



**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
EMAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Amy Rein Worth, Chair
Cities of Contra Costa County

Dave Cortese, Vice Chair
Santa Clara County

Alicia C. Aguirre
Cities of San Mateo County

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

David Campos
City and County of San Francisco

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sam Liccardo
San Jose Mayor's Appointee

Mark Luce
Association of Bay Area Governments

Jake Mackenzie
Sonoma County and Cities

Joe Pirzynski
Cities of Santa Clara County

Jean Quan
Oakland Mayor's Appointee

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Adrienne J. Tissier
San Mateo County

Scott Wiener
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

MTC PLANNING COMMITTEE

June 14, 2013

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Chair Sperring called the MTC Planning Committee meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. Planning Committee members in attendance were: Commissioners Aguirre, Giacopini, Haggerty, Halsted, Liccardo, Luce, and Mackenzie. Commission Vice-Chair Cortese was present in his ex-officio capacity. Commissioners' Bates, Campos, Quan, Tissier, and Weiner were also in attendance.

ABAG Administrative Committee members in attendance were: Cortese, Eklund, Gioia, Haggerty, Liccardo, Luce, Mar, Pierce, Quan, and Sperring.

CONSENT CALENDAR: a) Minutes of May 10, 2013

Commissioner Halsted moved approval of the Consent Calendar, ABAG Administrative Committee member Pierce seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA: a) Summary of Public Input

Ms. Ellen Griffin, MTC, summarized the various ways that ABAG and MTC reached out to Bay Area residents to seek comments on the Draft Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). She highlighted the key themes heard through public comments, and noted that staff continuously updated the "Frequently Asked Questions" on the OneBayArea.org website to answer basic questions and to address misperceptions and inaccuracies stated by some commenters. Ms. Miriam Chion, ABAG, added that in response to jurisdiction comments, the Housing and Employment Distribution was modified to make minor corrections to the datasets used and, in some cases to adjust local jurisdiction growth based on corrections to how the distribution methodology was applied.

Mr. Jon Canapary, Corey, Canapary & Galanis, summarized the results of the Plan Bay Area telephone poll. He noted that the survey was conducted in English, Spanish and Chinese during March through May, 2013, and included over 2500 respondents from all nine Bay Area counties.

Committee comments:

- Commissioner Haggerty requested a copy of the final telephone survey report when it is available. He stated his objection to the terminology used to describe different geographic areas of the region, and asked where the 2500 calls went – primarily urban areas/suburban areas? Mr. Canapary stated that he would revise the language, and noted that the survey used telephone prefixes throughout every Bay Area county, as well as cell phone samples and listed numbers.

- ABAG Administrative Committee member Gioia asked if the survey sample reflects the demographics, the diverse population and geography of the Bay Area. Mr. Canapary confirmed that it does.
- ABAG Administrative Committee member Eklund asked for clarification on the number of respondents from Marin County. She also requested some discussion on the age breakdown of respondents. Mr. Canapary clarified that the survey responses are weighted by population, and with over 250 interviews conducted in Marin County, one can have a high level of confidence in the data because they did a higher sample size. In terms of age representation, there were some differences in responses from different age groups. For example, older individuals rated upkeep of roads as more important than expanding rail.
- Commissioner Quan asked if there were multi-lingual interviewers. Mr. Canapary confirmed that there were.
- Commissioner Campos asked how many surveys were conducted in the different languages and how that compares to the overall Bay Area population. Mr. Canapary stated that responses are not balanced necessarily by ethnicity or language, because many of the interviews were with bilingual individuals, and were conducted in English if possible. If that was not possible, then a Spanish- or Chinese-language speaker called them back.
- Commissioner Cortese requested more information by county and noted that he hoped the survey did not exclude significant segments of the population.

b) Response to Key Issues and Preliminary Recommendations

Mr. Ken Kirkey, MTC, and Ms. Miriam Chion, ABAG, presented key issues and offered preliminary recommendations for possible revisions to the Draft Plan Bay Area in response to public comments.

