



CALL AND NOTICE

REVISED

CALL AND NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

As President of the Executive Board of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), I am calling a special meeting of the ABAG Executive Board as follows:

ABAG EXECUTIVE BOARD SPECIAL MEETING NO. 393

Thursday, June 20, 2013, 7:00 PM

Location:

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium
101 8th Street
Oakland, California

Agenda and attachments available at abag.ca.gov

For information, contact Fred Castro, Clerk of the Board, at (510) 464 7913.

The business to be transacted will include:

- 1. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT**
- 3. ANNOUNCEMENTS**
- 4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
- 5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
- 6. CONSENT CALENDAR**
 - A. Executive Board Summary Minutes
ACTION.**
- 7. DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA**
 - A. Summary of Public Input
Information.**

REVISED
ABAG Executive Board
June 14, 2013
2

**B. Summary of Land Use-Related Issues and Responses
Information.**

**C. Response to Key Issues and Preliminary Recommendations
ACTION.**

**8. CONSISTENCY OF LOCAL PROJECTS WITH PLAN BAY AREA
ACTION.**

**9. GENERAL ASSEMBLY DELEGATE ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY
ACTION.**

10. ADJOURNMENT

The ABAG Executive Board may act on any item on the agenda.

Members of the public shall be provided an opportunity to directly address the ABAG Executive Board concerning any item described in this notice before consideration of that item.

Agendas and materials will be posted and distributed for this meeting by ABAG staff in the normal course of business.

Submitted:



Mark Luce
President, Executive Board

June 18, 2013

Date



AGENDA

REVISED

ABAG EXECUTIVE BOARD SPECIAL MEETING NO. 393

Thursday, June 20, 2013, 7:00 PM

Location:

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium
101 8th Street
Oakland, California

The ABAG Executive Board may act on any item on this agenda.

Agenda and attachments available at abag.ca.gov

For information, contact Fred Castro, Clerk of the Board, at (510) 464 7913.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 2. PUBLIC COMMENT**
- 3. ANNOUNCEMENTS**
- 4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**
- 5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**
- 6. CONSENT CALENDAR**

A. Executive Board Summary Minutes

ACTION. Approval of Summary Minutes of Meeting No. 392 held on May 16, 2013.

Attachment: Summary Minutes

7. DRAFT PLAN BAY AREA

A. Summary of Public Input

Information. Miriam Chion, ABAG Planning and Research Director will present the results of the Plan Bay Area telephone poll and summarize recent public hearing and written comments.

Attachment: Draft Plan Bay Area—Summary of Public Comments

B. Summary of Land Use-Related Issues and Responses

Information. Miriam Chion, ABAG Planning and Research Director, will provide a more detailed discussion of key land use policy issues raised during the comment period, and will offer clarification on these issues.

Attachment: Summary of Land Use-Related Issues and Responses

C. Response to Key Issues and Preliminary Recommendations

ACTION. Miriam Chion, ABAG Planning and Research Director, will summarize key issues and related policy issues identified for potential revisions to the draft Plan Bay Area.

Attachment: Draft Plan Bay Area—Key Issues and Preliminary Recommendations

8. CONSISTENCY OF LOCAL PROJECTS WITH PLAN BAY AREA

ACTION. Miriam Chion, ABAG Planning and Research Director, will provide an overview of preliminary criteria for determining the consistency of local projects with Plan Bay Area. This consistency relates to access to State funding, including State Proposition 1C housing funds, and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) purposes.

Attachment: Consistency of Local Projects with Plan Bay Area

9. GENERAL ASSEMBLY DELEGATE ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY


ACTION. Brad Paul, ABAG Deputy Executive Director, will report on a General Assembly delegate engagement strategy.

Attachment: Delegate Strategy

10. ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Executive Board is July 18, 2013.

Submitted:



Ezra Rapport
Secretary-Treasurer

June 18, 2013

Date

ABAG Executive Board Roster

ABAG Executive Board Meeting Schedule

SUMMARY MINUTES (DRAFT)

ABAG Executive Board Meeting No. 392
Thursday, May 16, 2013
Joseph Bort MetroCenter
101 8th Street, Oakland, California

1. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

President Mark Luce, Supervisor, County of Napa, called the meeting to order at about 7:10 p.m.

A quorum of the Board was present.

Representatives and Alternates Present	Jurisdiction
Senior Advisor Jeff Buckley	City of San Francisco
Councilmember Ronit Bryant	City of Mountain View
Councilmember Kansen Chu	City of San Jose
Supervisor Malia Cohen	County of San Francisco
Supervisor David Cortese	County of Santa Clara
Mayor Pat Eklund	City of Novato
Director Jason Elliott	City of San Francisco
Vice Mayor Richard Garbarino	City of South San Francisco
Mayor Leon Garcia	City of American Canyon
Supervisor John Gioia	County of Contra Costa
Mayor Pedro Gonzalez	City of South San Francisco
Supervisor Scott Haggerty	County of Alameda
Mayor Bill Harrison	City of Fremont
Vice Mayor Dave Hudson	City of San Ramon
Councilmember Sam Liccardo	City of San Jose
Supervisor Mark Luce	County of Napa
Supervisor Karen Mitchoff	County of Contra Costa
Mayor Julie Pierce	City of Clayton
Supervisor Dave Pine	County of San Mateo
Councilmember Joe Pirzynski	Town of Los Gatos
Mayor Harry Price	City of Fairfield
Mayor Jean Quan	City of Oakland
Supervisor David Rabbitt	County of Sonoma
Supervisor Katie Rice	County of Marin
Councilmember Libby Schaaf	City of Oakland
Supervisor Linda Seifert	County of Solano
Deputy Director Joaquin Torres	City of San Francisco
Representatives Absent	Jurisdiction
Councilmember Desley Brooks	City of Oakland
Councilmember Ash Kalra	City of San Jose
Director William Kissinger	RWQCB
Councilmember Jake Mackenzie	City of Rohnert Park
Supervisor Eric Mar	County of San Francisco
Supervisor Warren Slocum	County of San Mateo
Supervisor Richard Valle	County of Alameda
Supervisor Mike Wasserman	County of Santa Clara

President Luce led the Board and the public in the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Pat Eklund, Mayor, City of Novato, announced that she was convening a meeting of ABAG General Assembly delegates from Marin County. The first meeting is on Plan Bay Area.

There were no other announcements.

President Luce recognized a motion by Eklund, which was seconded by Julie Pierce, Mayor, City of Clayton, to add to the agenda under Item 6, ABAG Consent Calendar, the appointment of Desley Brooks, Councilmember, City of Oakland, to the Finance and Personnel Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

4. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

President Luce reported on the following:

Tim Sbranti, Mayor, City of Dublin, has resigned as Executive Board representative from the Cities in the County of Alameda.

President Luce presented a resolution in recognition of service to Patricia Jones, ABAG Assistant Executive Director, who retires on May 24, 2013.

The ABAG Spring General Assembly was held on April 18, 2013, and was considered a success. The Fall General Assembly is scheduled for October 24, 2013. Members were encouraged to submit nominations for the next annual *Growing Smarter Together Awards*.

Public hearings for Plan Bay Area have taken place and are scheduled through May. Additional outreach included editorial boards and other media.

5. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Ezra Rapport, ABAG Executive Director, reported on the following:

The deadline for submitting Priority Conservation Area grants is July 19, 2013.

The focus of the meeting is for members to give feedback on Plan Bay Area so staff can respond to their concerns and provide clarifications before it is considered for approval at the Board's July meeting.

6. ABAG CONSENT CALENDAR

President Luce recognized a motion by Pierce, which was seconded by Linda Seifert, Supervisor, County of Solano, to approve the Consent Calendar, including the appointment of Brooks to the Finance and Personnel Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

A. Approval of Executive Board Summary Minutes**

Summary of Minutes of Meeting No. 392 held on March 21, 2013.

B. Grant Applications**

A list of grant applications was approved for submission to the State Clearinghouse, having been circulated in ABAG's "Intergovernmental Review Newsletter" since the last Executive Board meeting.

C. Authorization to Renew Agreement with Michael J. Arnold and Associates, Legislative Advocate**

Authorized renewal the agreement with Michael J. Arnold and Associates in an amount not to exceed \$60,000 to provide legislative advocacy on behalf of ABAG in Sacramento.

D. Authorization to Enter Into Agreement with Environmental Protection Agency**

Authorized approval of the annual ABAG/SFEP application for funds under the National Estuary Program and authorize the Executive Director or designee to enter into a new cooperative agreement or amendment with EPA on behalf of the San Francisco Estuary Partnership to provide technical, public involvement and administrative support in implementing the Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (CCMP). The agreement term will be through September 30, 2014.

7. UPDATE ON PLAN BAY AREA**

Information/ACTION. Miriam Chion, ABAG Planning and Research Director, provided an overview of the draft Plan Bay Area and EIR, and major comments and key issues to be addressed in the Plan.

Chion first announced that new Bay Trail map sets are now available and have been distributed to members.

A. Draft Plan Bay Area and EIR Highlights (Information)

Chion reviewed regional tasks and the development process of Plan Bay Area, and the preferred scenario adopted in May 2012. She reviewed growth trends, including regional growth of jobs, population, and housing units; regional growth strategy; and investments, including revenue forecast to 2040 and total transportation investments.

Rapport reviewed the purpose of the draft Environmental Impact Report and summarized and compared the Draft Plan Bay Area and alternatives, including No Project; Transit Priority Focus; Enhanced Network of Communities; and Environment, Equity and Jobs.

B. Comments on Plan Bay Area (Information)

Chion reviewed comments received.

C. Key Issues for Discussion (Information)

Chion reviewed key land use issues, including affordable housing and displacement, job growth and regional economic development, open space preservation resources, and regional resiliency and health. She listed key priorities to be addressed in the Plan and incorporating elements from the draft EIR alternatives. She listed next steps, including revision to housing and jobs distribution and update to the transportation analysis, revision to Plan document,

presentation at the ABAG Administrative Committee joint meeting with the MTC Planning Committee on June 14, 2013, and final approval at the Board joint meeting with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission on July 18, 2013.

Members discussed the schedule of upcoming meetings; reviewing comments submitted on Plan Bay Area. They provided staff with specific feedback on the Plan, including comments received from public workshops and meetings with elected officials; local control; generational differences; distribution of transportation funds; CEQA reform.

Tim Frank spoke about the benefits of the Equity and Environmental Justice alternative.

Members discussed the OBAG grant criteria; transportation infrastructure; policy issues and funding; the Plan as a planning process; emphasizing Green House Gas reduction; sea level rise analysis; and reviewing comments received and responses to the those comments.

President Luce recognized a motion by Eklund, which was seconded by Joe Pirzynski, Councilmember, City of Los Gatos, for a special meeting of the Board on June 20, 2013, to consider the draft Plan Bay Area and EIR, comments receive, and responses to those comments. The motion passed by consensus with one nay vote by Haggerty.

Members requested that staff provide the comments for their review and discussed the Plan Bay Area name.

D. SB 375 Provisions for Development Entitlement Process (Action)

Rapport reported on provisions for entitlement process related to SB 375 and CEQA and on potential regional consistency determination for projects within a Priority Development Area in the Plan and with regards to densities and intensities and place type designations, and on requirement for local consistency determination.

Members discussed local consistency determination and regional consistency determination, and CEQA benefits.

President Luce recognized a motion by Dave Hudson, Vice Mayor, City of San Ramon, which was seconded by Bill Harrison, Mayor, City of Fremont, to support the concept of including a regional consistency determination to support local options and to authorize staff to work with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission on developing language for consideration by the Board and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The motion passed unanimously.

President Luce recessed the meeting at about 9:00 p.m.

President Luce reconvened the meeting at about 9:10 p.m.

8. COORDINATION WITH US DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Information. Miriam Chion, ABAG Planning and Research Director, summarized correspondence with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

(HUD) and the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) regarding the inclusion of locally-nominated Priority Development Areas in the Regional Housing Need Allocation methodology and limiting housing options for low-income families and impacting minorities negatively. Staff provided both HUD and HCD with detailed assessment of RHNA in relation to PDAs and concentrations of low-income households and people of color. The analysis indicates that the RHNA methodology does not promote segregation or concentrations of poverty and complies with the statutory requirements of Housing Element law.

Members discussed the methodology, the inclusion of potential and planned PDAs in the analysis, the reason for HUD and HCD's concerns, and housing for students and veterans.

9. REGIONAL HOUSING NEED ALLOCATION**

Information/ACTION. Gillian Adams, ABAG Regional Planner, presented recommendations of the RHNA Appeal Committee and an inter-jurisdictional transfer of housing units. At its meeting on April 1, 2013, the committee heard appeals from eight jurisdictions and made the following recommendations: City of Hayward—support appeal for reduction of 116 units; City of Lafayette—support appeal for reduction of 27 units; City of Mountain View—deny appeal; City of Oakley—deny appeal; City of Palo Alto—deny appeal; City of San Ramon—deny appeal; City of Saratoga—deny appeal; City of Sunnyvale—support appeal for reduction of 531 units; and consider approval of a transfer of 200 moderate-income units from City of Palo Alto to the County of Santa Clara.

Staff will release the final Regional Housing Need Allocation on June 3, 2013. The final Regional Housing Need Allocation will be considered for adoption by the Board at its meeting on July 18, 2013.

President Luce recognized a motion by Eklund, which was seconded by Harry Price, Mayor, City of Fairfield, to adopt the RHNA Appeal Committee recommendations to support the appeals by the Cities of Hayward, Lafayette, and Sunnyvale, and to deny the appeals submitted by the Cities of Mountain View, Oakley, Palo Alto, San Ramon, and Saratoga; and to approve the transfer of 200 moderate-income units from the City of Palo Alto's RHNA to the County of Santa Clara's RHNA.

Members discussed the redistribution of housing units among jurisdictions, and housing for students and veterans.

The motion passed by consensus, with one abstention by Haggerty and one nay vote by Hudson.

10. LEGISLATION & GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE REPORT

Information/ACTION. Committee Chair David Rabbitt, Supervisor, County of Sonoma, reported on Committee activities and asked Board approval of Committee recommendations and pending legislation, including the following: reviewed and approved the meeting minutes of March 21, 2013; considered legislation proposed in 2013 state legislative session: AB 188 (Ammiano), Property Taxation: Change in Ownership—support; AB 210 (Wieckowski), Transactions and Use Taxes: County of Alameda and County of Contra Costa—support; AB 431 (Mullins), Regional Transportation Plan: Sustainable Communities Strategy—Funding—watch; AB 523

(Ammiano), Department of Housing and Community Development: Loans—watch; AB 738 (Harkey), Public Entity Liability: Bicycles—support; AB 1051 (Bocanegra), Housing: Sustainable Communities for All—watch; AB 1179 (Bocanegra), Regional Transportation Plan: Sustainable Communities Strategy—School-sites—oppose; AB 1229 (Atkins), Land Use: Zoning Regulations—support; SB 731 (Steinberg), California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Sustainable Communities Strategy—watch; SB 299 (DeSaulnier), Firearms: Lost or Stolen—support; and reviewed amendments to legislation previously considered, including AB 1002 (Bloom), Vehicles: Registration Fee-Sustainable Communities Strategy—no change; SB 1 (Steinberg), Sustainable Communities Investment Authority—no change; SB 391 (DeSaulnier), California Homes and Jobs Act of 2013—no change; SB 792 (DeSaulnier), Regional Entities: Bay Area—oppose, unless amended.

President Luce recognized a motion Chair Rabbitt, which was seconded by Haggerty, to accept the committee report.

Members discussed the committee's recommendations on AB 188 and AB 416 which the Board referred by to committee.

The motion passed unanimously.

11. FINANCE & PERSONNEL COMMITTEE REPORT

Information/ACTION. Committee Chair John Gioia, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa, reported on Committee activities and asked Board approval of Committee recommendations, including the following: approved of meeting minutes of March 21, 2013; reviewed February and March 2013 financial reports; reviewed prospective 'Cadillac Tax' mandated as part of Affordable Care Act; and conducted Public Employee Performance Evaluation: Title: Executive Director with no reportable action.


President Luce recognized a motion by Supervisor Gioia, which was seconded by Karen Mitchoff, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa, to accept the committee report. The motion passed unanimously.

12. ADJOURNMENT

President Luce adjourned the meeting of the Board at about 9:41 p.m.

The Board will have special meeting on June 20, 2013.

Submitted:


Ezra Rapport, Secretary-Treasurer

June 13, 2013

Date

Contact Information:

Regional Planning Committee—Miriam Chion, Planning and Research Director, at (510) 464 7919 or MiriamC@abag.ca.gov

Finance and Personnel Committee—Herbert Pike, Finance Director, at (510) 464 7902 or HerbertP@abag.ca.gov.

Legislation and Governmental Organization Committee—Kathleen Cha, Senior Communications Officer, at (510) 464 7922 or KathleenC@abag.ca.gov.

All ABAG Executive Board meetings are recorded. To arrange for review of audio recordings, contact Fred Castro, Clerk of the Board, at (510) 464 7913 or FredC@abag.ca.gov.

[Blank Page]



TO: MTC Planning Committee, ABAG Administrative Committee

DATE: June 7, 2013

FR: Executive Director, MTC; Executive Director, ABAG

RE: Draft Plan Bay Area – Summary of Public Comments

Background

MTC and ABAG released the Draft Plan Bay Area on March 22, 2013, followed by the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on April 2, 2013. The formal public comment period for both documents closed on May 16, 2013.

Attachment 1 summarizes the various ways that ABAG and MTC reached out to Bay Area residents to seek comments on the Draft Plan and DEIR. In all, a total of 588 oral and written comments were received. All of the comments are available for review online:<http://www.onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/plan-bay-area/meetings-events/What-We-Heard.html>. The public comment period caps off more than three years of dialogue and consultation on this planning effort. A summary of all public workshops, policy board meetings and other public engagement activities dating back to the spring of 2010 is included as Attachment 2.

Telephone Poll Results

MTC and ABAG retained a research firm to conduct a telephone survey of over 2,500 residents to measure public opinion on various land use, housing and transportation trade-offs under consideration in the Draft Plan. The sample is statistically valid by county, and for the region overall. Attachment 3 includes key findings from the poll along with the top-line survey results. We will present these results at your June 14 meeting. Cross-tabs by county are available on the OneBayArea.org. web site (see above link).

