



Metropolitan Transportation Commission/Policy Advisory Council
Annual Work Plan Workshop
May 25, 2011
Draft Minutes

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. Giacomini
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

Commission Chair Adrienne Tissier called the meeting to order at 11:24 a.m. Commissioners Bill Dodd, Dorene Giacomini, Federal Glover, Mark Green, Scott Haggerty, Anne Halsted, Sam Liccardo, Kevin Mullin, Amy Rein Worth, Bijan Sartipi, and Jim Spering were in attendance.

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

Summary of 2010-11 Council Work Plan

Chair Branson gave a report on the Council's activities for the past year. He noted that the Council passed a motion to ask the Commission to include seniors, youth and persons with disabilities in MTC's transportation impact analyses, in addition to low income people and communities of color.

Policy Advisory Council 2011-12 Work Plan

Chair Tissier opened the discussion on the Council's new work plan. Mr. Terplan asked how the Commission would like to receive the Council's input throughout the coming year. He noted that the Council is interested in helping shape the Commission's policies. Commissioner Spering noted that the purpose of this meeting was for Commissioners to hear the Council's concerns in more detail when developing their work plan. He added that the Council chair reports to the Commission on a monthly basis. Executive Director Steve Heminger suggested that members tell the Commission what they think about Plan Bay Area efforts to date.

Commissioner Giacomini questioned what the process should be after the Council's chair reports to the Commission. Commissioner Spering suggested addressing the Council's comments at Planning Committee meetings, with specific issues agendaized in order for Commissioners to respond. Chair Tissier added that if there are critical issues, the Council chair should attend the appropriate committee meeting. She stated that input needs to be given during the time when the Commission is discussing those issues. Commissioner Spering added that the purpose of this annual workshop was for the

Policy Advisory Council 2011-12 Work Plan (continued)

Council to have direct contact with Commissioners. As such, critical issues should be discussed during the annual workshop.

Commissioner Mullin said he attended the San Mateo County public workshop and noted that it was more of a stakeholder workshop. He added that the Council can assist in providing a sense of the public's input, specifically on Plan Bay Area. Commissioner Liccario suggested summarizing the Council's input in each relevant report to Commissioners.

Ms. Kinman said that the community she represents is concerned that MTC's investment policies center on housing and jobs, and there is no discussion about school and recreational park space. She added that investment policy should take into account quality of life, not just growth. Ms. Sandoval noted that one of the challenges has been the short timeline of the process. Mr. Din said that bilingual communities need materials that are easier for them to understand. Mr. Robertson asked why MTC does not oversee Title VI compliance for agencies that receive federal funds through MTC. Mr. Heminger said that the Federal Transit Administration regulates the vast majority of transit operators in the region and directly enforces Title VI for those agencies. MTC enforcement would be a duplication of those efforts, but MTC has asked for federal guidance on this question.

Mr. Terplan pointed out that the voluntarily targets lack a geographic focus that explicitly tries to set goals around the amount of growth in priority development areas or adjacent to transit. As such, the process is becoming a standard regional transportation plan rather than looking at the big picture and it is not questioning what kinds of places the region should be growing around. He added that there is no target that specifically says what portion of growth should be near our billion-dollar transit infrastructure. He noted that the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) is an opportunity to add a discussion about the shape of the Bay Area in the future. Commissioner Haggerty asked if the station area plans address Mr. Terplan's concern. Mr. Heminger said the priority development areas address growth near transit. He questioned if where we put the growth will determine if we meet the targets, and added that the answer will come from the current process. Mr. Terplan added that the lack of a mode share target and a percent growth around a transit target will make it harder to evaluate the scenarios as the policy of MTC going forward.

Ms. Kinman again expressed concern that the focus is completely directed toward growth. She added that one of the goals should be to improve the pedestrian and bike infrastructure throughout the region, not just in the areas where growth is directed. Ms. Jeffery Sailors cautioned that some targets may not be achievable because of other targets. Mr. Branson suggested that the Council continue to be involved in the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) process. Mr. Robertson noted that "low income" is often erroneously used to analyze race-specific information, and added that the two should be separated. Pam Grove of MTC staff noted that collecting demographic data during the community based outreach was a sensitive issue. Commissioner Rein Worth added that ethnicity/race information and income information are not necessarily synonymous. She noted the importance of accuracy when discussing communities of concern because the new census data is showing that our development pattern over the last ten years has created a different picture from historic assumptions. Ms. King Neuhausel said the Commission should be cautious about the organizations it partners with for public meetings.

