the region cannot address economic recovery without addressing affordability.

Chair Branson noted the importance of how we plan housing and transportation for seniors, adding there should be a focus on areas where affordable housing has been difficult to develop.

**Staff Liaison Report**

Ms. Grove updated her written report, noting the new Business Outreach Committee newsletter is provided for advisors to pick up from the handout table, reminding the Council of the upcoming SCS/RTP workshops, and noting a change in their next meeting date to May 25 to accommodate their work plan meeting with the Commission. Ms. Busenbark asked if there is an agenda for the joint Commission/Policy Advisory Council meeting. Ms. Grove noted that the workshop agenda has not been set and will depend on Commissioner and Council leaders' input. Ms. Narath asked if it would be appropriate to provide member updates on the One Bay Area public workshops at the joint meeting. Ms. Sandoval suggested that members provide written reports instead. Ms. Kinman noted the importance of using the joint meeting time constructively and requested that the agenda have 10-15 minutes of social time.

**Council Member Reports**

Ms. Armenta announced that the Ed Roberts Campus in Berkeley had its ribbon-cutting ceremony on Saturday, April 9. Mr. Terplan announced that the San Francisco seats on the Commission have been appointed. He added that the San Francisco Planning + Urban Research (SPUR) Association published a paper regarding Caltrain funding and governance. Ms. Jefferey Sailors announced that the community in Livermore is collecting signature to reverse a City Council decision about the location of BART in Livermore. Ms. Baker announced that San Mateo County is hosting its "Streets Alive" event on May 1. Mr. Hedges announced that he and Mr. Loring will hold a tour of the Contra Costa Center transit village, which he noted is the best example of a transit-oriented development.

**New Business**

Chair Branson announced that nominations for a new chair and vice chair for the Council will open in May. Ms. Baker suggested discussing any changes to the work plan. Mr. Terplan noted that the Council has not brought many recommendations to the Commission and noted the importance of providing feedback to the Commission on key decisions. Ms. Kinman expressed concern that members do not have enough time to review the materials that the Commission will be voting on. Chair Branson said that the Council needs to be given the opportunity to be proactive, rather than reactive to the material. Members discussed whether the Council can take action on items not already on the agenda.

Chair Branson asked what the agenda for the joint meeting might include. Ms. Grove said the focus is to set the Council's work plan for the coming year. Ms. Kinman expressed concern that the Council may be missing important opportunities to express their position. Ms. Galvez noted that she joined the Council on the assumption that they would be advising the Commission on matters of importance before the Commission takes action, and noted that the Council should function in such a way. Chair Branson expressed concern that the link between the Council and the Commission is weak. Mr. Terplan asked if all agenda items can be listed as action items just in case members decide to vote on an item. Mr. Din said action items must be concrete in order for the council to take action. Ms. Sandoval suggested that the chair and vice chair determine what items need to be on the agenda as action items. Staff responded that one solution would be to distribute draft agendas to the Council so the advisors could see what's coming before the Planning Committee and the Commission prior to the Council meeting.

## Adjournment/Next Meeting

There is no regularly scheduled meeting in May. Instead, the Policy Advisory Council will hold a joint meeting with the Commission on May 25, 2011. The meeting was adjourned at 3:38 p.m.