



Johnnie F. Tinsley, Chair  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth, Vice Chair  
Metropolitan Council

Johnnie F. Tinsley  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth  
Metropolitan Council

Johnnie F. Tinsley  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth  
Metropolitan Council

Johnnie F. Tinsley  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth  
Metropolitan Council

Johnnie F. Tinsley  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth  
Metropolitan Council

Johnnie F. Tinsley  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth  
Metropolitan Council

Johnnie F. Tinsley  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth  
Metropolitan Council

Johnnie F. Tinsley  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth  
Metropolitan Council

Johnnie F. Tinsley  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth  
Metropolitan Council

Johnnie F. Tinsley  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth  
Metropolitan Council

Johnnie F. Tinsley  
Metropolitan Council

Gregory R. Worth  
Metropolitan Council

**MTC PLANNING COMMITTEE**  
**October 14, 2011**  
**MINUTES**

**ATTENDANCE**

Chair Sperring called the MTC Planning Committee meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Planning Committee members in attendance were: Commissioners Azumbrado, Giacomini, Green, Haggerty, and Mackenzie. Commission Chair Tissier and Commission Vice Chair Worth were present in their ex-officio voting member capacity. Other Commissioners present as ad hoc members of the Committee were Bates, Cortese, Dodd, and Wiener.

**CONSENT CALENDAR: Minutes of September 9, 2011**

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

**PLAN BAY AREA EQUITY ANALYSIS FRAMEWORK**

Ms. Jennifer Yeaman presented a PowerPoint presentation which summarized the equity analysis development, and approach. She noted the existing definition of communities of concern, defined areas with either 70% minority populations or 30% low-income populations, would now include roughly 40% of the region based on updated data from the Census Bureau, up from 34% of the region analyzed in Transportation 2035. She noted that staff is proposing a revised definition which identifies communities with multiple overlapping factors as defined in the Executive Directors memo to the Committee. She also stated that both the equity analysis performance measures and the revised community of concern framework reflect feedback received over the past several months from numerous stakeholders, and the Policy Advisory Council's endorsement at its meeting on October 12<sup>th</sup>.

In closing, Ms. Yeaman recommended Committee approval of the proposed Equity Analysis performance measures to be used for the Alternative Scenarios evaluation and the revised definition of communities of concern to include communities that are characterized as having 4 or more factors, or that have concentrations of both low-income and minority populations. She also recommended the revised definition be incorporated into MTC's other work areas that currently use the existing definition, such as the Lifeline program and Community Based Transportation Planning Program.

**Public Comment:**

- Randi Kinman, Policy Advisory Council (PAC), mentioned that the Council supports staff's recommendation.

- Parisha Fatehi-Weeks, Public Advocates, stated that there are still a lot of methodological details to be worked out about how this goes forward, and stands ready to continue to work with staff and the PAC.

Committee Comments:

- Commissioner Green expressed his support on the revised community-of-concern definition. He commented that the 8 factors could be weighted, and if so, low-income have the most weight, followed by areas with high disabled populations.
- Commissioner Azumbrado asked how the different percentages used to define the various communities of concern populations were determined. He also stated that staff is using 200% of poverty, and asked if there was any consideration on reducing that back to 150%.
- Commissioner Haggerty commented on the CARE communities, and stated that the Air District implies that bad air quality doesn't matter if you're not low-income. He stated that the Air District's mission should strictly be to clean air. He also noted that is some concentrated-poverty neighborhoods in Livermore that don't meet the low-income percentage threshold.
- Commissioner Mackenzie agreed with Commissioner Green's comments that low-income populations be weighted highest. He noted the redefinition of communities of concern was a big change for the North Bay. Napa has disappeared, as well as some areas in Sonoma and Solano.