What We Heard: Key Themes from Comments

Attachment 4 summarizes key themes heard through public comments on the Draft Plan. A number of comments sought clarification on aspects of the Draft Plan. Staff has continuously updated the “Frequently Asked Questions” (FAQ) on the OneBayArea.org website to answer basic questions and to address misperceptions and inaccuracies stated by some commenters. The most recent update of the FAQ is found in Attachment 5. Several comments are discussed in greater detail in Agenda Item 5(b) for your consideration for revisions to the Draft Plan.

Comments from Implementing Agencies

More than 45 local jurisdictions, all nine County Congestion Management Agencies, and several transit and other public agencies provided written comments on the Draft Plan and/or DEIR. Most of the letters address broad themes, such as growth and development patterns, transportation investments, the role of local/regional government, concerns about forecasting, and implementation of Plan Bay Area. County-level agencies and larger jurisdictions generally expressed support for the Draft Plan as proposed, given that it has been widely vetted and is

generally supported by local agencies in their respective counties. Some jurisdictions expressed concerns about aspects of the DEIR alternatives to the Draft Plan, questioning their feasibility and impact on local control.

A number of generally smaller local jurisdictions expressed support for the goals of SB 375 and Plan Bay Area, but expressed concern about the accuracy of the Draft Plan's housing and employment forecast, the limited level of growth outside of Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in their community, potential future shifts away from local control over land use decisions, and the ability of communities to implement the Plan, particularly given the loss of redevelopment authority. Many implementing jurisdictions expressed support for the Draft Plan's Advocacy Platform, including CEQA modernization, with a few jurisdictions indicating that they did not support changes to CEQA. Agencies across the spectrum expressed significant support for expanding funding for affordable housing and transportation infrastructure.

Comments from Organizations

Written comments were received from a wide array of organizations. More than a dozen organizations signed joint letters or provided their own letters in support of some key components of the Environment, Equity, and Jobs DEIR Alternative. These organizations advocated for revisions to the Draft Plan that include: (1) shifting 25,000 housing units from PDAs to "PDA-like places" and suburban job centers; (2) increasing the regional control total for housing; (3) shifting funding from the Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI), Express Lanes and the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) to transit operations in some parts of the region; and (4) modifying OBAG to condition funding based upon local anti-displacement policies.

Several organizations associated with the Bay Area Business Coalition that provided key inputs for the Enhanced Network of Communities DEIR Alternative expressed support for elements of that Alternative, including (1) a higher regional control total for housing as a means to support job growth and reduce commuting; (2) a growth distribution that is less heavily weighted to the PDAs; and (3) strong support for partnering with the regional agencies to advocate for CEQA modernization, affordable housing funding, the replacement of redevelopment funding, and expanded funding for transportation infrastructure.

A number of environmental organizations expressed support for the Draft Plan's growth pattern that concentrates development within the region's existing urban footprint and encouraged MTC and ABAG to take an active role relative to air quality mitigations and to assist project sponsors seeking to "tier off" the Plan's final Environmental Impact Report. Several chapters of the League of Women Voters expressed appreciation for the process to develop Plan Bay Area, support for regional planning, and a desire for increased transit funding for both operations and maintenance. Finally, a few organizations submitted comments stating that MTC and ABAG lack the authority to develop Plan Bay Area and are in violation of both the state and federal constitutions.

Comments from Individuals

Oral and written comments from individuals focused on many of the same themes raised by implementing agencies or stakeholder groups. The majority of speakers at the public hearings opposed the plan, and some expressed their opinion that regional planning is unconstitutional. Many were concerned the plan would threaten their property rights, force them to give up their car and live in high-density housing, or force unwanted growth in their communities. Some

speakers questioned the accuracy of the population and job growth projections on which the Plan is based.

Many expressed concern about the impact of growth on existing communities, and the potential for a decline in the quality of life in the region. Some highlighted possible negative impacts of the plan on other infrastructure, such as schools, water, sewer, and police and fire services.

A significant number of commenters support the concept of PDAs, focused growth around expanded public transit, and a policy to maintain the region's existing transportation infrastructure. A number of young people attended several of the public hearings and expressed concern about the impact of the high cost of living here, especially for housing and transportation. Many speakers requested that the plan do more to address the potential risk of displacement and several suggested that revenues from express lanes be used to increase public transit service. Many individuals also requested that more be done to provide affordable housing, support improved, more frequent and affordable public transit, and offer housing for workers in the same county as their job. A number of speakers expressed support for more bicycle lanes, and projects to increase bicycle and pedestrian safety.


Minor Corrections to Draft Plan

The housing and employment distribution in Draft Plan Bay Area was modified to make minor corrections to the datasets used and, in some cases, adjust local jurisdiction growth based on corrections to how the distribution methodology was applied. A narrative with a more detailed description of the changes and the related distribution tables are included in Attachment 6.

At the meeting on June 14, staff will review the themes in Attachment 4 in preparation for your discussion of potential revisions to the Draft Plan under agenda item 5(b). A full evaluation of the Plan's public engagement process will be conducted after the Plan's adoption.



Steve Heminger



Ezra Rapport

Attachments

- 1 – Summary of Spring 2013 Public Engagement
- 2 – Plan Bay Area Public Meetings: Three-Plus Years of Dialogue and Consultation
- 3 – Topline Summary: Plan Bay Area Telephone Survey
- 4 – Plan Bay Area Comment Themes
- 5 – Frequently Asked Questions
- 6 – Draft Plan Bay Area Land Use Revisions

J:\COMMITTEE\Planning Committee\2013\June\3a_Draft PBA PublicComments_ABAG final_6.6.13.docx

**Summary of Spring 2013 Public Engagement:
Release of Draft Plan Bay Area and Draft Environmental Impact Report**

- 12 Public hearings in all nine counties, with some 1,250 residents attending and 385 speaking. Another 140 completed comment forms at the hearings. Transcripts and comment forms are available online here:

<http://www.onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/plan-bay-area/meetings-events/What-We-Heard.html>

587 comment letters and emails were submitted on the Draft Plan and DEIR. All correspondence is posted online and can be sorted by county and by the type of commenter (individual, government agency, stakeholder organizations, for example). This can be viewed at this link:

<http://www.onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/plan-bay-area/meetings-events/What-We-Heard.html>

- An interactive “Plan Bay Area Town Hall” garnered some 90 comments online from individuals who were able review and comment on the draft Plan from the convenience of their homes.
<http://onebayarea.org/file10069.html>
- Presentations to local elected officials were made in all nine counties; notices of all meetings were mailed to the clerks of the board of all local jurisdictions.
- Consultation workshop with Native American tribal government leaders in Sonoma County
- A series of 12 focus groups conducted in early spring 2013 in partnership with community organizations working in low-income communities and communities of color, drew a total of 181 participants. One session each was conducted in Spanish and Cantonese.
- A statistically valid telephone poll of over 2,500 Bay Area residents was conducted during March, April and early May 2013 to measure the general public’s opinion on issues relating to Plan Bay Area.
- Staff conducted a brown-bag lunch for news reporters to encourage coverage of the Plan and public hearings, and issued two news releases during the public comment period to encourage participation
- A direct mail piece and five email blasts were sent to notify residents about the release of the draft and opportunities to comment.
- Legal notices were published in newspapers in all nine Bay Area counties.

Meeting/Event	Special Workshops	ABAG/MTC mtg. with Plan on agenda	TOTAL
2010			
Local Government Summit (with ABAG Spring General Assembly)		1	1
Bay Area Greenhouse Gas Reduction Target Workshop: Oakland	1		1
Leadership Roundtables with Elected Officials (Summer/Fall 2010)	9		9
MTC's Policy Advisory Council		4	4
ABAG's Regional Planning Committee		5	5
Regional Advisory Working Group		8	8
MTC Planning Committee /ABAG Administrative Committee		6	6
ABAG Executive Board		5	5
MTC Commission		2	2
2011			0
Spring 2011 Workshops: all nine counties (2 in Alameda County)	10		10
Spring 2011 Community Hosted Meetings	10		10
Briefings for local elected officials in all nine counties: Spring 2011	21		21
MTC's Policy Advisory Council		8	8
ABAG's Regional Planning Committee		5	5
Regional Advisory Working Group		9	9
Equity Working Group		10	10
Native American Tribal Consultation	1		1
MTC Planning Committee /ABAG Administrative Committee		10	10
ABAG Executive Board		6	6
MTC Commission		5	5
2012			0
January 2012 Workshops: all nine counties	9		9
January 2012 Community Hosted Focus Groups	10		10
EIR Scoping Meetings: Fairfield, Oakland, SF, San Jose, San Rafael	5		5
MTC's Policy Advisory Council		6	6
ABAG's Regional Planning Committee		3	3
Regional Advisory Working Group		4	4
Equity Working Group		8	8
Native American Tribal Consultation	1		1
MTC Planning Committee /ABAG Administrative Committee		10	10
ABAG Executive Board		4	4
MTC Commission		2	2
Joint MTC Commission/ABAG Executive Board Meeting		2	2
2013			0
Spring 2013 Open Houses/ Public Hearings (all nine counties)	9		9
Public Hearings on Draft EIR: Oakland, San Jose, San Rafael (April)	3		3
February - April 2013 Community-Hosted Focus Groups	12		12
Presentations to Elected Officials (9 counties, with county CMAs)	9		9
MTC's Policy Advisory Council		3	3
ABAG's Regional Planning Committee		1	1
Regional Advisory Working Group		1	1
Equity Working Group		2	2
Native American Tribal Consultation	1		1
MTC Planning Committee /ABAG Administrative Committee		5	5
ABAG Executive Board		2	2
MTC Commission		1	1
Totals	111	138	249

Plan Bay Area 2013 Public Opinion Poll Key Findings – Management Summary

A telephone survey was conducted with a cross section of 2,516 Bay Area residents, for an overall margin of error of +/- 1.96%. Over 250 interviews were completed with residents of each Bay Area county. These interviews were then weighted to proportionally represent the overall Bay Area population by county and age (using 2010 Census data). Thus, this telephone survey provides projectable data for the region as a whole, as well as county-level results.

The telephone survey used a hybrid sampling approach which combines residential cell phone listings, Random Digit Dial (RDD), and listed residential telephone numbers for the Bay Area. This mix of sources is important due to the high share of Bay Area households who are “cell phone only.”

The survey questionnaire consisted of 35 questions, of which 3 were open-ended and 32 were closed-ended. Each survey took approximately 14 minutes to complete. Surveys were conducted in English, Spanish, and Chinese. Interviews were conducted from March 13, 2013 to May 11, 2013.

In addition to the 35 survey questions, respondents were also asked demographic and transportation usage, including questions about voter registration, party affiliation, and voting frequency. Reporting will include analysis based on respondent demographics, as well as differences among likely voters and unlikely/non-voters.


Following is a summary of key findings and the topline marginal responses to survey questions.

Plan Bay Area 2013 Public Opinion Poll

Key Findings – Management Summary


Plan Bay Area Initial Reaction

- After hearing a brief description of Plan Bay Area, a large share of residents feel that this type of plan is important to the region. 84% rate it as very or somewhat important.
 - Younger residents and transit users rate the importance even higher than others.




Plan Bay Area by County

- The level of importance by individual county remains high as well, ranging from 89% (in San Francisco) to 77% (in Napa).



Most Important Components

- Three key components of the plan were initially highlighted as most important to the Bay Area’s future – improving the local economy, providing access to housing and transportation for everyone, and reducing driving and greenhouse gases.
 - Improving the local economy was considered the most important part of the plan for many (40%);
 - Providing access to housing and transportation was equally important (40%);
 - Reducing driving and greenhouse gases was lowest (18%).




- By county, providing access to housing and transportation was ranked more important among respondents from San Mateo, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Alameda counties.

Housing and Commercial Development

Local vs. Regional Planning for Development

- Residents are split on whether a regional plan should guide housing and commercial development in the Bay Area or if local cities and counties should plan for these on their own. This appears to be a particularly divisive issue. Overall, slightly more than half of residents (53%) think this planning should be done locally, while 44% think this should be part of a regional plan.



- Among counties, San Francisco has the highest percentage supporting a regional plan (48%), while Napa has the highest percentage supporting local (75%).


	Local Cities & Counties	A Regional Plan	A Mix
By County			
Napa	75%	22%	1%
Sonoma	63%	35%	2%
Marin	58%	38%	2%
Solano	58%	41%	1%
Contra Costa	53%	46%	-
San Mateo	52%	44%	2%
Santa Clara	52%	46%	1%
Alameda	51%	43%	1%
San Francisco	49%	48%	1%

- Some of the key reasons that respondents oppose a regional plan for development include (open ended question):
 - Local government knows the needs of its own citizens better.
 - Unrealistic/Too difficult to get counties to agree.
- Some also indicate local control should stay – but local agencies/decision-makers should be able to work together to address regional issues.

Transportation Strategies


Reducing Driving / Decreasing Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Despite ranking lowest of the three key components of Plan Bay Area, reducing driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions (as a stand-alone issue) is actually supported by two-thirds (67%) of respondents. Respondents seem to support this goal even though it does not resonate as strongly as the economy or housing/transportation in general.
- Urban residents were most likely to support the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and were generally more favorable towards the various measures being considered to reach greenhouse gas reduction targets.




Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies

- Among the greenhouse gas reduction strategies, the most strongly supported strategy was: building more housing near public transit designed for residents who want to drive less, with 65% of respondents supporting this measure strongly (rating it a '4' or '5').
- The strategy opposed by most residents was: charging drivers a new fee based on the number of miles driven. More than half of respondents (64%) said they oppose this idea (rated a '1' or '2'), with nearly half (46%) strongly opposing.




Express Lanes

- When asked if they support or oppose the idea of establishing additional express lanes on Bay Area freeways, 55% of respondents overall supported additional express lanes.
- There is very little difference across areas, although the more urban the area, the slightly higher the support: Urban – 56%; Suburban – 55% and Outer Bay Area – 53%.




Funding Priorities

- Among the transportation related issues tested, the ones that were considered the highest priority for funding include:
 - Extend commuter rail, such as BART and Caltrain, throughout the Bay Area (78%);
 - Maintain highways and local roads, including fixing potholes (77%);
 - Provide more frequent public transit service (66%).




Trade-Offs and Attitudinal Statements

- The most highly rated attitudinal statements were (*percent who agree shown in parenthesis*):
 - Government agencies should play an active role in attracting jobs and promoting the economy in the Bay Area (79%);
 - I would take public transit more often if it took less time than driving (77%);
 - There should be a focus on walking and biking rather than having to rely on a car (70%);
 - Changes will be needed to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations (70%);
 - In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate changes are valid (70%)



Residents' Perception of Key Issues in Bay Area

- Residents rate the Bay Area highly on open space preservation and air quality, but lower on other key issues asked about.
- When asked, "How are we doing now?," residents rate the Bay Area as excellent/good as follows:
 - Preservation of open space and parks (64%);
 - Air quality (59%);
 - Economic growth and prosperity (51%);
 - Quality of public transit (36%);
 - Upkeep and repair of local roads and freeways (25%);
 - Availability of affordable housing (11%).



- These ratings vary some depending on the area. For example, those in the outer Bay Area rate availability of affordable housing more highly; but suburban and urban residents rate economic growth and prosperity more highly than those in the outer Bay Area.

PLAN BAY AREA PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY

Topline Marginals – 6/3/13

Bay Area Resident Telephone Poll in English, Spanish, and Chinese

Sample Size = 2,516 Margin of Error: +/- 1.96%

Introduction

Hello, I'm _____ calling on behalf of MTC (the Metropolitan Transportation Commission) and the Association of Bay Area Governments. We are conducting an important survey with Bay Area residents. Your input will be used to help develop a 30 year regional plan for our area.

(INTERVIEWER NOTES: If necessary, explain:

- *The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is a transportation planning, coordinating and financing agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area*
- *The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is a regional planning agency and Council of Governments for the nine counties and 101 cities and towns of the San Francisco Bay region. ABAG is focused on advocacy, collaboration, and excellence in planning, research, and member services.*
- *The (regional) plan seeks sustainable regional growth to preserve the quality of life in the Bay Area. This includes: improving the economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, accommodating housing needs and growth, and other regional issues that we face.*
- *The survey should take between 12-14 minutes to administer*
- *No selling is involved*
- *Responses will be treated in confidence*
- *If Spanish or Chinese monolingual household, flag for callback.)*

BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

1) About how long have you lived in the Bay Area? *(Read list if necessary)*

Less than one year	2%
One – five years	7%
Six – ten years	9%
Eleven – twenty years	18%
Over twenty years	64%
Don't know (do not read)	<1%

2) Which county do you live in? *(Read list if necessary)*

Santa Clara	25%
Alameda	21%
Contra Costa	15%
San Francisco	11%
San Mateo	10%
Sonoma	7%
Solano	6%
Marin	4%
Napa	2%

BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

Current Perception of Region

Please rate each of the following Bay Area issues on a five point scale, where 5 is excellent and 1 is poor. Overall how would you rate _____ (ask for each) in the Bay Area? (Randomize)

	Excellent 5	4	3	2	Poor 1	DK	MEAN
3) Quality of public transit services	9%	27%	34%	17%	7%	5%	3.17
4) Up-keep and repair of local roads and freeways.....	4%	21%	36%	24%	14%	<1%	2.78
5) Preservation of open space and parks	20%	44%	25%	7%	3%	2%	3.73
6) Economic growth and prosperity ...	14%	37%	33%	11%	4%	1%	3.47
7) Availability of affordable housing...	4%	7%	26%	33%	27%	4%	2.24
8) Air Quality ^	16%	43%	32%	7%	2%	<1%	3.63

Plan Bay Area – General

A long-term strategy for the entire Bay Area is currently being developed. The idea is to successfully plan the region’s housing and transportation needs for the next 30 years. This plan is focused on: improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, and providing access to housing and transportation for everyone who needs it.