Public comment:

- Dolly Sandoval, MTC Policy Advisory Council, stated that proximity of housing and jobs is vital, and that the Council agrees with the comments that the Plan should do more to improve social equity, prevent displacement and establish an off-plan study of establishing a fee on vehicle-miles traveled.
- Arthur Dao, Alameda County Transportation Commission, expressed support on the process and the Draft Plan. It represents a significant achievement in meeting greenhouse gas targets while respecting local land use control.
- Catherine Lyons, Bay Area Council, expressed support for the HOT Lane Network. She expressed concern that the housing unit numbers are not high enough to house the population workforce and stimulate job growth, and expressed support for including a Statement of Assurances, submitted by the Building Industry, in the Plan.
- Tim Frank, Center for Sustainable Neighborhoods, stated that he is impressed with the results of the EEJ scenario. He suggested moving some of the housing from the current PDAs into places that have lots of jobs and transportation but didn't volunteer to be designated as a PDA.
- John Datnymple, consultant for Sheet Metal Workers International, expressed concern that comments made by his clients were not reflected in the staff report. He expressed support for the Draft Plan, but Plan Bay Area will result in millions of dollars leaving the region, unless it includes job opportunities with local hire and other provisions for at-risk youth, veterans, and others.

- Peter Singleton stated that staff ignored about 85% of the commenters who expressed their opposition to the Plan. He stated that the Plan's model for greenhouse gas emissions in California shows that GHGs are 25-35% higher today than they were in 1990, which is false. He also stated that advances in clean-car standards will cut Bay Area gasoline consumption in half, yet the Plan assumes that gas tax revenues will increase.
- Rusty Snow, Orinda Watch, stated that the 45-day comment period on the DEIR should have been extended due to the length and complexities of the documents. She described comment letters from Orinda Watch and from the cities of Lafayette, Larkspur, Orinda, San Rafael, Sausalito, and Corte Madera that requested an extension of the comment period. They also requested that staff review and investigate the comments from Bay Area citizens and to adjust and modify the Plan accordingly.
- Sam Tepperman-Gelfant, Public Advocates/6 Wins, noted the Plan needs to address the issue of displacement. He supported strengthening future rounds of the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program to tie together transportation investments and land use. He also requested that future OBAG funds incentivize local affordable housing and anti-displacement policies.
- Steve Woo, Chinatown Community Development Corporation, expressed concern with displacement risks cited in the equity analysis of the Plan. He recommended state-level reform.
- Kirsten Spalding, San Mateo County Union Community Alliance, stated that the Plan should address labor standards, including a focus on standard area wages, and local youth apprenticeships.
- Wendy Alfsen, California Walks/SF Bay Walks, urged continued use of performance measurements and more emphasis on improving air quality, health and safety. She also requested the committee prioritize investment and expansion of public transit operations, including regional transit passes.
- Chris Lepe, TransForm, stated that investing in transportation alternatives is key to quality of life, as well as better air quality. He also stated that there needs to be anti-displacement measures and more scrutiny of the impacts of highway expansion on vulnerable communities.
- Clarrissa Cabansagan, TransForm, urged staff to incorporate the EEJ policies. She also commented on the Express Lane Network and stated that it would cost much less to convert existing general purpose lanes into HOT lanes. She requested that the Plan free up money for transit, and called for a study on conversion of general purpose lanes.
- Larry Tong, EBRPD, stressed the need for meaningful financial incentives and mitigation measures to protect the vital natural resources. He requested a 5% set-aside for natural resource protection.
- Erica Stephan, TransForm, commented on express lanes and stated that much of the money is allocated to new construction, new lanes, and yet many studies have shown this will induce demand. Transportation choices that will reduce driving are a better investment. She requested that 50% of express lane revenues be dedicated to increasing transit funding, especially along those corridors where the express lanes are operating.
- Joshua Hugg, Housing Leadership Council of San Mateo County, stated that the approach provided by the EEJ alternative provides the best chance for the region at large to meet the region's needs.