Ms. Yeamans responded to the Commissioners' comments as follows:

- 1) Each factor was given equal weight. However, several of the factors do correlate highly with the low-income factor, so in that sense it is being weighted more.
  - 2) The recommended percentage thresholds were rounded up from actual population percentages.
  - 3) Staff looked at an Age 75+ factor since mobility may begin to decline at that age.
  - 4) Staff has used the 200% of poverty as the regional definition of low-income for several past equity analyses to reflect the high cost of living in the Bay Area.
  - 5) According to staff's analysis of the data, the residents who live in communities not meeting 4 or more factors, such as in the North Bay, tend to have cars available to them, or otherwise face fewer barriers to mobility and access. Staff will be looking at all low-income households regionally as a group, so the residents who live in the North Bay counties will be captured in the analysis that way.
- Commissioner Spring expressed his concern on who is excluded from the Air District's CARE Communities.
  - Commissioner Haggerty agreed with Commissioner Spring and suggested that staff obtain a map from the Air District which shows where the bad air is. Mr. Steve Heminger clarified that the comparison staff made to the PDAs and the CARE Communities was simply a means of illustrating that what staff is proposing is fairly consistent with efforts of two regional counterparts. The disagreement needs to be resolved at the Air District.
  - Commissioner Worth-Rein requested that staff make sure that the analysis considers mobility challenges faced by minority populations that have moved to suburban areas.

Commissioner Mackenzie moved approval of the equity analysis performance measures for the Alternative Scenarios and the revised definition of communities of concern. Commissioner Worth-Rein seconded.

- Commissioner Haggerty asked why staff defined a “female-headed household with children” factor. He recommended staff identifying it as “single-parent households”.

Commissioner Haggerty amended the motion to change “female-headed household with children” to “single-parent households with children”. Commissioner Mackenzie accepted the amended motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### **PLAN BAY AREA PROGRESS REPORT/SCHEDULE UPDATE**

Ms. Ashley Nguyen stated that MTC and ABAG staffs are revising the Plan Bay Area production schedule to account for extra time needed for: 1) the Commission and ABAG to define the five scenario concepts previously approved by the Commission; 2) partners/stakeholders to provide input on scenario definitions, and 3) MTC and ABAG staff to analyze the scenarios and develop a preferred Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). She noted that the key change is that the preferred SCS was slated for approval in February 2012, and is now being extended to May 2012.

She noted that staff will be taking the benefit/cost and target assessment results to the Committee at its November 2011 meeting for discussion. The alternative scenario work is underway, with results out in December 2011.

In conclusion, she noted once staff has the draft results of the scenarios assessment, staff will conduct public outreach in January 2012 through focus groups, public workshops and community-based workshops.

### **CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL STATUS UPDATE**

Mr. Randy Rentschler stated that MTC received a letter from the Bay Area Council asking it to get more involved in making high speed rail work across the State of California. He introduced Ms. Marion Lee, Caltrain, who presented a PowerPoint presentation on the status of High Speed Rail (HSR) on the San Francisco Peninsula.

#### Public Comment:

- Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, expressed her support of HSR, and stated that it would be nice to see a good balance between the role of the MTC in helping to allocate funding, and move things forward, and having local communities that are extremely interested in the details of design, etc. involved.
- Jim Bigelow, Redwood City-San Mateo County Chamber, hopes to see MTC assist in finalizing the future of the Peninsula rail corridor.
- Patrick Burt, Palo Alto City Council, stated that the support of the blended system approach is a positive step.
- Kathy Hamilton stated that Caltrain service is extremely important to the community, and believes everyone needs to work together to work on a modernization program for Caltrain; however, the blended plan is premature at this point. She would like a Plan B for Caltrain having it separated from HSR.

- Clarence Fischer proposed to keep moving forward with the Peninsula plan; however, at the same time look at the cost analysis for the Altamont route because if you're going to have to spend \$2-4 billion on grade separations it may be more cost-effective for HSR to use the Altamont Pass alignment.

Committee comment:

- Commissioner Tissier appreciated the update on High Speed Rail, and looks forward to working with Caltrain to improve the corridor for local service and HSR.
- Commissioner Haggerty expressed his support of electrification of Caltrain, and would like to see HSR enter the Bay Area via the Altamont Pass.
- Commissioner Cortese stated Caltrain and HSR will need the support of major employers and education centers along the Peninsula.
- Commissioner Weiner agreed with Commissioner Cortese.
- Commissioner Green expressed his concern with the cost to implement HSR state-wide.

### **HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES REGIONAL PLANNING GRANT APPLICATION**

In the interest of time, there was no staff presentation. The item was submitted to the committee for information only.

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

Mr. Clarence Fischer commented on the communities of concern, suggesting staff provide more information on how the threshold factors were determined.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 11:51 a.m. The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Friday, November 4, 2011 at 9:30 a.m. in the Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland, CA.