9. In general, how important do you think it is to establish this type of a regional plan?

Use a 5 point scale where 5 is Very Important and 1 is Not at all important.

5	Very Important	63%
4		22%
3		9%
2		3%
1	Not at All Important	3%
0	Don’t know (Do Not Read)	1%

MEAN 4.39

10. Why is that?

BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

11. Which part of the plan is most important to the Bay Area’s future...improving the local economy, reducing driving and greenhouse gases, or providing access to housing and transportation for everyone?* (select one)

11a. Which is next most important? (select one)

	Most Imp (Q11)	Next Most Imp (Q11a)
1 Improving the local economy	40%	29%
2 Providing access to housing and transportation for everyone	40%	40%
3 Reducing driving and greenhouse gas emissions	18%	29%
4 Don’t know (Do Not Read)	2%	3%

**Note: If needed, re-read the options: “the first one is..., the second one is..., the third one is...”*

Plan Bay Area Funding Priorities

Next I will read you a number of items that may be considered as part of this Bay Area plan. Not all of these items will be funded due to limited resources. For each, please tell me whether funding should be a high priority or not a priority. Use a 5 point scale where 5 means High Priority and 1 means Not a Priority.

(Interviewer note: If asked, the funding itself is coming from Federal, State and local sources for projects related to this plan. These questions are asking how to allocate - or divide up - those funds)

	High Priority		Not a Priority			DK	MEAN
	5	4	3	2	1		
12) Increase the number of freeway lanes for carpoolers and bus riders	18%	22%	28%	17%	13%	1%	3.15
13) Expand bicycle and pedestrian routes	24%	26%	27%	14%	9%	1%	3.41
14) Extend commuter rail lines, such as BART and Caltrain, throughout the Bay Area	53%	25%	14%	4%	4%	1%	4.20
15) Maintain highways and local roads, Including fixing potholes	46%	31%	17%	4%	1%	<1%	4.17
16) Provide more frequent public transit service ^.....	37%	29%	22%	7%	4%	1%	3.91

BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

	High Priority				Not a Priority		MEAN
	5	4	3	2	1	DK	
17) Provide financial incentives to cities to build more multi-unit housing near public transit	22%	29%	28%	12%	9%	<1%	3.43

Policies to Reduce Use of Cars and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

18) The Bay Area plan also focuses on reducing (the amount of) driving as a way to decrease greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area. How strongly do you support or oppose this policy?^ Use a 5 point scale where 5 is support strongly and 1 is oppose strongly.

5	Support Strongly	39%
4		27%
3		20%
2		6%
1	Oppose Strongly	7%
0	Don't know (Do Not Read)	1%

MEAN 3.87

Next I will read you a list of specific strategies being considered to reduce driving and greenhouse gases. Indicate whether you would support or oppose each using the same 5 point scale (5 Support Strongly and 1 Oppose Strongly)

	Support Strongly			Oppose Strongly		DK	MEAN
	5	4	3	2	1		
19) Build more housing near public transit designed for residents who want to drive less ^	31%	34%	22%	7%	6%	<1%	3.79
20) Limit urban sprawl by requiring most additional housing and commercial buildings be built within current city or town limits	19%	23%	32%	13%	12%	2%	3.24
21) Charge drivers a new fee* based on the number of annual miles driven	6%	10%	19%	19%	46%	1%	2.11

(Note: Expansion of Express Lanes is another greenhouse gas reduction strategy. A specific question about this is being asked later in the questionnaire – Q34)

*New fee: Specifics are still being developed, this could be an annual fee using vehicle registration or a vehicle device which calculates mileage at the fuel pump

BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

Regional vs. Local

22. Which statement do you agree with more?

a) There should be a regional plan guiding housing and commercial development in the Bay Area. OR

b) Local cities and counties on their own should plan housing and commercial development in their area.

Local Cities and Counties Should Plan	53%
Regional Plan	44%
Regional and local should be equal (<i>do not read</i>)	1%
Don't know (<i>do not read</i>)	2%
Refused (<i>do not read</i>)	<1%

23. Why is that?

Trade Offs and Attitudinal Statements

Next I'd like you to rate the statements I read to you using a 5 point scale, where 5 means strongly agree and 1 means strongly disagree. (*Randomize*)

	Strongly Agree		3	Strongly Disagree		DK	MEAN
	5	4		2	1		
24) I would be willing to live in a smaller house to be closer to work, shopping and restaurants	28%	21%	19%	12%	20%	1%	3.26
25) I would live in a more densely populated area if there were better neighborhood amenities (restaurants, shops, etc.)^ .	25%	23%	22%	12%	17%	1%	3.27
26) I would take public transit more often if it took less time than driving ^	58%	19%	10%	4%	7%	1%	4.18
27) I will take public transit more often if gas prices reach \$5.00 a gallon ^	26%	14%	19%	14%	24%	3%	3.04
28) Throughout the Bay Area, there should be a focus on making it easier to walk or bike, rather than having to rely on a car for every trip	45%	25%	19%	6%	5%	<1%	3.98

BASE (All Respondents) N = 2,516

	Strongly Agree		Strongly Disagree		DK	MEAN	
	5	4	3	2	1		
29) Local and regional government agencies should play an active role in trying to attract jobs and promote the economy in the Bay Area.....	53%	26%	13%	3%	3%	1%	4.23
30) I support building a High Speed Rail system connecting the Bay Area with the Los Angeles area ^	46%	15%	13%	7%	17%	2%	3.67
31) In general, warnings about greenhouse gas emissions causing climate changes are valid ^	49%	21%	15%	5%	9%	1%	3.96
32) Encouraging high density housing near public transit could destroy the character of my city or town ^	16%	16%	25%	20%	22%	1%	2.82
33) Changes will be needed in my community to maintain the quality of life in the Bay Area for future generations ^	42%	28%	18%	6%	5%	1%	3.97

Express Lanes

Express lanes* are currently in use in Alameda and Contra Costa counties. They are designed to reduce commute times. Based on congestion, they would allow solo drivers to use the carpool lanes for a fee while carpoolers and bus riders continue to use the lanes for free.

34) Do you support or oppose the idea of establishing additional express lanes on Bay Area freeways? ^

(Get answer, then ask): Is that strongly or somewhat?

** If necessary, Express Lanes are also called High Occupancy Toll Lanes or HOT lanes.*

4 Support Strongly	28%
3 Support Somewhat	27%
2 Oppose Somewhat	17%
1 Oppose Strongly	21%
Don't know (Do not read)	6%
MEAN	2.67

Plan Bay Area Comments by Theme
(includes oral and written comments submitted by
individuals, public agencies and stakeholder organizations)

In reviewing the many individual comments submitted about the Draft Plan Bay Area, several themes emerge. The following summary is grouped according to subject with reference to responses as either provided in the Frequently Asked Questions (Attachment 5) or to be discussed in greater detail in agenda item 5(b) as potential revisions to the Draft Plan.

Plan Bay Area Purpose and Process — addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions

- Comments about legitimacy of the regional planning process
- Questions about the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Protect people's ability to live in suburban and rural communities; don't want to be forced to live in high-density housing
- Concerns about diminished private property rights
- Support for Plan Bay Area's approach to cleaner air, complete streets, reducing sprawl

Demographics

- Don't agree with statements in the report about preferences of different demographic groups

Growth — addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions and agenda item 5(b)

- Assumptions on population and employment are flawed
- Need more information about the housing and job distributions
- Water supply for new development need to be addressed

Development Feasibility — addressed in agenda item 5(b)

- Concerns about the feasibility of the growth shown in the Plan
- Request for specific actions from ABAG/MTC to ensure that development is feasible

Land Use/Environment — addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions and agenda item 5(b)

- Concerns about the impact of growth on public services
- Concern that the Plan will supersede local land use planning
- Need to include other strategies to reduce GHGs in the Plan
- Need to better integrate planning around air quality, hazards, sea level rise
- Comments about CEQA streamlining
- Concern that local jurisdictions won't get enough assistance from regional agencies to implement EIR mitigations

Affordable Housing — addressed in agenda item 5(b)

- Need for additional funding for affordable housing
- Feasibility of providing sufficient affordable housing
- Need for Plan to ensure minimal displacement of current low-income residents

- Questioned the location of high-density or affordable housing; concerned about local impacts of affordable housing

Funding — addressed in agenda item 5(b)

- Concern that Plan implementation is not feasible with current resources
- Need to identify additional funding sources for successful implementation of the Plan
- Suggested changes to OBAG
- Increase funding for transit operations and maintenance needs
- Increase funding for streets and roads maintenance
- Comments about possible funding sources (bridge tolls, VMT tax, state/federal sources, Infrastructure Financing District, etc.)
- Suggestions for better ways to distribute funding
- Need for policies and funding sources to support open space and Priority Conservation Areas

Transportation — addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions and item 5(b)

- Provide more public transit service
- Comments for and against funding for highways
- Redirect express lane revenues to public transit
- Invest in bike/pedestrian infrastructure

Public Health — addressed in the Frequently Asked Questions

- Concern about health impacts of infill development near highways

Social Infrastructure

- Concern about growth impacts on public services such as schools, libraries, and social services
- Desire for local hire, job training, and living wage incentives



Frequently Asked Questions

Overview

What is Plan Bay Area?

Plan Bay Area is a state-mandated, integrated long-range transportation, land-use and housing plan that will support a growing economy, provide more housing and transportation choices and reduce transportation-related pollution in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. It builds on earlier efforts to develop an efficient transportation and grow in a financially and environmentally responsible way. It is a work in progress that will be updated every four years to reflect new priorities. By planning now, we will create a Bay Area we will be proud to leave to future generations.

Why is there a Plan Bay Area?

By law (Senate Bill 375), all regions in California must complete a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). SB 375 requires California's 18 metro areas to integrate transportation, land-use and housing as part of an SCS to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks. In the Bay Area, this requires the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to adopt an SCS that meets greenhouse gas reduction targets adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

Who is responsible for doing this planning?

Within the Bay Area, the law gives joint responsibility for Plan Bay Area to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). These two agencies work with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC). They also partner with local communities, agencies, and a wide range of stakeholders to ensure broad public input into Plan Bay Area's preparation.

What does the Metropolitan Transportation Commission do?

MTC is the transportation planning, financing, and coordinating agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. MTC operates the regional transportation network as smoothly and efficiently as possible now and for the future.

Under what authority does MTC exist?

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), a statutorily created regional transportation planning agency pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 *et seq.*, is for the purposes of the Political Reform Act, a local government agency pursuant to Government Code Section 82041. Federal law [Title 23, United States Code, Section 134 (d)] designates MTC as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. As such, MTC must adopt and regularly update a long-range regional transportation plan.

The Commission's work is guided by a 21-member policy board, with 18 of the commissioners designated as voting members. Sixteen of the voting commissioners are appointed by local elected officials in each county. The two most populous counties, Alameda and Santa Clara, each have three representatives on the Commission: the county board of supervisors selects one member; the mayors of the cities within the county collectively appoint another; and the mayors of the biggest cities in these two counties (Oakland in Alameda County and San Jose in Santa Clara County) each appoint a representative.

What does the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) do?

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) is the regional planning agency and council of governments (COG) serving the people who live and work in the 101 cities and towns of the Bay Area, including coastal communities, older industrial centers, rural towns and big cities. ABAG was formed by local government leaders in 1961 who recognized the need to address common issues from a regional perspective.

ABAG's mission is promoting good planning to build a better Bay Area in order to enhance the quality of life here by supporting regional collaboration, planning, research and member services. ABAG also houses the San Francisco Bay Trail project, the San Francisco Estuary Project, and a Risk Management and Insurance Services program that provides cost effective self-insurance to over two dozen local jurisdictions. ABAG also conducts regional population and employment projections and the state-mandated Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process (Government Code Section 65584 *et seq.*).

Under what authority does ABAG exist?

ABAG is a joint powers agency formed in 1961 pursuant to California Government Code Section 6500, *et seq.*, and the council of governments (COG) for the San Francisco Bay Area. ABAG is governed by a 38-member Executive Board comprised of locally elected officials based on regional population. A General Assembly made up of elected officials from every member jurisdiction determines policy matters and reviews major Executive Board actions and recommendations. Each delegate has one vote, and a majority of city and county votes are required for action.

So why are regional agencies involved in planning?

As required by State legislation (Government Code Section 65080 *et seq.*) and by federal regulation (Title 23 USC Section 134), MTC is responsible for preparing the RTP for the San Francisco Bay Area Region. An RTP is a long-range transportation plan, updated every four years, that identifies the strategies and investments to maintain, manage, and improve the

region's transportation network. In 2009, MTC adopted its most recent RTP, known as the Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area.

As the Council of Governments for the Bay Area, ABAG is responsible for providing a forum for local jurisdictions to work out issues with impacts that cross jurisdictional boundaries. ABAG also is required by state law (Article 10.6 of the California Government Code) to update the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) every eight years, and to allocate specific housing targets to individual cities and counties. State law (Senate Bill 375) also requires ABAG and MTC to plan jointly for transportation, land-use and housing as part of an SCS to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks.

What will Plan Bay Area do?

State law requires Plan Bay Area to:

1. Identify "areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region" — where people will live, including all income groups, for at least the next 25 years; and
2. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by an amount specified by the CARB.
3. Meet the federal requirements for an RTP.

How does the Plan Bay Area affect me, personally?

This Plan looks ahead to 2040 and seeks to preserve what we love about our small towns, cities and farmlands; maintain key transportation infrastructure; and offer more choices in where we will live and how we will get around. As a long-range initiative, Plan Bay Area will have more of an impact on future generations than it will on those of us here today. The goal is to reduce traffic congestion, improve transit options, create more opportunities to walk or bike, strengthen existing neighborhood infrastructure and support the creation of more affordable housing options within Bay Area communities.

Will Plan Bay Area change the character of the region's rural communities, small towns and suburban residential neighborhoods?

No. Most single-family neighborhoods will remain unchanged. Plan Bay Area recognizes the diversity of communities across our region. The Plan concentrates new growth in areas nominated by local governments, with most of the growth taking place toward the center of our region in cities like San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose. Overall, over two-thirds of all regional growth by 2040 is allocated to Priority Development Areas. As a result, small cities, single family neighborhoods and rural areas throughout the Bay Area will take on a very small share of the region's overall growth. Local land use authority is retained by the region's cities and counties. Local jurisdictions will continue to determine where future development occurs.

How do smaller suburban job centers benefit from Plan Bay Area?

Plan Bay Area supports growing suburban job centers such as the Tri-Valley by maximizing the amount of forecasted employment growth in these jurisdictions given the amount of housing that they deem appropriate. The Draft Plan invests in the region's transportation network to support

job growth and housing in existing communities by focusing the lion's share of funding on maintaining and improving the efficiency of the existing transit and road system.

The Draft Plan also includes strategic transportation investments that benefit suburban cities by addressing management, reliability and safety of the existing freeway, highway and arterial infrastructures while targeting freeway improvements to most congested locations.

Why would local governments want to support the Plan Bay Area?

Implementation of Plan Bay Area is intended to improve the quality of life of neighborhoods by providing cleaner air, improved public health, better mobility, more walkable streets, and homes closer to transit, jobs and services. Plan Bay Area redirects some regional resources to more closely align with local community development visions, as adopted in local plans. This includes funding from the One Bay Area Grant Program and assistance in meeting the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This sounds like a big effort. Are we starting from scratch?

Not at all. For decades, the Bay Area has been encouraging more focused and compact growth. Plan Bay Area builds on this history and places even greater emphasis on the integration of transportation and land use planning. Plan Bay Area continues our traditional emphasis of investing in operating and maintaining our existing transportation system, and builds on successful regional programs centered on focused growth around high quality transit, including affordable housing, complete streets that serve pedestrians and bicyclists and well as motorists, and protection and preservation of open space.

When will the Draft Plan Bay Area be complete?

MTC and ABAG issued a Draft Plan Bay Area for public comment in April 2013, after more than two years of public dialogue and consultation. The agencies are scheduled to consider adoption of the Final Plan in July 2013. If adopted, Plan Bay Area will be updated every four years, as required by law, to reflect the region's changing needs and priorities.

What does it cost to conduct and complete a planning process like this?

The budget for the planning portion of Plan Bay Area (that is, the costs associated with conducting the process versus the funding the plan directs toward programs and projects) is approximately \$3.1 million over 3 years. This includes consultant assistance and staff costs to update the regional travel model; to create a new, integrated economic and land use model for the current Plan and future updates to the Plan; to conduct model analyses; to evaluate the performance of plan scenarios, alternatives and projects; to prepare the Draft Plan and the Draft Environmental Impact Report; to complete supplementary reports and to conduct public engagement. Funding comes from the region's annual allocation of federal, state and local planning revenues.

What are some of the other regional efforts related to Plan Bay Area?

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) are considering how to improve the region's land use pattern and placement of public infrastructure, including transportation. To reduce air pollution (smog, particulate matter and airborne toxins), the Air District is considering how to address the air quality impacts of transportation and other sources associated with land development. BCDC is preparing for rising sea levels and storm surges affecting areas on and near the Bay shoreline. Future sea levels will have implications for the location of development and transportation infrastructure.

About Forecasts

How can ABAG and MTC predict the future?

We do not predict the future. For several decades, both MTC and ABAG have been developing and updating long-term regional plans for the Bay Area by using computer modeling to forecast transportation and housing demand, economic growth, demographics, and land-use changes, among others. These forecasts are used to inform planning and investment decisions. The forecasts are updated every two to four years to make sure they are based on the most reliable data, including locally adopted plans for development and conservation.

How many people will Plan Bay Area need to accommodate?

The Bay Area is currently home to about 7 million people. Data suggests that over the next 30 years the region will attract another 2 million people. The rate of growth depends on several variables, including job growth, age distribution, predicted birth and death rates, and estimated migration into the Bay Area.

Why do the Department of Finance population numbers differ from ABAG's projections?

California's Department of Housing and Community Development, the Department of Finance, and ABAG all agree that economic trends need to be addressed in Plan Bay Area. ABAG's 2.1 million population growth projection is directly tied to employment growth. The Department of Finance's 2013 projections do not take into account the high rate of growth in jobs, population and migration into the region. The Department of Finance population projections depict only one possible course of future population change, i.e., the one reflecting assumed trends in fertility, mortality, and migration. The model does not consider employment, which is a major driver of migration. The Department of Finance will incorporate ABAG employment forecasts in the future. The Department of Finance, and Department of Housing and Community Development agree with ABAG's methodology and projections.