- Claire Jahns stated that this Plan is an important next step to ensure that existing conservation planning is leveraged to benefit broader planning efforts. She urged staff to factor in early the potential impacts of infrastructure on agricultural and open space lands.
- Tina Hugg, Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District, expressed her support of the recommendation to expand and refine the Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program and seeking additional funding for PCA conservation and management efforts. She urged that eligibility criteria and the 3-1 match requirement be relaxed to make qualifying for the program easier. The Plan needs to analyze the Bay Area's parks and open space assets to better link the PCAs with PDAs.
- Clayton Smith, Save Tam Valley, stated that the poll survey is designed to deceive.
- Marilynne Mellander, Save El Sobrante.com, expressed her opposition to Plan Bay Area. She also stated that express lanes will force traffic into fewer traffic lanes, which means they will be idling, which generates even more particulates so anyone living along those corridors will have more pollution to deal with.
- Carmen Angelandretti, ACCE, stated that there needs to be more buses and less highways and a free regional youth bus pass. She urged addition of \$3.3 million more to transit operating funds and prioritization of transit operations as new funds become available.
- Bob Allen, Urban Habitat, commented on the EEJ alternative and proposed shifting cap and trade revenue into affordable housing near transit and into transit and operations, with the goal of targeting a greater percentage of revenue for local service and related capital for increasing transit operations. He also noted that having a long-term policy that targets new sources of revenue for transit operations would be a good structural improvement. He commented on the express lane network and urged conversion of general-purpose lanes.
- Aubrey Freedman, Libertarian Party of San Francisco, expressed his opposition to the Plan and noted that the government needs to stay out of the housing area.
- Melissa Hippard, Greenbelt Alliance, stated that the Plan should have a more explicit policy suggestions, language, or goals to protect natural resources. She supports staff's recommendation to continue to work on the PCA Program, and the grant program that is in place now. She echoed concerns staff raised around redistributing housing to green-fill suburban locations because that will likely increase pressure on open spaces and agricultural lands. She recommended that the Plan include language addressing mitigation for biological carbon dioxide emissions and impacts on public lands.
- Robert Macaulay, Solano Transportation Authority, expressed support for the Plan as proposed, including the Express Lane Network. He noted that displacement is an important issue and is one best addressed at the local level. He also commented on the Cap and Trade funds and noted, from the CMAs perspective, that it appears to be too early to commit who will make the decision on how those funds will be spent.
- Judy Galletti, Citizens Alliance for Property Rights, expressed her opposition of the Plan.
- Pat Ferguson submitted a graph from the Joint Center for Housing Studies at Harvard University that shows that crime increases with the size of buildings. She stated that the Plan would import failed urban planning policies into the suburbs. Suburbs don't need transit; the plan should fund more transit in Oakland instead.
- Steve Lowe, West Oakland Commerce Association and Jack London District Association, stated that if West Oakland is going to be among the PDAs, then they need to be among the first of the PDAs to take into consideration the negative impacts of transportation.

- Glenn stated that the people should have the right to vote on Plan Bay Area. He also stated that the notice for the public comment period was seriously flawed – the greater proportion of the population of the Bay Area is totally unaware of this Plan. He stated that the people wanted local planning and local control – not regional.
- Gloria Bruce, East Bay Housing Organizations/6 Wins, agreed with the proposal for affordable housing funding from Cap and Trade revenue, but there needs to be more. She agrees with the consideration made on the OBAG criteria and possibly some consideration made on anti-displacement policies.
- Wafaa Aborashed, Bay Area Healthy 880 Communities/6 Wins, requested more funding towards public transit to help the youth get to school, etc.
- Mike Bulea expressed his opposition to the Plan, and requested that the Plan go to the voters.
- Jamie Studley, 6 Wins, expressed her support of the EEJ recommendations, and noted that valuing equity adds to the greenhouse gas goals.
- Charles Cagnon, SF Republican Party Central Committee, expressed his opposition to the Plan.
- Chris Pareja expressed his opposition to the Plan and objected to language in the plan stating that Latinos and Asians have a historical preference for multifamily homes, that many do not have cars, that there will be a lot more lower paying jobs for communities of color/communities of concern or minority groups. He stated this is not correct.
- Nina Pellegrini, Californians for Property Rights, expressed her concern about property rights and properly values diminishing in rural areas. She expressed her opposition of the Plan.
- Janet Marorana expressed her concern about the future for the Bay Area. She stated that the main problem is that only a few people are aware of Plan Bay Area, and if Plan Bay Area had merit, communities who do not want to comply would not be punished financially.
- Gini David, Bay Area Patriots, expressed her concern with the poll and noted that 53% were in favor of local control versus 44% for regional control.
- Shelley expressed opposition to the Plan and disagreed with population projections. She stated people are moving out of the state, and there is no proof the sea is going to rise 3 feet.
- Victor Aguila, Republican Party, expressed his opposition to the Plan and urged the committee stop the relocation of people in the Bay Area.
- Fernando Marti, Council of Community Housing Organizations, expressed support for regional planning, but stated the Plan needs funding to meet its goals; the displacement risk is not acceptable, less so with the EEJ alternative. He stated all funds should be conditioned on strong anti-displacement policies, tailored to each jurisdiction's conditions.
- Peter Cohen, Council of Community Housing Organizations, stated the plan should not result in more people being vulnerable to being displaced. He said policies need to be in place to protect tenants, stabilize communities, ensure funding for the affordable housing.
- Paul Campos, Business Industry Association, submitted a letter asking the Committee to add language in the final Plan clarifying their intent in adopting the Plan.
- Bill Bowen commented on the demographics and displacement impact, he asked what Plan Bay Area is if no money arrives from Cap & Trade. He also stated the Plan should go before the voters.
- Stephanie Reyes, Greenbelt Alliance, supported staff's recommendation for Cap and Trade funds for affordable housing near transit, and urged the committee to commit that the next round of the One Bay Area grant funds include affordable housing and anti-displacement funds with a menu of options to implement.