Policy Advisory Council 2011-12 Work Plan (continued)

Commissioner Spring requested the Council's input on how to engage local jurisdictions. He added that if the Plan is not received by local jurisdictions it would create a great challenge for implementing the SCS. Ms. Kinman said that part of the process of planning for the next 30 years is to correct the inadequacies of the last 30. She added that MTC is the money funnel that is incentivizing infill growth and must be aware of the potential problems that may arise in the next 30 years as a result. She clarified that it is not MTC's responsibility to build parks, but if the purpose is to incentivize high-density growth, then quality of life issues must be addressed. Ms. Kinman suggested MTC should put up the local planning money in order to get the necessary information from the local jurisdictions.

Commissioner Green suggested the Council meet at different locations in the region on a regular basis, and well as hold joint meetings with each county's advisory committee. Mr. Terplan said that MTC has a great opportunity through the TSP to set performance targets for the transit agencies and tie some of the money they receive to performance and have something similar for local jurisdictions. He added that the Commission has the opportunity to speak for the Bay Area. Ms. King Neuhausel also suggested holding joint and regional meetings. Mr. Castellanos said that continuing programs, such as the Transportation for Livable Communities program, can be used as a tool to educate local jurisdictions about the importance of planning sustainably, thus complying with the SCS. Ms. Jaquez noted that the Commissioners, as local elected officials, can best engage local jurisdictions.

Chair Tissier noted that the process is moving quickly, but it is important to keep it moving. Ms. Sandoval asked if there are additional issues the Commission would like the Council to address. Commissioner Spring asked the Council to discuss possible legislative changes that could assist MTC in implementing the SCS. Commissioner Rein Worth concluded that the goal is to have a unified plan for the Bay Area, but stressed the importance of each county's uniqueness and so the Plan must have something that addresses the needs of each county.

Chair and Vice Chair Nominations

Council Chair Branson opened nominations for Council chair and vice chair. Ms. Jaquez nominated Ms. Sandoval for Council chair. Mr. Rico nominated Mr. Castellanos for Council chair; however, Mr. Castellanos declined the nomination. Mr. Terplan nominated Mr. Castellanos for vice chair. Ms. Jaquez nominated Mr. Branson for vice chair. Ms. Sandoval nominated Mr. Terplan for vice chair. Nominations will remain open until the elections, to be held at the June 8, 2011 meeting.

Public Comment

Mahasin Abdul-Salaam of Genesis spoke of the work of her organization. Gerry Grace commented on his participation in MTC's meetings.

Adjournment/Next Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 12:31 p.m. The next Policy Advisory Council meeting is scheduled for June 8, 2011 in the Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland, California.



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. Giacomini
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 Licardo
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. Spring
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
June 8, 2011
Draft Minutes

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

Elections

Vice Chair Sandoval turned the elections process over to staff liaison Pam Grove, who asked for nominations from the floor for chair. Hearing none, Ms. Grove closed nominations and asked by show of hands of all those in favor of electing Ms. Sandoval — the only candidate — for chair. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Ms. Grove noted there was a revised candidate list for nominations for vice chair (Paul Branson and Egon Terplan). She called for nominations from the floor and, hearing none, closed nominations. On a show of hands, five were in favor of Mr. Branson, and 13 were in favor of Mr. Terplan, making Mr. Terplan the new vice chair. Four members abstained from voting.

Ms. Baker and Ms. Sandoval commended past chair Paul Branson for his gracious service and leadership over the past year.

Mr. Hedges asked whether the joint work plan meeting will be held during the Commission's meeting in May again next year. Ms. Grove said that has not yet been decided, but she will ask.

Approval of April Meeting Minutes

The minutes of the April 13, 2011 meeting were unanimously approved after a motion by Ms. Jeffery Sailors and a second by Mr. Hedges.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Subcommittee Reports

Equity and Access Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chair Naomi Armenta reported that the Equity and Access Subcommittee held a separate meeting following their participation in the Equity Working Group that morning. The Subcommittee decided to make a statement to the full Council that they would like to see equity embedded into the Council's work plan and not separated out. They then received a staff progress report on the paratransit analysis portion of the Transit Sustainability Project. The Subcommittee discussed some cost savings strategies, and commented to staff that riders should be included at the table during the analysis. The Subcommittee will continue the discussion at next month's meeting; however, since the analysis is ongoing, it is important for members with comments to forward them to staff prior to that meeting.

Ms. Armenta also commented that starting next month, the subcommittee meeting will begin at 10:30 a.m. to ensure they are able to use the full time allotted for their meeting. Chair Sandoval asked and Ms. Grove agreed to provide the new subcommittee start time information to the Council.

Plan Bay Area: Defining Alternative Scenarios

Senior Planner Ashley Nguyen from MTC and Planning Director Ken Kirkey from ABAG presented some alternative scenarios that are going before the MTC's Planning Committee and ABAG's Executive Committee on Friday, June 10.