Why are your population estimates based on one number and not a range?

We recognize that there is a range of future population estimates; however for planning purposes we have to arrive at a single number. Based on the current population and assumptions for fertility rates, death rates and future jobs (which affects job seekers moving to the Bay Area), the Plan Bay Area estimate represents what we believe is the most likely future population. To ensure the forecast is as accurate as possible, it will be updated every four years.

Why should we have confidence in the population/demographic models used to support the plan?

The Plan Bay Area forecast was developed by ABAG with extensive assistance and peer review by a team of economists and other state agencies including the California Department of Finance. The forecast uses demographic data from national and state sources, such as the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Census, and the California Department of Finance. It relies upon standardized forecasting methods to estimate the Bay Area's share of expected national employment growth and the detailed demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, race/ethnicity, etc.) of the region's future population. The methodology for forecasting the region's future population is based on natural increase of the existing population (births minus deaths) and expected job growth (which draws people to the region). A detailed description of the forecasting methodology is available in the *Draft Forecast of Jobs, Population and Housing*.

The forecast includes these inputs and is based on the best professional estimates of ABAG staff. In addition, although the SCS forecasts population growth out to 2040, by law the SCS must be updated every four years. This provides ABAG the opportunity to continually refine the assumptions and data used in its forecasts.

Why are natural hazards such as earthquakes, sea level rise and flooding not integrated more directly into the plan?

Plan Bay Area is a long-term, regional-scale plan covering 101 cities and nine counties, over 150 major transportation projects, and many other transportation and land use projects over the next approximately 27 years. The Plan and the Environmental Impact Report address natural hazards at the level appropriate for long-term, programmatic regional plans. Potentially significant site-specific natural hazards caused by projects implemented under Plan Bay Area will be addressed at the project-specific level. MTC and ABAG will continue to monitor these issues and revise Plan Bay Area in response to the changing environment every four years, as required by law.

About Transportation

How does Draft Plan Bay Area invest transportation funds?

Draft Plan Bay Area focuses the lion's share of investment on maintaining the existing transit and road system and boosting the transportation system's efficiency. The Plan also provides support for focused growth in Priority Development Areas, including the new One Bay Area Grant program.

How much transportation revenue is expected to be available?

The Draft Plan Bay Area forecasts transportation revenue totaling \$289 billion over 28 years. However, most of this money will be needed just to maintain the existing transportation network. Of the total amount, \$57 billion is "discretionary," or available for assignment to new projects and programs.

How does Plan Bay Area invest future transportation funds?

Draft Plan Investments by Function

Function	Committed YOES billions	Discretionary Revenue YOES billions	Total YOES billions	% of Total
Transit: Maintain Existing System	\$139	\$20	\$159	55%
Road and Bridge: Maintain Existing System	\$69	\$25	\$94	33%
Transit: Expansion	\$13	\$8	\$21	7%
Road and Bridge: Expansion	\$11	\$4	\$15	5%
Total	\$232	\$57	\$289	100%

How does the Draft Plan Bay Area propose to invest future discretionary funds?

The Draft Plan invests discretionary funds into six key investment strategies: (1) county investment priorities would receive \$16 billion, or 29 percent of available funds; (2) system maintenance would receive \$15 billion, or 26 percent; (3) programs to support focused growth are slated to garner \$14 billion through the One Bay Area Grant program, or 25 percent of expected discretionary funds; (4) transit expansion projects would receive \$5 billion, or 9 percent; (5) freeway and transit efficiency projects would receive \$4 billion, or 7 percent; and (6) \$1 billion (less than 1 percent) would go toward programs specifically designed to combat climate change. The plan includes a \$2 billion reserve fund set aside for future rail expansion projects.

What is OBAG?

The One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program is designed to reward jurisdictions that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation process. The program totals \$320 million over the next four years (\$14.6 billion over the life of the Plan, which amounts to 5 percent of overall funding and 25 percent of discretionary funding in the plan). The program grants local communities the flexibility to invest in transportation infrastructure that supports infill development by providing funds for bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local road repair and planning activities, while also providing funds for Safe Routes to School programs and for Priority Conservation Areas.

How does the Draft Plan propose to support bicycle and pedestrian travel?

State Transportation Development Act (TDA) and local sales tax funds committed to bicycle and pedestrian improvements total \$4.6 billion during the Plan period. The One Bay Area Grant program, \$14.6 billion over the life of the Plan, is another fund source that can be used to pay for 'Complete Streets' projects. These projects can include stand-alone bicycle and pedestrian paths, bicycle lanes, pedestrian bulb-outs, lighting, new sidewalks, Safe Routes to Transit, and Safe Routes to Schools projects that will improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and travel.

In addition to this funding, cities and counties that wish to use OBAG grant funds must adopt a 'Complete Streets' resolution and in the future an updated general plan element to improve the delivery of Complete Streets projects serving all road users, including pedestrians and bicyclists. During MTC's last survey of project sponsors in 2006, over 55% of transportation projects surveyed already included complete streets elements. The resolution requirement is expected to increase the rate of complete street implementation.

What does the Plan propose to fund for the region’s Climate Initiatives Program?

The Climate Initiatives Program invests in eight programs focused on technology advancements and incentives for travel options to help the region meet the SB 375 GHG emissions targets. The programs include: implementing the Commuter Benefit Ordinance, authorized by SB 1339; expanding car sharing to ensure vehicles are available at high-demand locations and expanded to suburban communities; providing incentives to reduce the cost of vanpools; establishing discounted fees charged on new vehicles with low miles-per-gallon rating to help purchase fuel-efficient vehicles; a public education campaign and rebates for tools that encourage “smart driving”; establishing a voluntary vehicle buy-back incentive program to accelerate the removal of low-mpg vehicles coupled with incentives towards the purchase of plug-ins or electric vehicles; and investing in a regional electric vehicles charger network. In addition, the Plan calls for the expansion of the most successful strategies identified in the Climate Initiatives Innovative Grants program, which is currently underway.

About Housing and Land Use

Why do we have RHNA – Regional Housing Need Allocation?

California Housing Element law (Article 10.6 of the California Government Code) requires each jurisdiction to plan for housing for all income levels by ensuring that local zoning and planning support the production of a diverse range of new housing. The RHNA is the state-mandated process to identify the share of the state’s housing need for which each jurisdiction must plan over an 8-year period. Jurisdictions are not responsible for building the housing; only for demonstrating in their local Housing Element that it could be built under current zoning. ABAG oversees the RHNA process in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area.

How does Plan Bay Area relate to the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA)?

Plan Bay Area combines these three initiatives into a single, integrated regional plan. For example, RTPs traditionally include land use projections. Plan Bay Area’s distribution of growth is the SCS. Senate Bill 375 also stipulates that the SCS will identify areas to accommodate the RHNA. State law requires that the RHNA follow the development pattern specified in the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Does Plan Bay Area override local land use control?

No. Cities and counties, not MTC or ABAG, are ultimately responsible for the manner in which their local communities continue to be built out in the future. For this reason, cities and counties are not required to revise their “land use policies and regulations, including [their] general plan, to be consistent with the regional transportation plan or an alternative planning strategy.” [Gov. Code, § 65080, subd. (b)(2)(J)]. The Plan’s SCS merely provides a land use vision that “*if implemented*, [would] achieve the greenhouse gas emission reductions targets” for the region. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21155, subd. (a) (emphasis added).) The proposed Plan will only be implemented insofar as local jurisdictions adopt its policies and recommendations.

Rather than increase regional land use control, the Plan facilitates implementation by expanding incentives and opportunities available to local jurisdictions to support growth in Priority Development Areas (PDAs). In addition to funding transportation and planning projects in PDAs, the Plan sets the stage for cities and counties to increase the efficiency of the development process, if they choose, for projects consistent with the Plan and other state legislation.

What is a Priority Development Area?

Priority Development Areas (PDAs) are locally designated areas within existing communities that have been identified and approved by local cities or counties for future growth. These areas are typically accessible to transit, jobs, shopping and other services. Over 70 local governments have voluntarily designated some 170 PDAs, which are proposed to absorb about 80 percent of new housing and over 60 percent of new jobs on less than five percent of the Bay Area's land. The result is a locally supported, compact and efficient growth pattern that meets CARB's GHG reduction targets and provides adequate housing for the Bay Area's growing population.

What is a Priority Conservation Area?

Priority Conservation Areas are identified in partnership with land trusts, open space districts, parks and recreation departments, local jurisdictions and property owners to preserve the region's diverse farming, recreational, and resource lands for future generations. This process builds on a century of park development and open space protection. The purpose of designating Priority Conservation Areas is to protect key natural lands in the San Francisco Bay Area through purchase or conservation easements with willing property owners.

If Plan Bay Area includes additional housing units in my community, does this guarantee that those units are going to be built?

No. The pace at which new housing is built will be determined by various factors, including local zoning, the financial feasibility of building the new housing permitted under this zoning, and ultimately the decision by a city council, town council, or board of supervisors to approve each housing project. Cities and counties will continue to retain all control over local building decisions following adoption of the Plan. Over the long term, communities may change zoning, provide incentives for developers, or adjust other land use policies to increase or decrease the feasibility of building the levels of housing projected in the Plan.

Have ABAG and MTC investigated whether Plan Bay Area's development is feasible?

The regional land use plan, or distribution of growth to individual jurisdictions, was developed through a variety of land use and transportation scenarios that distributed the total amount of growth forecasted for the region to specific locations. These scenarios sought to address the needs and aspirations of each Bay Area jurisdiction, as identified in locally adopted general plans and zoning ordinances, while meeting Plan Bay Area performance targets adopted by ABAG and MTC to guide and gauge the region's future growth.

The framework for developing these scenarios is based as Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) nominated by local governments, not ABAG or MTC. ABAG and MTC incorporated local feedback from individual jurisdictions, relying on their best

assessment of feasible growth over the plan period and then applied a series of additional factors to achieve Plan Bay Area's goals. The scenarios were then developed through an open, deliberative process, during which public input was sought at every step along the way. After further modeling, analysis, and public engagement, the five initial scenarios were narrowed down to a single preferred land use scenario.

Feasibility of this scenario was further tested by an assessment of a representative sample of PDAs from throughout the region by consultants at Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) deeply familiar with the market characteristics of each jurisdiction in the Bay Area. Overall, the study concluded that the proposed development pattern contained in the preferred scenario, while ambitious, represents an achievable level of growth with sufficient policy changes, some of which are now underway or currently being examined.

So all projects in Plan Bay Area will require further environmental review?

It's important to note that while Plan Bay Area includes a "Program-level" EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (or CEQA), any major transportation, housing or other project included in the plan must still comply with CEQA, and in some cases the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). For example, if a project to add bicycle lanes is listed in the Plan, separate environmental review specific to that project is still required under CEQA and will be conducted by the jurisdiction with approval authority over the project. Likewise, if the Plan describes new housing units or jobs within a city or county, the actual planning and development enabling any proposed project that might be brought forward to a city or county would fall under a local environmental review and still need local approval. SB 375 provides CEQA streamlining benefits that local jurisdictions can take advantage of, but it the Plan Bay Area EIR does not preclude future environmental review.

What is open space and who owns it?

Open space generally refers to undeveloped land or water that could be either publicly or privately owned.

Is Plan Bay Area consistent with Urban Growth Boundaries and similar locally adopted growth controls in many Bay Area counties?

Yes. The Draft Plan accommodates 100% of new growth within existing urban growth boundaries and similar locally adopted growth controls. It also emphasizes protection for the region's farmland and scenic and natural resource areas, including Priority Conservation Areas.

How will local sewer, fire, water and other local infrastructure be impacted by housing growth? What about schools, libraries, and other public services?

Infrastructure, school, police, and fire service effects will vary in different locations, with those locations experiencing more growth likely requiring additional services. Funding for many of these services will be locally determined, as public service standards, performance measures, and policies related to police and fire are typically set by local jurisdictions and agencies; and library and recreation facilities are typically set in city and county general plans. For schools, standards

relating to class size are primarily determined at the state level, although local school districts are responsible for the planning and construction of school facilities. Additional funding may come from developer agreements, which can include impact fees to support schools and other community benefits, such as parks and libraries.

As a regional plan encompassing nine counties, Plan Bay Area cannot provide a detailed assessment of local needs. However the compact growth pattern in the SCS should allow jurisdictions to leverage existing facilities and absorb some of the increased demand with facilities that are currently underutilized. Overall, more compact urban development costs less for upfront infrastructure, saves on ongoing delivery of services, and generates more local tax revenue per acre than conventional suburban development. New employment associated with providing public services is recognized in the Plan Bay Area jobs forecast, with increases in every county consistent with population growth.

The SCS DEIR found that impacts to schools, libraries, and parks from land use development are Potentially Significant, and therefore would have to undergo environmental review during the approvals process to determine feasible mitigations. For additional information, please see the Draft EIR, chapters 2.12 and 2.14.

How are water needs for new development proposed in this plan being addressed?

Plan Bay Area is a programmatic document and the Draft EIR includes a program-level assessment of impacts related to water supply. The Draft EIR demonstrates the region faces questions regarding water supply deficiencies particularly during drought years. While numerous factors influence water demand, including employment growth, socio-economic characteristics, geographic distribution of the population, variation in precipitation levels, and water conservation practices, overall population growth is the most important factor. The projected population growth will occur with or without the Plan.

The proposed Plan Bay Area concentrates the projected growth within currently developed areas in the region, which reduces per capita water consumption. As a result, the proposed Plan should help protect the region's water supply by reducing development pressure on rural areas; areas where per capita water use is typically higher and new water infrastructure would be needed to accommodate growth.

With a few exceptions, the areas anticipated for new development conform to local general plans and specific plans. Each of the Bay Area's urban water suppliers must prepare an Urban Water Management Plan that assesses current and future demands for water. The potential future development would have been accounted for in the local Urban Water Management Plan.

About Greenhouse Gas Emissions

What are the greenhouse-gas reduction targets?

In 2010, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) adopted greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets for regions across California, as required by law. For the San Francisco Bay Area, this

means a 7 percent per capita reduction target for the year 2020 and 15 percent per capita reduction target for 2035, based on 2005 levels. CARB set the GHG emissions reductions targets for the various regions in the state as a per capita metric. The DEIR of the Plan included both this “SB 375 metric” focused on reducing per capita emissions from cars and light duty trucks related to transportation and land use planning, as well as an overall GHG emissions metric in its analysis of Plan Bay Area.

Why is lowering greenhouse gas emissions important?

Lowering greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions protects public health, lowers energy consumption, and reduces our contribution to global warming. More immediately, strategies to reduce emissions emphasize creating more options to take public transit, walk or use a bicycle for transportation instead of a car, when viable and appropriate. In addition, other laws require Plan Bay Area to meet federal and state air quality health standards for several pollutants.

Why the focus on cars and light trucks?

Transportation is the biggest single source of greenhouse gases in California. In the Bay Area, it accounts for 41 percent of our overall emissions, most of that comes from personal travel in on-road vehicles. To reduce our contribution to global warming, the region must pursue multiple transportation and land use strategies.

Plan Bay Area will:

1. Reduce the separation of land uses (jobs, stores, schools, and homes) and encourage more complete, mixed-use communities, so people can drive less and walk, bike or use more transit;
2. Cluster more homes, jobs and other activities around transit, so people can more easily use transit rather than drive; and
3. Plan land uses and transportation together, to reduce traffic congestion, improve vehicle speeds, reduce emissions from idling and other inefficiencies.

What about low-carbon fuels, more efficient cars, and solar/green buildings? Won't that reduce the region's greenhouse gas emissions? Why do we even need SB 375?

Vehicle technology and transportation pricing (e.g., parking) are likely to have a significant impact on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The impact of more efficient vehicles would be significantly reduced, however, if we continue to drive more and congestion increases because of inefficient land uses. Experts agree that there is no single answer. Changes in technology as well as changes in travel behavior will be necessary to reduce emissions to healthier levels in the future. There are other planning and implementation efforts that address building energy efficiency, renewable energy production, and additional GHG reduction approaches (for example, local Climate Action Plans and Energy Upgrade California (<https://energyupgradeca.org/overview>).

Further, SB 375 requires regional planning agencies in the state to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their regional transportation plan that demonstrates how the region could achieve the GHG emissions reductions targets through integrated land use and

transportation planning. The CARB Scoping Plan, developed to implement AB 32 as a comprehensive statewide strategy to reduce GHG, specifically charges CARB with implementing GHG reduction strategies related to clean vehicles and fuel efficiency. Therefore, the SB 375 targets analysis does not include the GHG emissions reductions and benefits of statewide standards that are anticipated as the result of fuel efficiency standards and the low carbon fuels standards (LCFS) as part of the region's efforts to reduce GHG emissions through integrated land use and transportation planning. Were MTC/ABAG to include those benefits in the SB 375 analysis, the region would be taking credit for emissions reductions in the land use and transportation planning sector that the state is taking credit for as part of ARB's responsibilities, thus double counting.

What if Plan Bay Area can't meet its targets?

If we cannot meet the greenhouse-gas reduction targets in Plan Bay Area, then we must prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) to accompany the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The APS would identify the physical, economic or political conditions required to meet the regional greenhouse gas targets.

Equity

What does "social equity" mean?

Social equity is the idea that all persons should have fair and equal access to opportunity. Plan Bay Area is designed to find housing for all persons at all income levels in the region, improve air quality in polluted areas and to make housing and transportation more affordable for lower-income households. For more information, visit the One Bay Area web page on [equity](#).

What does "environmental justice" mean?

Environmental justice stems from a Presidential Executive Order to fairly distribute benefits and burdens for disadvantaged communities and to include minority and low-income communities in decision-making. The federal government oversees regional planning. As a recipient of federal funds, MTC is required to incorporate environmental justice principles in all its planning efforts, including Plan Bay Area.

Public Input

How are local governments and other organizations involved?