- Zoe Levitt, Alameda County Public Health Dept., urged the committee to increase the investment in local transit service as a critical public health resource.
- Gloria Rotunno Strong stated that if younger people understood the plan they would not be in favor of it. She expressed her opposition to the Plan.
- Sara Lowell stated the Plan should do more to incentivize local governments to create policies that mitigate for development and expand the conservation and lands network; and increase investments in PCAs.
- Shilpi Chultray stated the Plan should identify ways to increase access to open spaces, including more public transportation and bicycle access.
- Vince expressed his concern about greenhouse gases; he challenged members to leave their cars and use the public transportation system; and may find it is impractical in some places.
- Jim Bitter, for Fred Volking, stated this is a nationwide plan that should go to the voters.

Committee discussion:

- ABAG Administrative Committee member Eklund identified the following topics for further discussion: population – do we keep the population and job projections or consider lowering them; local control – the name of the Plan should be changed to something that does not give the impression it's a one size fits all document; ensuring the local labor market is given preference for jobs in the nine county Bay Area; 5% set aside for parks and open space; CEQA streamlining and other specifics; and the DEIR responses to comments. She also noted the 99% of the comments from Marin were against Plan Bay Area. She supports the Plan going to the voters, and also recommended that ABAG hold a General Assembly and have each city and county vote on the Plan before July 18, 2013.
- Commissioner Quan would like more response from staff on the EEJ recommendations, such as what percentage of the Cap and Trade projected funds would be used; more discussion on the HOV lanes and what HOV funds could be reallocated. She asked how much the Plan spends on highways versus public transportation, in particular in areas where transit is heavily used. She asked what the Plan does to get people to the three regional centers of San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose. She also expressed concern that immigrants were underrepresented in the poll, and in future polls would like more analysis of responses by age of respondents, as she believes many seniors are returning to the urban core.
- Commissioner Haggerty asked if the Cap and Trade revenues had been vetted with all of the CMAs. Mr. Steve Heminger stated that when staff started the Plan, there was no framework to estimate Cap and Trade revenues, so staff did not include any at all. Staff is now asking the Committee to consider including staff's estimate for this revenue source in the Plan so that a certain amount can be reserved for affordable housing and the remaining be reserved for future discussion. He also noted that staff did not consult with the CMAs with regard to this revenue source. Commissioner Haggerty asked that CMAs be consulted on future policy development, project selection and funding allocation with respect to Cap and Trade funds.
- Commissioner Haggerty noted there is a great need for affordable housing in rural areas of the region, not just urban areas. Mr. Heminger stated that staff's proposal was to include the revenue stream in the Plan and establish a broad policy. He agreed there needs to be discussion about how and where the money will be spent, and who will make the decisions. He noted this discussion would be best served with a revenue estimate that can provide a parameter to the discussion.