Mr. Kirkey first reminded the Council that the two main requirements of SB 375 are: 1) that we have adopted a Sustainable Communities Strategy that identifies areas within the region sufficient to house all of the expected population growth, including all economic segments of the population; and 2) that we set forth a forecasted development pattern, which, when integrated with the transportation network, results in a lowering of greenhouse gas emissions (related to how much we drive). He then went over the five alternative land-use scenarios that will be presented to the joint MTC and ABAG committee on June 10th.

Ms. Nguyen presented three transportation scenarios that align with the latter three land-use scenarios, giving some background on past spending patterns, and commenting on how the transportation and development scenarios, along with some policy initiatives, could work together to move the region toward the SCS goals. She also mentioned that the scenarios will undergo a technical analysis which will be discussed during outreach scheduled for the fall. Ms. Nguyen then went over the rest of the Plan Bay Area schedule, highlighting the adoption of a preferred scenario early next year and the final adoption of Plan Bay Area slated for early 2013.

Mr. Castellanos brought up a suggestion by the Equity Working Group to add a sixth "equity" scenario for analysis. This sixth scenario would start from the position of equity first, instead of looking at equity after a scenario has already been selected.

Other members commented or asked for clarification on the following issues:

- Make clearer where pedestrian improvements are in these scenarios

Plan Bay Area: Defining Alternative Scenarios (continued)

- What new transit services might be implemented (need to consider new innovations)
- Include equity goals and targets that each of the adopted scenarios needs to meet
- Like the suggestion by the Equity Working Group, and Council should ask the Commission to include a 6th “equity” scenario whose primary goal is to maximize equity (reduce the differences between high and low on a set of social indicators)
- Consider more joint planning between cities and counties
- Have same inputs for all the scenarios (i.e., same population, same distribution of jobs by industry, same dollars)
- All the scenarios should at least meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets and the housing targets
- Include water supply and policies as part of the discussion
- Consider how climate change and adaption strategies might impact this process
- Discuss strategies for building below market rate housing
- Do an analysis of “high performing” transit service, and who the riders are on those lines; high performing lines are most likely work commute lines, which could be an equity issue – need to identify riders on those lines
- Analyze housing needs based on income levels and whether it’s senior or family housing
- Future discussion about what it takes for local jurisdictions to attract more jobs
- Define the terms “urban core” and “suburban/outer Bay Area” (a visual map illustrating these areas would be best)

Mr. Kirkey, Ms. Nguyen and Mr. Kimsey responded to members questions and clarified future plans. The Council had a longer discussion focused on the idea of an “equity” scenario. Following discussion, the Council adopted the following comments:

Administrative comments to be addressed by staff:

- All scenarios must meet the greenhouse gas target
- All scenarios must meet the housing target, but for scenarios that don’t meet the housing target, then explain why
- All inputs are to be the same for all scenarios (jobs, population and infrastructure dollars); therefore, the variance is the distribution of the jobs and population growth in each scenario, and transportation infrastructure dollars are consistent for all scenarios

Policy comments to forward to the June 10 Joint MTC Planning and ABAG

Administrative Committee meeting:

- Do not equate “urban core” to mean urban footprint
- Set goals for all scenarios to address equity, and also request the addition of a 6th scenario that maximizes equity (TBD)

Policy Advisory Council 2011-12 Work Plan

Ms. Grove commented that based on the work plan meeting with the Commission, she included a copy of the items in the previous year’s work plan with one exception. Commissioner Spering

Policy Advisory Council 2011-12 Work Plan (continued)

asked the Council to discuss possible legislative policies or strategies that could help implement the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Ms. Grove added the item to the Council's work plan. She also suggested the removal of the "key drivers" discussion, since that topic was discussed and resolved last fall.

Upon motion by Mr. Terplan and second by Ms. Hughes, the 2011-2012 Work Plan was approved with the aforementioned revisions. Ms. Grove agreed to provide members with the final version of the work plan.

Staff Liaison Report

Due to the late time, Chair Sandoval asked members to read the staff report, and Ms. Grove agreed.

Council Member Reports

Ms. Armenta commented that each year Alameda County hosts a senior and disabled mobility workshop. This year's event will be held on July 12 at the Ed Roberts campus in Berkeley.

Mr. Burnett reported that he attended the ribbon cutting ceremony for the new Vallejo Downtown Transit Center on June 6.

Ms. Jaquez commented she was impressed with the exchange at last month's work plan meeting with the Commission, and looks forward to future interaction with Commissioners.

New Business

Mr. Castellanos proposed a report on the high school internship program. Ms. Grove responded that update is being planned for the Council's July agenda.

Ms. Kinman requested the Council review the work plan and have a discussion about how it will be accomplished.

Adjournment/Next Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 3:33 p.m. The next Policy Advisory Council meeting is scheduled for July 13, 2011 in the Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland, California.