Local officials, as well as environmental, social justice, faith-based, public-health and business leaders, are engaging in Plan Bay Area through a Regional Advisory Working Group that provides input on planning and policy issues. The agencies also get input from several other interest groups through MTC's Policy Advisory Council and ABAG's Regional Planning Committee. These meetings are open to the public and broadcast live via streaming audio. For more details, visit OneBayArea.org.

How are you involving residents in low-income communities and communities of color?

MTC and ABAG are partnering with nonprofit groups working in low-income communities and communities of color, selected through a competitive procurement process, to involve residents in those communities in development of the Plan.

Are businesses involved in the Plan Bay Area process?

Yes. MTC and ABAG have been working with business leaders from throughout the region, especially at key points during development of the Plan.

Is my input really considered by ABAG and MTC?

Absolutely. Oral and written comments from workshops, telephone survey results, a web survey and focus groups, have been analyzed, summarized and presented to ABAG and MTC decision makers at key milestones in the development of the plan. The Draft Plan and its Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) were released March 22 and April 2 respectively for public review and comment. All oral and written comments will be summarized and presented for review by ABAG and MTC board members to inform their final action on the Draft Plan, which is slated for adoption in July 2013.

How can I get involved?

Public engagement is essential to the success of all the regional planning efforts. Plan Bay Area needs the input of all stakeholders — especially the people who live and work in Bay Area communities — to build a plan that meets their vision, goals and aspirations for a prosperous future.

There are many ways to get involved. You can go to our [Get Involved](#) page to sign up for alerts about [meetings](#) and other opportunities to have your voice heard. We also encourage you to visit our [Public Process](#) page, which explains the nuts and bolts of what can be an admittedly complicated multi-year planning process.

Plan Bay Area is based on the work of hundreds of local planning efforts that have taken place around the Bay Area. We encourage you to get involved in local planning efforts, including neighborhood plans, General Plan and Housing Element updates. A second regional planning effort, the Bay Area Prosperity Plan, is engaging a broad range of community organizations and partners around the region on economic development and housing strategies to implement Plan Bay Area. You can learn more about this effort at <http://onebayarea.org/regional-initiatives/Bay-Area-Prosperity-Plan.html>.

Why don't you do more to publicize opportunities to comment on this plan?

MTC and ABAG are conducting an extensive public engagement program. Methods for publicizing comment opportunities include:

- Regular press releases to the news media outlets about comment opportunities
- Numerous presentations to local elected officials and civic groups.
- Social media (Facebook and Twitter)
- An interactive web site that has drawn some 50,000 unique visitors to learn about Plan Bay Area and comment via a “Virtual Workshop” and an online “Plan Bay Area Town Hall”
- Email and direct mail

The Role of Regional Government

Some claim that Plan Bay Area is part of an ill-intended global agenda to force lifestyle changes — is this true?

Plan Bay Area is a home-grown effort to plan for future transportation and land use needs. Most of us who live here are accustomed to saying that we live in “The Bay Area.” That simple phrase speaks volumes. It shows we already share a regional identity. We have a history of joining together on issues that cross jurisdictional lines. Notable examples include working to save San Francisco Bay, set aside land for a vast system of interconnected parks and open space, and pioneer a regional rapid rail system. All these efforts have shaped our collective identity and put us on the map as a region. Our first long-range comprehensive regional plan was completed in 1964 by ABAG. MTC has been adopting and updating regional transportation plans since 1971, the most recent of which was adopted in 2009. Plan Bay Area is a work in progress that will be updated every four years. While it is done in part to meet state and federal laws that require metropolitan areas to plan for regional needs, the Plan furthers a very important conversation in the Bay Area about the quality of life we enjoy today, and how to leave a better region for future generations.

Is there any relationship between Plan Bay Area and U.N. Agenda 21?

No. Plan Bay Area is mandated by California Senate Bill 375. For more information, read the American Planning Association fact sheet “[Agenda 21: Myths and Facts](http://www.onebayarea.org/pdf/Agenda21mythsfacts.pdf)” available online at <http://www.onebayarea.org/pdf/Agenda21mythsfacts.pdf>.

Does Plan Bay Area force local governments to accept regional dictates in order to receive transportation funding?

Plan Bay Area does not require local governments to implement regional requirements in order to receive transportation funding. The majority of funding in the Plan (\$232 billion, or 80%) is already committed for specific purposes. The remaining \$57 billion in revenues are available for assignment through the plan. As revenues become available, MTC assigns these funds to specific projects and programs, and may, at its discretion, include specific requirements. For the One Bay Area Grant program (OBAG) — which is slated to receive 5% of funding included in the Plan — MTC requires recipients to comply with existing state law by having an approved housing element. MTC directs the majority of OBAG funds to areas that local jurisdictions have nominated and have been approved as Priority Development Areas, though it is not a requirement to be designated a PDA in order to receive funding. So the Plan itself does not dictate specific requirements to local governments, rather the subsequent funding programs may

include policies to ensure scarce transportation revenues are invested appropriately and in a manner that supports implementation of the Plan.

Will Plan Bay Area be on the ballot for approval by voters?

Rather than asking voters to adopt the long-range transportation and land use plan, state law requires this action from ABAG (as the state-designated Council of Governments) and MTC (as the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization). Both boards consist of locally elected officials.

J:\COMMITTE\Planning Committee\2013\June\5a_Attachment5_FAQsJun7.docx

**Draft Plan Bay Area
Housing and Employment Distribution Revisions
June 10, 2013**

Minor modifications have been made to the housing and employment distributions in the Draft Plan Bay Area (“Draft Plan”). These modifications take into account the considerable local input received on the land use plan to date. Specifically, the modifications reflect: (1) corrections to datasets that were used to develop the jobs and housing distributions in the Draft Plan; (2) adjustments to ensure consistency with Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA); and (3) adjustments to local jurisdictions growth based on corrections to how the distribution methodology was applied. These modifications are described in more detail below. The revised employment and housing distribution tables are attached to this document. These minor modifications do not affect the conclusions of regional significance in the Draft Environmental Impact Report, nor do they impact the regional modeling results in a significant way.

Corrections to Data Sets

Several errors in the data used to develop the employment and housing distributions were identified both by ABAG staff and local jurisdictions. These include: errors in the number of jobs in specific jurisdictions within the National Establishment Time Series (NETS) data set that was used to develop the job distribution, errors in the U.S. Census housing data used to develop the housing distribution, and errors in local plan data that was used to develop the housing distribution.

NETS Corrections

The correction to the NETS base data was made for five jurisdictions including Hayward, Lafayette, Hillsborough, Unincorporated San Mateo County (specifically the San Francisco Airport area), Saratoga and Los Altos Hills. The corrections reduced 2010 jobs for each of these jurisdictions, with the exception of the San Francisco Airport, which saw a significant increase in 2010 jobs. The 2010 job shifts were contained within each county (reductions in one city meant a proportional increase in jobs for other cities within the county). The modified base data was then used to recalculate 2040 jobs, resulting in shifts in the 2040 job distribution for all jurisdictions throughout the region. However, the bulk of the shifts were contained within the counties in which the corrections were made. At the regional level, the overall shift of jobs is negligible.

U.S. Census Corrections

Two fixes were made to the U.S. Census 2010 housing unit and household data set that was used in the housing distribution. These include a reduction in the 2010 housing numbers for Colma, per a statement of correction from the U.S. Census Department, and a fix to the split of housing units and households within and outside Orinda’s Priority Development Area (PDA). The result of the first correction was an increase of 2010 units to the Unincorporated San Mateo County area adjacent to Colma. The result of the second is a change only in the 2040 housing figures for Orinda’s PDA. In both cases, housing growth for these jurisdictions was not modified.

Corrections to local plan data

A change was made to Cupertino’s “local plan feedback” number, used to develop the housing distribution, to correct an error found after adoption of the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy in May of 2012. The result of this fix was a reduction of housing growth in Cupertino.

Adjustments to ensure consistency with RHNA

Upon development of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation, ABAG found that the eight-year RHNA housing allocation for two jurisdictions, Clayton and Los Altos Hills, was higher than the housing growth for these jurisdictions in the thirty-year Plan Bay Area housing distribution. These jurisdictions received additional housing growth in the Plan Bay Area distribution so that total growth is equivalent to the RHNA number.

Adjustments to local jurisdiction growth based on corrections to application of methodology

The formal public comment period for both documents closed on May 16, 2013. A number of jurisdictions commented on the levels of employment and housing growth allocated in the Draft Plan as being too high, too low, or overly concentrated in their cities' PDAs. Twenty jurisdictions requested adjustments to their job number, sixteen requested adjustments to their housing number, and five requested shifts in growth from their PDAs to other areas within their city.

The distribution of employment and housing growth in the Draft Plan takes into account a variety of factors—including input from jurisdictions, level of transit service, Vehicle Miles Travelled by Household, in-commuting by low-wage workers, housing values, existing employment base, and concentration of knowledge-based economic activity, among others. ABAG staff thoroughly reviewed each request for modification and the overall methodology assigning job and housing growth to each jurisdiction. Staff acknowledged that the application of the distribution methodologies in certain instances was not appropriate. Several modifications for a small number of areas are noted below.

For all other jurisdictions, staff deemed that the distribution methodology was applied appropriately and consistently. Employment and housing growth in these jurisdictions was found to be consistent with and comparable to similarly-sized cities, and could be reasonably accommodated over the thirty-year time-frame of the Draft Plan.

Job Adjustments

Upon review of the employment methodology and employment figures for Dublin and Livermore, additional job growth was assigned to these cities. Staff found that the employment distribution methodology is slightly under-allocating certain sectors of employment growth in these cities, given that the model bases growth largely on cities' existing jobs base and does not account well for current and anticipated employment growth rates. Dublin and Livermore are currently small job centers but have growing jobs in the knowledge-based sector. These cities were assigned proportionately fewer jobs than cities with larger current job bases but less capacity and slower expected rates of growth, such as Hayward and Unincorporated Alameda County. Growth in Hayward and Unincorporated Alameda County was reduced commensurate to the increases in Dublin and Livermore.

Housing Adjustments

Housing growth for the portion of the El Camino Real Priority Development Area (PDA) in Burlingame was reduced. This is a reduction of the growth that was assigned to the Burlingame El Camino Real PDA as part of the additional housing growth allocation to several key job centers and locations along the core transit network in the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy¹. Staff found that this PDA was inappropriately assigned this additional housing growth given its close proximity to the San Francisco Airport. The balance of housing from this adjustment was distributed to all other cities and towns within the region per the growth distribution methodology.

Housing growth in the Plan was deemed to be quite low for Brentwood. The level of housing was adjusted upward to reflect a more reasonable rate of growth considering current development rates. The increase in housing growth in Brentwood is commensurate with the decrease in Cupertino.

Housing growth in the PDAs was reduced for the following jurisdictions: Lafayette, Walnut Creek, San Mateo, and Sunnyvale. In the case of Lafayette and Walnut Creek, staff acknowledges that a portion of the housing growth allocated to these jurisdictions' PDAs, given their small size, could be accommodated in the transit-accessible areas adjacent to the PDAs. In the case of San Mateo and Sunnyvale, it was recognized that housing growth was somewhat over-concentrated in the cities' PDAs in relation to the regional concentration of growth in the PDAs. Growth in San Mateo's PDAs was adjusted to achieve a lower concentration of growth, down from 81% to 77% of total city growth, and for Sunnyvale, growth in the PDAs was adjusted down from 83% to 79% of total city growth. The total growth for all four of these cities was not modified.

Conclusions

These changes do not affect the regional significance conclusions in the Draft Environmental Impact Report, nor do they result in significant changes in the regional modeling results, including the conclusion that the Draft Plan achieves the greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets.

Appendix: Employment and Housing Distribution by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

¹ http://onebayarea.org/pdf/Draft_Plan_Bay_Area/Draft_PBA_Forecast_of_Jobs_Population_and_Housing.pdf, p. 39

Appendix: Employment and Housing Distribution by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

KEY

Jurisdiction (Bold Italic)
Priority Development Area or
Investment Area

Alameda County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	JOBS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Alameda		24,070	33,220	9,160	38%
Naval Air Station	Transit Town Center	1,220	8,420	7,200	
Northern Waterfront	Transit Neighborhood	2,440	3,440	1,000	
Albany		4,230	5,630	1,400	33%
San Pablo Avenue & Solano Avenue	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,920	2,440	520	
Berkeley		77,110	99,330	22,220	29%
Adeline Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	950	1,630	680	
Downtown	City Center	15,210	21,600	6,390	
San Pablo Avenue *	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,400	3,340	950	
South Shattuck	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,150	1,450	300	
Telegraph Avenue	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,740	2,560	820	
University Avenue *	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,410	1,990	580	
Dublin		16,810	31,650	14,840	88%
Downtown Specific Plan Area	Suburban Center	4,460	5,950	1,490	
Town Center	Suburban Center	310	3,010	2,700	
Transit Center	Suburban Center	0	9,030	9,030	
Emeryville		16,070	23,610	7,550	47%
Mixed-Use Core	City Center	11,280	18,450	7,170	
Fremont		90,010	120,000	29,990	33%
Centerville	Transit Neighborhood	4,030	4,470	440	
City Center	City Center	18,770	24,660	5,900	
Irvington District	Transit Town Center	5,470	5,650	180	
South Fremont/Warm Springs	Suburban Center	12,890	28,980	16,090	
Hayward		68,140	87,820	19,680	29%
Downtown	City Center	6,300	9,270	2,970	
South Hayward BART	Mixed-Use Corridor	320	810	480	
South Hayward BART	Urban Neighborhood	470	1,610	1,130	
The Cannery	Transit Neighborhood	1,450	2,320	870	
Mission Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,700	2,830	1,120	
Livermore		38,450	53,210	14,760	38%
Downtown	Suburban Center	2,880	3,710	830	
East Side	Suburban Center	16,370	24,360	8,000	
Isabel Avenue/BART Station Planning Area	Suburban Center	3,300	8,500	5,200	
Newark		17,930	23,150	5,220	29%
Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development	Transit Town Center	860	2,100	1,240	
Old Town Mixed Use Area	Transit Neighborhood	180	390	210	
Oakland		190,490	275,760	85,260	45%
Coliseum BART Station Area	Transit Town Center	5,160	12,430	7,270	
Downtown & Jack London Square	Regional Center	88,260	127,710	39,450	
Eastmont Town Center	Urban Neighborhood	3,460	5,320	1,860	
Fruitvale & Dimond Areas	Urban Neighborhood	8,150	15,700	7,550	
MacArthur Transit Village	Urban Neighborhood	10,600	12,880	2,280	
Transit Oriented Development Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	33,560	41,830	8,270	
West Oakland	Transit Town Center	7,440	14,910	7,470	
Piedmont		1,930	2,410	490	25%
Pleasanton		54,340	69,640	15,300	28%
Hacienda	Suburban Center	9,910	15,330	5,410	
San Leandro		39,980	52,920	12,940	32%
Bay Fair BART Transit Village Development *	Transit Town Center	1,440	2,700	1,260	
East 14th Street *	City Center	2,790	2,840	50	
	Mixed-Use Corridor	9,010	15,680	6,670	
Union City		20,600	25,700	5,100	25%
Intermodal Station District	City Center	340	2,810	2,470	
Alameda County Unincorporated		34,300	43,600	9,300	27%
Castro Valley BART	Transit Neighborhood	2,020	2,980	960	
East 14th Street and Mission Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,740	4,250	1,510	
Hesperian Boulevard	Transit Neighborhood	1,860	2,600	740	
Meekland Avenue Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	900	1,330	430	

Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Contra Costa County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	JOBS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Antioch		19,090	25,530	6,430	34%
Hillcrest eBART Station	Suburban Center	20	3,260	3,250	
Rivertown Waterfront	Transit Town Center	4,030	4,530	490	
Brentwood		8,670	11,660	3,000	34%
Clayton		1,540	1,950	410	27%
Concord		47,640	69,450	21,810	46%
Community Reuse Area	Regional Center	170	14,200	14,040	
Community Reuse Area	Transit Neighborhood	0	3,240	3,240	
Downtown	City Center	7,850	10,200	2,360	
Danville		13,460	17,620	4,160	31%
Downtown Danville	Transit Town Center	5,320	7,290	1,970	
El Cerrito		5,880	7,310	1,430	24%
San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,850	2,240	390	
Hercules		3,910	6,440	2,530	65%
Central Hercules	Transit Neighborhood	800	1,830	1,030	
Waterfront District	Transit Town Center	1,230	1,890	650	
WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	730	1,180	450	
Lafayette		9,940	12,430	2,490	25%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	5,250	6,730	1,480	
Martinez		18,320	22,490	4,160	23%
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	4,040	5,110	1,070	
Moraga		4,740	5,940	1,190	25%
Moraga Center	Transit Town Center	1,140	1,510	360	
Oakley		3,750	6,680	2,930	78%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	800	1,390	580	
Employment Area	Suburban Center	680	2,290	1,610	
Potential Planning Area	Transit Neighborhood	290	880	590	
Orinda		5,530	6,940	1,410	25%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	3,220	3,980	760	
Pinole		6,740	8,490	1,740	26%
Appian Way Corridor	Suburban Center	2,430	3,190	750	
Old Town	Transit Town Center	2,840	3,440	610	
Pittsburg		14,180	19,800	5,620	40%
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	1,390	2,500	1,110	
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Transit Town Center	140	1,450	1,310	
Railroad Avenue eBART Station	Transit Town Center	5,610	7,930	2,320	
Pleasant Hill		17,370	22,940	5,570	32%
Buskirk Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,590	6,200	1,610	
Diablo Valley College	Transit Neighborhood	2,550	4,190	1,640	
Richmond		30,790	42,320	11,530	37%
Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	6,600	8,670	2,070	
South Richmond	Transit Neighborhood	7,030	9,360	2,340	
WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,790	3,010	1,210	
San Pablo		7,470	9,660	2,190	29%
San Pablo Avenue & 23rd Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,530	7,510	1,980	
Rumrill Boulevard	Empl. Investment Area	220	320	100	
San Ramon		43,960	58,320	14,370	33%
City Center	Suburban Center	10,430	17,800	7,360	
North Camino Ramon	Transit Town Center	11,430	14,460	3,030	
Walnut Creek		41,720	57,380	15,660	38%
West Downtown	Suburban Center	7,450	12,070	4,620	
Contra Costa County Unincorporated		40,220	54,040	13,820	34%
Contra Costa Centre	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,740	4,750	1,010	
Downtown El Sobrante	Mixed-Use Corridor	940	1,430	490	
North Richmond	Transit Neighborhood	1,490	1,980	500	
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Transit Neighborhood	400	1,150	750	
WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	680	990	310	

Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Marin County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	JOBS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Belvedere		430	480	50	12%
Corte Madera		7,940	8,260	320	4%
Fairfax		1,490	1,820	330	22%
Larkspur		7,190	7,810	620	9%
Mill Valley		5,980	6,790	810	14%
Novato		20,890	24,390	3,490	17%
Ross		510	590	80	16%
San Anselmo		3,740	4,360	610	17%
San Rafael		37,620	44,960	7,340	20%
Civic Center/North Rafael Town Center	Transit Town Center	5,660	6,860	1,200	
Downtown	City Center	8,250	10,480	2,230	
Sausalito		6,220	7,640	1,420	23%
Tiburon		2,340	2,690	340	15%
Marin County Unincorporated		16,380	19,360	2,980	18%
Urbanized 101 Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	2,260	2,960	700	

Napa County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	JOBS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
American Canyon		2,920	4,160	1,240	42%
Highway 29 Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,280	2,100	810	
Calistoga		2,220	2,640	420	19%
Napa		33,950	44,520	10,570	31%
Downtown Napa	Rural Investment Area	9,870	11,620	1,750	
Soscol Gateway Corridor	Rural Investment Area	1,080	1,960	870	
St. Helena		5,340	6,230	890	17%
Yountville		1,600	1,980	380	24%
Napa County Unincorporated		24,630	30,010	5,380	22%

San Francisco County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	JOBS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
San Francisco		568,720	759,500	190,780	34%
19th Avenue	Transit Town Center	9,980	13,570	3,590	
Balboa Park	Transit Neighborhood	2,690	3,460	770	
Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	Urban Neighborhood	19,590	29,260	9,670	
Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Regional Center	315,570	368,150	52,580	
Eastern Neighborhoods	Urban Neighborhood	61,070	70,890	9,820	
Market & Octavia	Urban Neighborhood	31,850	34,790	2,940	
Mission Bay	Urban Neighborhood	2,770	27,200	24,430	
Mission-San Jose Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	12,680	18,760	6,080	
Port of San Francisco	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,430	24,400	18,970	
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with Brisbane)	Transit Neighborhood	1,720	2,590	860	
Transbay Terminal	Regional Center	7,950	37,660	29,720	
Treasure Island	Transit Town Center	260	3,010	2,750	

Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

San Mateo County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	JOBS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Atherton		2,610	3,160	550	21%
Belmont		8,180	10,450	2,270	28%
Villages of Belmont	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,250	2,500	1,250	
Brisbane		6,780	7,670	890	13%
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with San Francisco)	Suburban Center	500	960	460	
Burlingame		29,540	37,780	8,240	28%
Burlingame El Camino Real	Transit Town Center	12,290	17,920	5,630	
Colma		2,780	3,200	420	15%
Daly City		20,760	26,580	5,820	28%
Bayshore	Transit Town Center	1,100	3,230	2,130	
Mission Boulevard	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,770	5,200	1,430	
East Palo Alto		2,670	3,680	1,000	38%
Ravenswood	Transit Town Center	790	1,210	420	
Foster City		13,780	17,350	3,570	26%
Half Moon Bay		5,030	6,020	990	20%
Hillsborough		1,850	2,250	410	22%
Menlo Park		28,890	34,980	6,090	21%
El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown	Transit Town Center	5,620	7,650	2,050	
Millbrae		6,870	9,300	2,430	35%
Transit Station Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,340	3,370	2,040	
Pacifica		5,870	7,100	1,230	21%
Portola Valley		1,500	1,770	270	18%
Redwood City		58,080	77,480	19,400	33%
Downtown	City Center	10,430	14,060	3,630	
Broadway/Veterans Boulevard Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	8,480	11,900	3,420	
San Bruno		12,710	16,950	4,240	33%
Transit Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	6,620	10,520	3,900	
San Carlos		15,870	19,370	3,510	22%
Railroad Corridor	Transit Town Center	1,940	3,090	1,150	
San Mateo		52,540	72,950	20,410	39%
Downtown	City Center	4,370	6,970	2,600	
El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,260	5,660	3,410	
Rail Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	8,810	18,590	9,800	
South San Francisco		43,550	53,790	10,240	24%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	2,530	6,800	4,270	
Woodside		1,760	2,060	310	17%
San Mateo County Unincorporated		23,570	31,180	7,600	32%
Midcoast	Rural Investment Area	1,870	2,640	770	
City County Association of Governments of San Mateo County		66,960	95,590	28,660	43%
El Camino Real:					
Daly City **	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,820	5,210	1,380	
Colma	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,120	2,400	280	
South San Francisco	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,740	6,120	1,380	
San Bruno **	Mixed-Use Corridor	7,190	10,290	3,100	
Millbrae **	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,560	6,280	1,730	
San Mateo **	Mixed-Use Corridor	17,100	29,020	11,940	
San Carlos **	Mixed-Use Corridor	10,040	12,350	2,300	
Redwood City **	Mixed-Use Corridor	7,360	9,670	2,310	
Menlo Park **	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,520	7,510	2,000	
Uninc Daly City	Mixed-Use Corridor	300	410	120	
North Fair Oaks	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,600	5,650	2,050	
Unincorporated County	Mixed-Use Corridor	610	680	70	

Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Santa Clara County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	JOBS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Campbell		27,320	35,170	7,850	29%
Central Redevelopment Area	Transit Neighborhood	7,900	10,250	2,340	
Cupertino		26,090	33,110	7,030	27%
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	10,540	13,780	3,240	
Gilroy		17,650	21,960	4,310	24%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	2,380	3,620	1,240	
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,380	2,990	600	
Los Altos		14,760	18,240	3,480	24%
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,690	7,250	1,560	
Los Altos Hills		2,060	2,540	480	23%
Los Gatos		23,630	29,040	5,410	23%
Milpitas		45,190	57,810	12,630	28%
Transit Area	Suburban Center	5,270	9,600	4,330	
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	310	510	190	
Monte Sereno		450	580	120	29%
Morgan Hill		17,570	22,140	4,570	26%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	1,670	3,010	1,340	
Mountain View		47,950	63,590	15,640	33%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	9,450	10,310	860	
East Whisman	Empl. Investment Area	8,740	12,420	3,680	
El Camino Real Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,790	6,660	860	
North Bayshore	Suburban Center	7,400	15,110	7,700	
San Antonio Center	Transit Town Center	3,160	4,340	1,180	
Whisman Station	Transit Neighborhood	650	1,210	560	
Palo Alto		89,690	119,470	29,780	33%
California Avenue	Transit Neighborhood	3,390	5,060	1,670	
San Jose		377,140	524,510	147,380	39%
Bascom TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	11,530	12,920	1,400	
Bascom Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,710	2,670	960	
Berryessa Station	Transit Neighborhood	6,150	12,220	6,060	
Blossom Hill/Snell Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	880	1,720	840	
Camden Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,610	7,640	2,040	
Capitol Corridor Urban Villages	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,340	5,590	3,250	
Capitol/Tully/King Urban Villages	Suburban Center	4,090	7,090	3,000	
Communications Hill	Transit Town Center	3,940	5,660	1,720	
Cottle Transit Village	Suburban Center	2,550	3,040	490	
Downtown "Frame"	City Center	26,930	31,320	4,390	
	Mixed-Use Corridor	10,020	13,460	3,440	
East Santa Clara/Alum Rock Corridor					
Greater Downtown	Regional Center	28,250	56,410	28,160	
International Business Park	Empl. Investment Area	11,670	19,810	8,130	
North San Jose	Regional Center	84,660	130,760	46,110	
Oakridge/Almaden Plaza Urban Village	Suburban Center	5,440	9,710	4,270	
Old Edenvale	Empl. Investment Area	6,920	14,750	7,830	
Saratoga TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,530	5,540	2,000	
Stevens Creek TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,690	8,040	2,350	
West San Carlos & Southwest Expressway Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	8,970	15,660	6,680	
Westgate/El Paseo Urban Village	Suburban Center	3,440	5,240	1,790	
	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,060	6,850	2,790	
Winchester Boulevard TOD Corridor					
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	22,590	24,880	2,290	
Santa Clara		112,890	146,180	33,290	29%
El Camino Real Focus Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,400	6,990	2,590	
Santa Clara Station Focus Area	City Center	10,070	12,820	2,750	
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	10,320	14,520	4,200	

Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Santa Clara County (continued)

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	JOBS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Saratoga		9,910	11,640	1,730	17%
Sunnyvale		74,810	95,600	20,790	28%
<i>Downtown & Caltrain Station</i>	<i>Transit Town Center</i>	3,760	5,680	1,920	
<i>East Sunnyvale</i>	<i>Urban Neighborhood</i>	8,070	9,260	1,190	
<i>El Camino Real Corridor</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	13,220	16,500	3,280	
<i>Lawrence Station Transit Village</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	4,170	5,110	950	
<i>Moffett Park</i>	<i>Empl. Investment Area</i>	11,450	19,090	7,640	
<i>Peery Park</i>	<i>Empl. Investment Area</i>	5,990	8,000	2,010	
<i>Reamwood Light Rail Station</i>	<i>Empl. Investment Area</i>	3,060	3,740	690	
<i>Tasman Station ITR</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	1,550	2,530	990	
Santa Clara County Unincorporated		39,160	47,940	8,770	22%

Employment Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Solano County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	JOBS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Benicia		14,240	18,930	4,680	33%
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	2,540	2,840	300	
Northern Gateway	Empl. Investment Area	6,780	10,930	4,150	
Dixon		4,460	5,780	1,310	30%
Downtown	Rural Investment Area	560	830	280	
Fairfield		39,300	53,310	14,010	36%
Downtown South (Jefferson Street)	Suburban Center	2,970	4,280	1,320	
Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station	Transit Town Center	340	2,650	2,310	
North Texas Street Core	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,420	2,420	1,000	
West Texas Street Gateway	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,680	2,890	1,210	
Rio Vista		1,790	2,340	550	31%
Downtown	Rural Investment Area	670	1,000	330	
Suisun City		3,080	4,520	1,440	47%
Downtown & Waterfront	Transit Town Center	1,040	1,960	930	
Vacaville		29,800	41,120	11,310	38%
Allison Area	Suburban Center	900	1,710	810	
Downtown	Transit Town Center	2,800	3,800	1,000	
Vallejo		31,660	43,070	11,410	36%
Waterfront & Downtown	Suburban Center	3,640	5,940	2,300	
Solano County Unincorporated		8,010	10,870	2,860	36%

Sonoma County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	JOBS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Cloverdale		1,570	2,270	700	45%
Downtown/SMART Transit Area	Transit Town Center	880	1,390	510	
Cotati		2,920	3,860	940	32%
Downtown and Cotati Depot	Transit Town Center	650	1,190	550	
Healdsburg		6,440	8,210	1,780	27%
Petaluma		28,830	38,690	9,860	34%
Central, Turning Basin/Lower Reach	Suburban Center	3,110	8,330	5,220	
Rohnert Park		11,730	16,320	4,590	39%
Central Rohnert Park	Transit Town Center	3,350	5,170	1,820	
Sonoma Mountain Village	Suburban Center	140	1,190	1,050	
Santa Rosa		75,460	103,940	28,470	38%
Downtown Station Area *	City Center	9,250	13,820	4,550	
Mendocino Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue Corridor *	Mixed-Use Corridor	23,230	30,080	6,850	
North Santa Rosa Station *	Suburban Center	8,960	13,060	4,100	
Roseland	Transit Neighborhood	2,650	3,890	1,240	
Sebastopol Road Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,110	3,450	1,340	
Sebastopol		5,650	7,300	1,650	29%
Nexus Area	Rural Investment Area	5,440	7,010	1,570	
Sonoma		6,650	8,650	2,000	30%
Windsor		5,610	7,760	2,150	38%
Redevelopment Area	Suburban Center	1,020	1,830	810	
Sonoma County Unincorporated		47,150	60,470	13,320	28%
Forestville	Rural Investment Area	540	590	50	
Graton	Rural Investment Area	410	720	320	
Guerneville	Rural Investment Area	640	980	340	
Penngrove Urban Service Area	Rural Investment Area	340	610	260	
The Springs	Rural Investment Area	2,100	2,580	480	

* Indicates PDAs that overlap within a jurisdiction. Job totals for the overlapping areas are assigned to one PDA only, with no duplicate counts.

** Indicates C/CAG El Camino Real PDAs that overlap with another PDA. Job totals may duplicate jobs already listed in that city.

Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

KEY
Jurisdiction (Bold Italic)
Priority Development Area or Investment Area

Alameda County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	HOUSING UNITS				HOUSEHOLDS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth	2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Alameda		32,350	38,250	5,890	18%	30,120	36,570	6,450	21%
Naval Air Station	Transit Town Center	1,460	5,470	4,010		1,090	5,040	3,950	
Northern Waterfront	Transit Neighborhood	1,070	1,830	760		990	1,760	780	
Albany		7,890	9,060	1,170	15%	7,400	8,740	1,340	18%
San Pablo Avenue & Solano Avenue	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,810	2,060	240		1,690	1,970	280	
Berkeley		49,450	58,740	9,280	19%	46,030	55,980	9,950	22%
Adeline Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	690	940	250		620	900	280	
Downtown	City Center	2,690	6,840	4,150		2,570	6,670	4,100	
San Pablo Avenue *	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,630	2,500	870		1,440	2,340	900	
South Shattuck	Mixed-Use Corridor	340	460	110		310	440	120	
Telegraph Avenue	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,110	1,470	360		990	1,400	410	
University Avenue *	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,480	2,030	550		1,390	1,940	550	
Dublin		15,780	24,320	8,530	54%	14,910	23,610	8,700	58%
Downtown Specific Plan Area	Suburban Center	830	1,790	960		790	1,750	950	
Town Center	Suburban Center	4,130	5,990	1,860		3,750	5,770	2,020	
Transit Center	Suburban Center	670	3,810	3,140		620	3,720	3,100	
Emeryville		6,650	12,110	5,470	82%	5,690	11,620	5,930	104%
Mixed-Use Core	City Center	4,150	9,620	5,470		3,530	9,300	5,780	
Fremont		73,990	91,620	17,630	24%	71,000	89,090	18,090	25%
Centerville	Transit Neighborhood	10,850	13,360	2,510		10,360	12,990	2,620	
City Center	City Center	7,310	10,210	2,900		6,870	9,910	3,040	
Irvington District	Transit Town Center	7,280	10,260	2,980		6,910	9,990	3,080	
South Fremont/Warm Springs	Suburban Center	2,330	5,310	2,980		2,180	5,150	2,970	
Hayward		48,300	60,610	12,320	25%	45,370	58,850	13,490	30%
Downtown	City Center	2,290	5,510	3,220		2,100	5,370	3,280	
South Hayward BART	Mixed-Use Corridor	180	1,360	1,170		170	1,330	1,160	
South Hayward BART	Urban Neighborhood	1,800	4,500	2,700		1,660	4,400	2,740	
The Cannery	Transit Neighborhood	340	1,100	750		330	1,070	740	
Mission Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,480	3,320	1,840		1,230	3,210	1,980	
Livermore		30,340	40,040	9,700	32%	29,130	38,940	9,800	34%
Downtown	Suburban Center	1,020	2,690	1,680		920	2,620	1,710	
East Side	Suburban Center	100	4,370	4,270		90	4,280	4,200	
Isabel Avenue/BART Station Planning Area	Suburban Center	530	4,000	3,470		470	3,910	3,440	
Newark		13,410	17,100	3,680	28%	12,970	16,640	3,660	28%
Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development	Transit Town Center	140	2,550	2,400		140	2,500	2,360	
Old Town Mixed Use Area	Transit Neighborhood	600	970	370		580	940	370	
Oakland		169,710	221,160	51,450	30%	153,790	212,470	58,680	38%
Coliseum BART Station Area	Transit Town Center	3,870	10,720	6,850		3,440	10,420	6,980	
Downtown & Jack London Square	Regional Center	11,910	26,200	14,290		10,630	25,390	14,770	
Eastmont Town Center	Urban Neighborhood	6,850	7,260	410		5,960	6,840	880	
Fruitvale & Dimond Areas	Urban Neighborhood	14,210	18,580	4,370		12,840	17,820	4,990	
MacArthur Transit Village	Urban Neighborhood	8,820	13,910	5,090		8,030	13,410	5,390	
Transit Oriented Development Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	67,370	77,500	10,130		60,970	74,320	13,350	
West Oakland	Transit Town Center	10,830	17,690	6,870		9,030	16,940	7,920	
Piedmont		3,920	4,020	100	3%	3,800	3,890	90	2%
Pleasanton		26,050	33,160	7,110	27%	25,250	32,300	7,050	28%
Hacienda	Suburban Center	1,310	4,900	3,590		1,270	4,800	3,530	
San Leandro		32,420	39,630	7,210	22%	30,720	38,390	7,670	25%
Bay Fair BART Transit Village Development *	Transit Town Center	660	1,560	900		630	1,520	890	
East 14th Street *	City Center	4,210	7,900	3,690		3,930	7,690	3,760	
	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,850	4,830	980		3,490	4,610	1,120	
Union City		21,260	24,270	3,010	14%	20,430	23,650	3,220	16%
Intermodal Station District	City Center	1,060	1,850	800		1,030	1,810	780	
Alameda County Unincorporated		51,020	56,470	5,450	11%	48,520	54,590	6,070	13%
Castro Valley BART	Transit Neighborhood	1,480	2,150	670		1,400	2,090	690	
East 14th Street and Mission Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	7,190	9,120	1,930		6,740	8,800	2,060	
Hesperian Boulevard	Transit Neighborhood	2,860	3,560	690		2,740	3,450	720	
Meekland Avenue Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	1,400	1,860	460		1,300	1,790	500	

Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Contra Costa County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	HOUSING UNITS				HOUSEHOLDS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth	2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Antioch		34,850	40,340	5,490	16%	32,250	38,790	6,540	20%
Hillcrest eBART Station	Suburban Center	160	2,450	2,290		150	2,400	2,250	
Rivertown Waterfront	Transit Town Center	1,600	3,430	1,830		1,430	3,330	1,900	
Brentwood		17,520	19,420	1,900	11%	16,490	18,690	2,190	13%
Clayton		4,090	4,240	150	4%	4,010	4,150	150	3%
Concord		47,130	65,200	18,070	38%	44,280	63,190	18,920	43%
Community Reuse Area	Regional Center	150	3,420	3,270		70	3,320	3,240	
Community Reuse Area	Transit Neighborhood	0	9,120	9,120		0	8,960	8,960	
Downtown	City Center	4,600	7,740	3,140		4,200	7,530	3,320	
Danville		15,930	17,440	1,500	9%	15,420	16,920	1,500	10%
Downtown Danville	Transit Town Center	1,450	2,200	750		1,370	2,130	760	
El Cerrito		10,720	12,000	1,280	12%	10,140	11,560	1,410	14%
San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	700	1,180	480		630	1,150	510	
Hercules		8,550	13,070	4,520	53%	8,120	12,690	4,570	56%
Central Hercules	Transit Neighborhood	410	2,850	2,440		400	2,800	2,400	
Waterfront District	Transit Town Center	690	1,710	1,020		640	1,660	1,020	
WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	620	1,340	710		600	1,310	710	
Lafayette		9,650	11,020	1,370	14%	9,220	10,640	1,420	15%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	2,030	2,930	900		1,890	2,840	950	
Martinez		14,980	16,240	1,270	8%	14,290	15,690	1,410	10%
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	820	1,510	690		750	1,460	710	
Moraga		5,750	6,540	790	14%	5,570	6,350	780	14%
Moraga Center	Transit Town Center	440	780	340		430	760	330	
Oakley		11,480	17,010	5,520	48%	10,730	16,440	5,720	53%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	560	1,740	1,180		520	1,690	1,180	
Employment Area	Suburban Center	580	1,480	900		560	1,450	890	
Potential Planning Area	Transit Neighborhood	1,060	2,310	1,260		980	2,240	1,260	
Orinda		6,800	7,610	800	12%	6,550	7,340	790	12%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	340	550	210		330	530	210	
Pinole		7,160	8,240	1,080	15%	6,780	7,970	1,200	18%
Appian Way Corridor	Suburban Center	560	1,150	590		520	1,110	590	
Old Town	Transit Town Center	1,430	1,540	110		1,300	1,470	180	
Pittsburg		21,130	28,520	7,390	35%	19,530	27,510	7,990	41%
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	1,870	3,700	1,820		1,600	3,540	1,950	
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Transit Town Center	0	1,090	1,090		0	1,070	1,070	
Railroad Avenue eBART Station	Transit Town Center	3,930	7,470	3,530		3,600	7,240	3,640	
Pleasant Hill		14,320	15,530	1,210	8%	13,710	15,060	1,360	10%
Buskirk Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,730	1,820	90		1,620	1,750	130	
Diablo Valley College	Transit Neighborhood	360	660	300		330	640	310	
Richmond		39,330	49,020	9,690	25%	36,090	47,090	11,000	30%
Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,240	5,750	500		4,700	5,480	780	
South Richmond	Transit Neighborhood	3,590	4,960	1,380		3,250	4,740	1,490	
WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,870	3,460	1,590		1,710	3,350	1,640	
San Pablo		9,570	11,460	1,890	20%	8,760	11,030	2,270	26%
San Pablo Avenue & 23rd Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,780	4,250	1,470		2,530	4,110	1,580	
Rumrill Boulevard	Empl. Investment Area	430	430	0		400	410	20	
San Ramon		26,220	31,550	5,330	20%	25,280	30,730	5,440	22%
City Center	Suburban Center	490	1,410	920		480	1,390	910	
North Camino Ramon	Transit Town Center	130	1,910	1,780		40	1,820	1,780	
Walnut Creek		32,680	40,050	7,370	23%	30,440	38,520	8,080	27%
West Downtown	Suburban Center	1,520	4,100	2,580		1,270	3,970	2,700	
Contra Costa County Unincorporated		62,400	67,090	4,690	8%	57,710	63,770	6,060	11%
Contra Costa Centre	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,910	2,380	470		1,780	2,310	530	
Downtown El Sobrante	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,810	2,290	480		1,670	2,190	510	
North Richmond	Transit Neighborhood	1,240	1,530	290		1,030	1,410	380	
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Transit Neighborhood	1,170	1,870	700		1,020	1,800	780	
WCCTAC San Pablo Ave Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,740	1,910	170		1,590	1,830	240	

Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Marin County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	HOUSING UNITS				HOUSEHOLDS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth	2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Belvedere		1,050	1,070	20	2%	930	970	40	4%
Corte Madera		4,030	4,250	230	5%	3,790	4,080	280	8%
Fairfax		3,590	3,790	210	6%	3,380	3,620	240	7%
Larkspur		6,380	6,770	390	6%	5,910	6,450	540	9%
Mill Valley		6,530	6,920	390	6%	6,080	6,540	460	8%
Novato		21,160	22,220	1,070	5%	20,280	21,450	1,180	6%
Ross		880	940	50	7%	800	860	60	8%
San Anselmo		5,540	5,790	250	5%	5,240	5,530	290	6%
San Rafael		24,010	27,400	3,390	14%	22,760	26,490	3,730	16%
Civic Center/North Rafael Town Center	Transit Town Center	1,990	3,030	1,040		1,900	2,950	1,050	
Downtown	City Center	2,610	3,960	1,350		2,420	3,830	1,410	
Sausalito		4,540	4,790	260	6%	4,110	4,470	350	9%
Tiburon		4,030	4,250	220	5%	3,730	4,000	270	7%
Marin County Unincorporated		29,500	30,550	1,060	4%	26,190	27,580	1,390	5%
Urbanized 101 Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	4,580	5,020	440		4,290	4,810	520	

Napa County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	HOUSING UNITS				HOUSEHOLDS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth	2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
American Canyon		5,980	7,900	1,910	32%	5,660	7,630	1,980	35%
Highway 29 Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	440	1,980	1,540		400	1,930	1,530	
Calistoga		2,320	2,370	50	2%	2,020	2,130	110	5%
Napa		30,150	33,430	3,280	11%	28,170	32,020	3,860	14%
Downtown Napa	Rural Investment Area	150	640	490		130	620	490	
Soscol Gateway Corridor	Rural Investment Area	640	1,090	450		600	1,050	450	
St. Helena		2,780	2,830	60	2%	2,400	2,520	120	5%
Yountville		1,250	1,280	30	2%	1,050	1,110	60	6%
Napa County Unincorporated		12,280	13,030	750	6%	9,580	10,890	1,300	14%

San Francisco County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	HOUSING UNITS				HOUSEHOLDS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth	2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
San Francisco		376,940	469,430	92,480	25%	345,810	447,350	101,540	29%
19th Avenue	Transit Town Center	5,220	11,170	5,950		4,790	10,870	6,070	
Balboa Park	Transit Neighborhood	1,270	3,120	1,850		1,190	3,020	1,830	
Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	Urban Neighborhood	11,610	22,520	10,900		10,470	21,770	11,300	
Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Regional Center	101,520	128,660	27,150		89,850	121,620	31,770	
Eastern Neighborhoods	Urban Neighborhood	34,270	45,690	11,420		31,650	43,820	12,170	
Market & Octavia	Urban Neighborhood	11,950	18,160	6,210		11,130	17,540	6,410	
Mission Bay	Urban Neighborhood	3,470	6,850	3,390		3,200	6,610	3,410	
Mission-San Jose Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	31,230	32,490	1,260		29,360	30,880	1,510	
Port of San Francisco	Mixed-Use Corridor	120	1,950	1,830		110	1,910	1,800	
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with Brisbane)	Transit Neighborhood	1,630	6,880	5,250		1,510	6,720	5,210	
Transbay Terminal	Regional Center	490	5,210	4,720		190	4,990	4,800	
Treasure Island	Transit Town Center	690	7,960	7,270		590	7,750	7,160	

Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

San Mateo County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	HOUSING UNITS				HOUSEHOLDS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth	2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Atherton		2,530	2,750	220	9%	2,330	2,580	250	11%
Belmont		11,030	12,150	1,120	10%	10,580	11,790	1,210	11%
Villages of Belmont	Mixed-Use Corridor	920	1,830	910		890	1,790	900	
Brisbane		1,930	2,180	250	13%	1,820	2,090	270	15%
Suburban Center		0	0	0		0	0	0	
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with San Francisco)									
Burlingame		13,030	16,700	3,670	28%	12,360	16,170	3,800	31%
Burlingame El Camino Real	Transit Town Center	7,610	10,870	3,260		7,170	10,530	3,360	
Colma		430	680	240	58%	410	660	250	61%
Daly City		32,590	36,900	4,310	13%	31,090	35,770	4,680	15%
Baysshore	Transit Town Center	1,590	3,580	1,990		1,550	3,510	1,960	
Mission Boulevard	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,270	3,310	1,050		2,070	3,210	1,150	
East Palo Alto		7,820	8,670	860	11%	6,940	8,340	1,400	20%
Ravenswood	Transit Town Center	1,030	1,880	860		970	1,830	860	
Foster City		12,460	13,350	900	7%	12,020	12,950	930	8%
Half Moon Bay		4,400	4,660	270	6%	4,150	4,410	260	6%
Hillsborough		3,910	4,230	310	8%	3,690	4,010	320	9%
Menlo Park		13,090	15,090	2,000	15%	12,350	14,520	2,170	18%
El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown	Transit Town Center	1,130	2,050	920		1,010	1,980	970	
Millbrae		8,370	11,400	3,020	36%	7,990	11,050	3,060	38%
Transit Station Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	280	2,710	2,420		270	2,650	2,390	
Pacifica		14,520	15,130	610	4%	13,970	14,650	680	5%
Portola Valley		1,900	2,020	130	6%	1,750	1,900	160	9%
Redwood City		29,170	37,890	8,720	30%	27,960	36,860	8,900	32%
Downtown	City Center	1,060	6,310	5,250		990	6,180	5,190	
Broadway/Veterans Boulevard Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	770	2,300	1,530		730	2,250	1,520	
San Bruno		15,360	19,820	4,460	29%	14,700	19,170	4,470	30%
Transit Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,330	7,660	3,330		4,140	7,450	3,320	
San Carlos		12,020	13,800	1,780	15%	11,520	13,390	1,870	16%
Railroad Corridor	Transit Town Center	460	1,230	770		440	1,200	760	
San Mateo		40,010	50,200	10,180	25%	38,230	48,620	10,390	27%
Downtown	City Center	540	1,610	1,070		500	1,560	1,060	
El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor	880	2,080	1,200		840	2,030	1,200	
Rail Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	520	5,180	4,660		500	5,080	4,580	
South San Francisco		21,810	28,740	6,920	32%	20,940	27,900	6,970	33%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	1,590	4,700	3,120		1,510	4,600	3,090	
Woodside		2,160	2,250	90	4%	1,980	2,080	110	5%
San Mateo County Unincorporated		22,510	27,470	4,960	22%	21,070	26,170	5,100	24%
Midcoast	Rural Investment Area	3,900	4,900	1,000		3,670	4,660	990	
City County Association of Governments of San Mateo County		46,710	71,390	24,690	53%	44,100	69,360	25,270	57%
El Camino Real:									
Daly City **	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,960	7,230	1,270		5,570	7,000	1,430	
Colma	Mixed-Use Corridor	410	650	240		390	640	250	
South San Francisco	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,670	9,200	3,530		5,450	8,970	3,520	
San Bruno **	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,350	6,930	2,580		4,150	6,730	2,580	
Millbrae **	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,910	5,100	2,190		2,730	4,950	2,230	
San Mateo **	Mixed-Use Corridor	13,180	19,990	6,810		12,490	19,400	6,910	
San Carlos **	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,570	4,730	1,160		3,350	4,600	1,250	
Redwood City **	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,820	7,020	2,210		4,560	6,830	2,280	
Menlo Park **	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,850	3,850	1,000		2,650	3,730	1,080	
Uninc Daly City	Mixed-Use Corridor	400	430	30		320	400	80	
North Fair Oaks	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,540	6,180	3,640		2,400	6,030	3,630	
Unincorporated County	Mixed-Use Corridor	50	80	30		40	80	30	

Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Santa Clara County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	HOUSING UNITS				HOUSEHOLDS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth	2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Campbell		16,950	19,990	3,040	18%	16,160	19,440	3,270	20%
Central Redevelopment Area	Transit Neighborhood	1,340	2,820	1,470		1,260	2,750	1,490	
Cupertino		21,030	24,790	3,760	18%	20,180	24,040	3,860	19%
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,160	5,570	2,410		2,980	5,400	2,420	
Gilroy		14,850	17,570	2,720	18%	14,180	17,050	2,870	20%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	980	2,910	1,930		880	2,820	1,940	
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,880	1,880	0		1,730	1,800	70	
Los Altos		11,200	12,310	1,100	10%	10,750	11,850	1,100	10%
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	750	1,200	450		700	1,160	460	
Los Altos Hills		3,000	3,130	130	4%	2,830	2,980	150	5%
Los Gatos		13,050	13,830	780	6%	12,360	13,220	870	7%
Milpitas		19,810	32,430	12,620	64%	19,180	31,680	12,500	65%
Transit Area	Suburban Center	790	7,870	7,080		750	7,730	6,970	
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	460	780	320		450	760	310	
Monte Sereno		1,290	1,370	80	6%	1,210	1,300	80	7%
Morgan Hill		12,860	16,690	3,830	30%	12,330	16,150	3,820	31%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	570	1,990	1,420		510	1,930	1,420	
Mountain View		33,880	43,280	9,400	28%	31,960	41,800	9,850	31%
Downtown	Transit Town Center	5,240	6,390	1,150		4,790	6,030	1,240	
East Whisman	Empl. Investment Area	720	720	0		690	690	0	
El Camino Real Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	9,190	11,150	1,960		8,740	10,830	2,090	
North Bayshore	Suburban Center	360	1,790	1,420		350	1,750	1,410	
San Antonio Center	Transit Town Center	3,590	6,350	2,760		3,420	6,180	2,770	
Whisman Station	Transit Neighborhood	670	1,670	1,010		650	1,640	990	
Palo Alto		28,220	35,630	7,410	26%	26,490	34,370	7,880	30%
California Avenue	Transit Neighborhood	800	1,650	850		750	1,600	850	
San Jose		314,040	443,320	129,280	41%	301,370	432,030	130,660	43%
Bascom TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	680	2,240	1,560		650	2,190	1,540	
Bascom Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,780	2,590	810		1,670	2,520	850	
Berryessa Station	Transit Neighborhood	1,880	7,990	6,110		1,850	7,850	6,000	
Blossom Hill/Snell Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	640	1,720	1,080		610	1,690	1,070	
Camden Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	490	1,480	1,000		480	1,460	980	
Capitol Corridor Urban Villages	Mixed-Use Corridor	860	7,100	6,240		820	6,960	6,140	
Capitol/Tully/King Urban Villages	Suburban Center	1,090	3,340	2,250		1,060	3,270	2,210	
Communications Hill	Transit Town Center	6,810	10,150	3,340		6,540	9,910	3,370	
Cottle Transit Village	Suburban Center	0	3,580	3,580		0	3,510	3,510	
Downtown "Frame"	City Center	18,120	28,210	10,090		16,980	27,410	10,440	
East Santa Clara/Alum Rock Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	7,180	13,380	6,200		6,750	12,980	6,230	
Greater Downtown	Regional Center	4,590	19,750	15,160		3,670	19,310	15,650	
International Business Park	Empl. Investment Area	200	200	0		190	190	0	
North San Jose	Regional Center	10,880	43,740	32,860		10,420	42,830	32,410	
Oakridge/Almaden Plaza Urban Village	Suburban Center	1,910	9,210	7,300		1,790	9,030	7,240	
Old Edenvale	Empl. Investment Area	150	150	0		140	140	0	
Saratoga TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,430	3,550	1,120		2,340	3,470	1,130	
Stevens Creek TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,620	7,800	5,170		2,500	7,630	5,120	
West San Carlos & Southwest Expressway Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	11,150	20,960	9,810		10,320	20,420	10,100	
Westgate/El Paseo Urban Village	Suburban Center	850	3,340	2,490		800	3,270	2,480	
Winchester Boulevard TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,850	6,850	2,000		4,630	6,690	2,050	
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	25,920	30,950	5,030		24,880	30,100	5,220	
Santa Clara		45,150	58,930	13,780	31%	43,020	57,260	14,230	33%
El Camino Real Focus Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,840	5,400	3,560		1,650	5,220	3,580	
Santa Clara Station Focus Area	City Center	480	3,880	3,410		450	3,810	3,360	
VTA Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,080	3,540	1,460		1,970	3,440	1,480	

Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Santa Clara County (continued)

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	HOUSING UNITS				HOUSEHOLDS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth	2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Saratoga		11,120	11,760	630	6%	10,730	11,360	630	6%
Sunnyvale		55,790	74,820	19,030	34%	53,380	72,800	19,410	36%
<i>Downtown & Caltrain Station</i>	<i>Transit Town Center</i>	1,840	3,810	1,980		1,730	3,710	1,980	
<i>East Sunnyvale</i>	<i>Urban Neighborhood</i>	1,020	4,280	3,260		950	4,170	3,220	
<i>El Camino Real Corridor</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	10,990	15,410	4,410		10,350	14,940	4,590	
<i>Lawrence Station Transit Village</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	1,660	4,420	2,760		1,560	4,330	2,770	
<i>Moffett Park</i>	<i>Empl. Investment Area</i>	20	20	0		20	20	0	
<i>Peery Park</i>	<i>Empl. Investment Area</i>	130	130	0		110	120	10	
<i>Reamwood Light Rail Station</i>	<i>Empl. Investment Area</i>	0	0	0		0	0	0	
<i>Tasman Station ITR</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	1,440	3,270	1,830		1,390	3,200	1,810	
Santa Clara County Unincorporated		29,690	32,500	2,820	9%	28,080	31,070	2,990	11%