- Commissioner Haggerty stated the Plan should mention goods movement, including interregional coordination of truck traffic on I-580. Mr. Ken Kirkey noted this is highlighted in the staff memo because it is a high priority item for additional work upon adoption of the Plan. Commissioner Haggerty asked why we don't put the Plan before the voters.
- ABAG Administrative Committee member Julie Pierce stated the Plan needs a statement of intent that clearly explains that the Plan is a regional strategy for local and interregional cooperation among counties and cities; it is up to local jurisdictions to implement; and that all land use decisions will remain with individual cities and counties, not the region. The Plan is a strategy for how to grow, with incentives for development in PDAs. She noted that while 70% of growth will be in PDAs, all jurisdictions will be responsible for their fair share of housing, even outside of PDAs, and thus we expect growth across the region partly as the market dictates.
- Commissioner Luce expressed his support of the Plan as recommended, and agreed there needs to be more discussion on potential revenue from Cap and Trade.

In anticipation of losing a quorum of the ABAG Administrative Committee, Commissioner Luce moved approval of staff's recommendation. Commissioner Spring expressed his concern about the way the potential Cap and Trade funds are being allocated and stated it needs more discussion. He supported the motion with the understanding of the need for more discussion on Cap and Trade. Commissioner Liccardo seconded. Commissioner Haggerty opposed. Motion passed.

- Commissioner Bates stated that Cap and Trade has not yet been decided. The legislature may decide to spend it in a totally different way, so it's important for ABAG and MTC to get a uniform position and advocate for the money. He agreed with Committee member Pierce's comments on the PDAs. He supports the 5% set aside for natural resources. He also stated that displacement issue is a real problem and staff needs to address it, and when the two-year review comes up, he would like to see the demographics. Lastly, he commented on the HOT lanes and noted that he supports the concept, but it's important to recognize that money can't just be taken from HOT lanes and invested in more HOT lanes without some tangible benefit to go with it for the people who are paying the price. A certain percentage of the net revenue should go to help provide additional public transportation.
- Commissioner Mackenzie agreed that the Cap and Trade allocation requires further discussion, as well as the recommendations on the affordable housing and transportation investments. He stated that the Priority Conservation Program has pilot programs in all nine counties, and is very sympathetic towards a 5% set-aside, but he believes it needs to be done in the context of the next iteration of Plan Bay Area. He also expressed interest in the idea of including a letter of intent into the Plan.
- Commissioner Halsted agrees that there needs to be more discussion on Cap and Trade.
- Commissioner Spring commented on affordable housing and noted that the redevelopment agencies still have millions of dollars for affordable housing and there should be some obligation to how the money is spent in those communities that have to a part of that commitment.
- Commissioner Haggerty requested that staff work with the CMAs regarding policy development, project selection and funding allocation for the \$3.1b Cap and Trade

revenues. He also commented on goods movement, and asked staff to move the additional incentives and priorities for the Bay Area planning implementation and give it more credence in the Plan. Mr. Heminger stated that both he and Mr. Ezra Rapport will work on something to include in the Plan in relationship to goods movement. Ms. Miriam Chion stated that staff will prepare a one-page White Paper on Goods Movement as well as on PCAs for the ABAG meeting on June 20, 2013.

Mr. Heminger clarified that staff is not recommending the committee include the 5% set-aside because taking 5% of the money from the Plan means taking it away from somewhere else. He agrees that they should do pilot programs, learn from it, and have a discussion about the kind of set-aside when the Plan is updated.

Commissioner Spring commented on the Building Industry Association letter and requested staff to convene the working group that did the analysis on the PDAs and get input from them on that letter to see if there is something that can be done to mitigate those concerns.

Commissioner Spring motioned approval of staff's recommendations with the noted modifications made by the committee, and with the understanding of more discussion on the comments made on the Cap and Trade, Affordable Housing, and Priority Conservation Area. Commissioner Mackenzie moved approval, Commissioner Halsted seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS/PUBLIC COMMENT

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 1:26 p.m. The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Friday, July 12, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. in the Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland, CA.