Housing Growth by Jurisdiction and PDA/Investment Area

Solano County


Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	HOUSING UNITS				HOUSEHOLDS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth	2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Benicia		11,310	12,690	1,380	12%	10,690	12,250	1,560	15%
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	600	1,530	930		530	1,480	950	
Northern Gateway	Empl. Investment Area	0	0	0		0	0	0	
Dixon		6,170	6,660	490	8%	5,860	6,430	580	10%
Downtown	Rural Investment Area	740	990	250		690	960	270	
Fairfield		37,180	48,300	11,120	30%	34,480	46,430	11,950	35%
Downtown South (Jefferson Street)	Suburban Center	680	1,100	420		600	1,060	460	
Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station	Transit Town Center	410	6,450	6,050		90	6,060	5,970	
North Texas Street Core	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,770	3,470	1,700		1,600	3,370	1,780	
West Texas Street Gateway	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,120	3,550	2,430		1,020	3,450	2,440	
Rio Vista		3,890	4,260	370	10%	3,450	3,950	500	14%
Downtown	Rural Investment Area	360	720	360		300	680	380	
Suisun City		9,450	10,820	1,370	14%	8,920	10,490	1,570	18%
Downtown & Waterfront	Transit Town Center	1,180	2,230	1,040		1,090	2,160	1,060	
Vacaville		32,810	36,910	4,100	12%	31,090	35,860	4,770	15%
Allison Area	Suburban Center	610	700	100		550	690	130	
Downtown	Transit Town Center	250	940	690		220	920	690	
Vallejo		44,430	46,980	2,540	6%	40,560	44,900	4,340	11%
Waterfront & Downtown	Suburban Center	1,130	1,970	840		980	1,920	950	
Solano County Unincorporated		7,450	8,950	1,500	20%	6,710	8,400	1,690	25%

Sonoma County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	HOUSING UNITS				HOUSEHOLDS			
		2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth	2010	2040	2010-2040	% Growth
Cloverdale		3,430	4,210	790	23%	3,180	4,040	860	27%
Downtown/SMART Transit Area	Transit Town Center	1,150	1,880	730		1,040	1,800	760	
Cotati		3,140	3,650	510	16%	2,980	3,530	560	18%
Downtown and Cotati Depot	Transit Town Center	890	1,290	400		830	1,250	410	
Healdsburg		4,800	5,000	200	4%	4,390	4,650	270	6%
Petaluma		22,740	25,440	2,700	12%	21,740	24,620	2,880	13%
Central, Turning Basin/Lower Reach	Suburban Center	810	2,570	1,760		750	2,500	1,750	
Rohnert Park		16,550	20,160	3,610	22%	15,810	19,600	3,790	24%
Central Rohnert Park	Transit Town Center	1,360	2,320	960		1,300	2,270	970	
Sonoma Mountain Village	Suburban Center	200	2,210	2,010		200	2,170	1,980	
Santa Rosa		67,400	83,430	16,030	24%	63,590	80,580	16,990	27%
Downtown Station Area *	City Center	2,230	6,130	3,900		2,080	5,980	3,900	
Mendocino Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue Corridor *	Mixed-Use Corridor	6,280	7,720	1,440		5,850	7,460	1,610	
North Santa Rosa Station *	Suburban Center	4,240	6,200	1,960		3,960	6,040	2,090	
Roseland	Transit Neighborhood	3,570	6,480	2,920		3,400	6,300	2,900	
Sebastopol Road Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,610	4,630	2,020		2,400	4,480	2,080	
Sebastopol		3,470	3,890	430	12%	3,280	3,710	430	13%
Nexus Area	Rural Investment Area	2,510	2,890	390		2,360	2,750	400	
Sonoma		5,540	5,840	300	5%	4,960	5,390	430	9%
Windsor		9,540	11,460	1,920	20%	8,960	10,880	1,910	21%
Redevelopment Area	Suburban Center	1,430	2,640	1,200		1,370	2,550	1,190	
Sonoma County Unincorporated		67,970	73,400	5,430	8%	56,950	63,740	6,790	12%
Forestville	Rural Investment Area	990	1,390	400		890	1,290	400	
Graton	Rural Investment Area	570	1,000	440		530	960	430	
Guerneville	Rural Investment Area	460	870	410		370	780	410	
Penngrove Urban Service Area	Rural Investment Area	440	820	380		420	790	380	
The Springs	Rural Investment Area	5,110	6,200	1,090		4,700	5,850	1,150	

* Indicates PDA that overlap within a jurisdiction. Housing totals for the overlapping areas are assigned to one PDA only, with no duplicate counts.

** Indicates C/CAG El Camino Real PDAs that overlap with another PDA. Housing totals may duplicate jobs already listed in that city.



Date: June 20, 2013

To: ABAG Executive Board

From: Ezra Rapport, Executive Director, ABAG

Subject: Draft Plan Bay Area – Summary of Land Use-Related Issues and Responses

Background

MTC and ABAG released the Draft Plan Bay Area on March 22, 2013, followed by the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on April 2, 2013. The formal public comment period for both documents closed on May 16, 2013. MTC/ABAG received a large volume of written comments from public agencies, stakeholder organizations, and members of the public during the comment period for Draft Plan Bay Area in addition to oral comments received at public hearings.

This memo highlights some of the recurring issues raised by local jurisdictions, agencies and stakeholders related to land use policies in the Plan, and responds to those issues. Some of these issues have also been addressed in other documents, such as the Frequently Asked Questions and the Key Issues and Policy Recommendations Memo; they have been included in this memo to provide an overview of the issues that are most important to local jurisdictions. Attachment A to this memo summarizes the comments from jurisdictions during this comment period. Comments from individual jurisdictions on the DEIR will be formally addressed in the DEIR Response to Comments.

The comments are grouped into the following themes, and the issues raised in each of the themes are described in more detail in the following pages:

- 1. Land Use/Environment**
- 2. Affordable Housing and Displacement**
- 3. Economic Development**
- 4. Regional Growth Forecast**
- 5. Infrastructure and Public Services**
- 6. Public Health**
- 7. Funding**

1. Land Use/Environment

- **Issue: Relationship between Plan Bay Area and local land use planning**

Response: By law, adoption of Plan Bay Area will not require any changes to local zoning, general plans, or project review [Govt. Code Section 65080, subd. (b)(2)(J)]. Neither MTC nor ABAG has any authority over land use decisions. Cities and counties, not MTC or ABAG, are ultimately responsible for the manner in which their local communities continue to be built out in the future. The growth pattern in Plan Bay Area builds on the land use planning done by local jurisdictions and the Plan facilitates implementation of these local community development visions by expanding incentives and opportunities available to local jurisdictions to support growth in Priority Development Areas (PDAs).

In addition to funding transportation and planning projects in PDAs, the Plan sets the stage for cities and counties to increase the efficiency of the development process for projects consistent with the Plan and other state legislation. California Senate Bills 375 and 226 provide local jurisdictions with the option of reducing the scope of environmental review required for projects that are consistent with a Sustainable Community Strategy (Plan Bay Area is our region's SCS) and meet additional requirements related to transit proximity, density, land use, housing affordability, and environmental benefits. Local jurisdictions can elect not to allow projects to utilize the provisions of SB375 and SB226, or to impose additional requirements for projects to be able to utilize these provisions.

More information about the requirements of SB226 and SB375 is provided on the California Office of Planning Research website: <http://opr.ca.gov/>.

- **Issue: Accounting for additional Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction strategies**

Response: Plan Bay Area is the region's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS). The SCS is part of the larger effort to reduce GHG emissions statewide in response to Assembly Bill 32 (AB32). The SCS specifically accounts for GHG reductions associated with transportation and land use. Other planning and implementation efforts address building energy efficiency, renewable energy production, and other GHG reduction approaches. To avoid double counting emissions reductions accomplished through these other efforts, the Draft Plan and the DEIR only take into account GHG reductions resulting from transportation investments and strategies, and planning for the location of jobs and housing.

- **Issue: Stronger open space policies and additional funding for Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs)**

Response: Plan Bay Area connects open space with urban development through the establishment of both Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) and Priority Development Areas. The forecast achieves, within the range possible, the Plan's adopted target to maintain growth within our existing urban footprint. A prominent feature of Plan Bay Area is the lower amount of growth forecasted in counties that primarily consist of open space and

agricultural lands compared to previous forecasts. To support conservation efforts, the Plan provides \$10 million for protecting PCAs. Implementation actions can further support the PCA program and regional open space protection. A first step could involve updating the PCA program to define the role of different kinds of PCAs in supporting agriculture, recreation, habitat, and other ecological functions and using this analysis to seek additional funding for PCA conservation efforts. The PCA program could also be expanded to draw upon the resources of a broader array of open space agencies, non-profits, foundations and federal agencies—including funding sources specifically dedicated to land acquisition and preservation.

- **Issue: Integration of air quality, hazards and sea level rise into Plan Bay Area.**

***Response:** As the Bay Area’s Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), Plan Bay Area is required to focus on coordinating land use and transportation, and this is the primary focus of the Plan. However, the chapter “A Plan to Build On” highlights the importance of integrating the Plan with ongoing efforts related to cleaning our air and planning for resilience, including preparing for natural disasters and the expected impacts of climate change.*

As noted in the Plan, regional agencies are collaborating on a comprehensive set of best practices for local governments on how best to address local air pollutants in their planning and development decisions. The Adapting to Rising Tides planning effort is assessing the potential impacts of sea level rise and storm events on local communities and working to identify strategies to reduce and manage these risks. There are also over 100 local jurisdiction efforts around climate adaptation. In addition, ABAG is leading the Regional Disaster Resilience Initiative, which will develop strategies and policies to guide the region’s long-term recovery after a major natural disaster.

The regional agencies and other stakeholders involved in these efforts are committed to continuing to better coordinate regional planning to address these challenges, and to incorporate them more fully in the next update to the SCS in four years.

- **Issue: Local implementation of EIR mitigation measures**

***Response:** Where actions are necessary to address the impact of the Plan on an area of environmental analysis such as noise or air quality, the Draft EIR (DEIR) identifies mitigations. Where these are beyond the scope of MTC and ABAG responsibilities (e.g. water), the mitigations would be carried out by the responsible parties (e.g. utilities). ABAG and MTC could take on or coordinate the mitigations that are within their scope of responsibility. For a summary of mitigations, see the Executive Summary of the DEIR.*

2. Affordable Housing and Displacement

- **Issue: Affordable housing funding to meet the Plan’s goals and forecasted growth**

Response: Given today’s soaring housing costs, housing production costs in the Bay Area, and the complexity of developing housing in locations near transit, there is no doubt that additional resources are needed to facilitate preservation of currently affordable housing and the construction of new affordable homes in the future. The loss of redevelopment funding combined with reduced funding levels at the state and federal level leaves a structural financing gap of at least 10 to 20 percent on most affordable housing projects in the region after accounting for typical equity investments from banks, local trusts and fees, and other lenders.

Implementation of the Plan hinges on increasing the availability of affordable housing. Production of affordable housing and community stability have been raised as critical issues to retain and improve the quality of life of existing neighborhoods, accommodate future growth, and address the labor needs of our business community.

In the section of Chapter 6 of the Draft Plan entitled “A Platform for Advocacy,” ABAG and MTC have committed to work to strategically replace the loss of redevelopment funding with locally controlled funding tools. Already, the Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) Fund established with \$10 million from MTC has created a \$50 million fund dedicated to facilitating affordable housing in Priority Development Areas. An additional investment of \$10 million in 2013 will grow the fund to at least \$90 million.

MTC and ABAG staff has also put forward the following recommendations for action by the two agencies to increase affordable housing options (see Attachment C of the Key Issues and Preliminary Recommendations memo for more details):

- *Reserve \$600 million over the life of the Plan from Cap and Trade revenues to a regional affordable housing fund. Based on the experience with TOAH and local jurisdictions’ contributions to affordable housing production and preservation, this \$600 million can be leveraged to a large degree to support the creation and rehabilitation of affordable housing units. The fund can support the preservation of currently affordable units and assist with the development of new affordable units. The specific provisions and identification of partners in the fund and leveraging opportunities will be determined following adoption of Plan Bay Area.*
- *Continue the use of Regional PDA Planning funds to facilitate the entitlement of affordable housing in transit corridors.*

- **Issue: Displacement Risk**

Response: The Draft Plan’s goal is to house the region’s current and future population without displacement. The Plan’s sustainability strategy is to increase affordable housing near transit. The Plan has assessed the potential risk of displacement by location based on

areas of major growth where people pay more than half of their income in rent. This includes approximately 30,000 households or about 1 percent of the total Bay Area households. Displacement risk does not affect all or even the majority of PDAs. However, the effectiveness of the Plan relies on the social, cultural and economic vitality of our existing neighborhoods, which could be disrupted through displacement.

Displacement risk can be primarily addressed by increasing resources for the creation and preservation of affordable housing (as described in Attachment C “Affordable Housing” in the Key Issues and Preliminary Recommendations Memo) and improving economic opportunities for current residents.

To ensure that growth and investments support vertical mobility for existing residents rather than horizontal displacement, the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program provides a framework for local government and Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to adopt appropriate neighborhood stabilization and affordable housing policies through the OBAG-related Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategies. The success of this effort will require monitoring and appropriate revisions as well as the development of additional regional initiatives. These initiatives will need to recognize the unique qualities of each neighborhood and the need for policy interventions that are locally defined.

To help address displacement risk, MTC and ABAG are proposing to target funds from the Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) fund mentioned above to community stabilization efforts such as land banking and housing acquisition and rehabilitation. Additional proposals include a menu of anti-displacement policies for consideration in the next OBAG round and potential funding for community stabilization that emerge from the HUD grant-funded Regional Prosperity Grant. These proposals are described in greater detail in Attachment D of the Key Issues and Preliminary Recommendations Memo)

3. Economic Development

- **Issue: Employment Investment Areas**

Response: Employment Investment Areas (EIAs) were developed to recognize the unique contribution of places with convenient transit service that are not anticipated to add new housing but that expect strong employment growth over the next three decades. Objectives for the Investment Areas include the addition of services that meet the daily needs of workers, reducing the need for vehicle trips, “last mile” solutions connecting transit stations to workplaces, and urban design interventions to improve the pedestrian environment and increase walking and bicycling.

The Investment Areas were not adopted at the time of the Draft Plan in May 2012. As a result, they are not identified in the Plan and not eligible for the first round of One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) funding. The regional agencies will work with local jurisdictions to identify opportunities to support efforts to achieve the transportation, land use, and design objectives of these areas.

- **Issue: Plan Bay Area should have included policies related to facilitating goods movement and protecting industrial lands, including investments in local jurisdictions**

Response: The movement of freight and the protection of production and distribution facilities has important environmental, economic and equity implications for the region. Building on MTC’s Regional Goods Movement Study and related land use analysis, MTC/ABAG will evaluate the needs related to the development, storage, and movement of goods through our region and identify essential industrial areas to support the region’s economic vitality. This issue will also be considered as part of MTC’s participation in the update of the State of California’s freight and rail plans and as MTC/ABAG prepare for the update of Plan Bay Area in four years.

- **Issue: Local jurisdictions need assistance from regional agencies to attract jobs**

Response: MTC/ABAG will consider relevant findings from the HUD grant-funded Regional Prosperity Plan and other regional economic development plans to craft policies for the update of Plan Bay Area and interim planning efforts. This will include both worker-based strategies for career pathways, model land use guidelines for growing industries, and place-based strategies to support the growth of different kinds of Priority Development Areas, including small towns, mixed use corridors and existing office parks.

- **Issue: Desire for local hire, job training, and living wage incentives**

Response: Currently, local hire policies are a project sponsor/city level decision and are not tracked by regional agencies. In order to develop or encourage more local hire strategies, regional agencies would need to conduct additional research to better understand best practices and the experiences of local governments implementing such programs. The HUD

grant-funded Regional Prosperity Plan is looking more broadly at our region's projected job growth with regards to career pathways and opportunities for all workers.

4. Regional Growth Forecast

- **Issue: Regional housing and jobs forecast methodology**

Response:

The population and housing forecast included in the plan has undergone significant scrutiny and has been validated by the California Departments of Finance (DOF) and Housing and Community Development (HCD). The regional growth forecast was conducted using an approach adopted by the ABAG Executive Board. In summary, this methodology involved:

- *A projected regional job growth, which is the main determinant of ABAG's regional population and housing growth forecast—consistent with other major regional forecast models in California and the models used by the three major national economic forecasting firms. Forecasted job growth to 2040 is estimated as a share of U.S. projected job growth, based on an assessment of regional competitiveness by major industry sector. The Bay Area's strength in industry sectors that are expected to grow, such as professional services and information, results in a higher rate of projected job growth than the rate for the nation as a whole.*
- *Population growth is projected in terms of natural increases from births and deaths and migration into the region. The ABAG forecast uses California Department of Finance (DOF) fertility and mortality assumptions to determine the amount of natural increase in the population to develop a population profile. Migration, rather than being tied to recent trends, is forecasted as a function of job growth.*
- *From population growth, a forecast of households and housing units is developed. The final forecast incorporates all of these factors, as well as assumed availability of funding to support affordable housing.*

This regional forecast was used as the basis for developing the employment and housing growth pattern adopted by the MTC and the ABAG Executive Board in May 2012 as the Preferred Alternative and included in the Draft Plan.

Reports documenting the forecast methodology and regional growth distribution include:

- *Draft Plan Bay Area Supplementary Report: Draft Forecast of Jobs, Population and Housing*
http://onebayarea.org/pdf/Draft_Plan_Bay_Area/Draft_PBA_Forecast_of_Jobs_Population_and_Housing.pdf
- *Bay Area Job Growth to 2040: Projections and Analysis*
<http://www.abag.ca.gov/abag/events/agendas/r040412a-Item%205%20-%20Attachment%201.pdf>

- *Evaluating the Effects of Projected Job Growth on Housing Demand*
http://www.onebayarea.org/pdf/KC_Effects_of_Projected_Job_Growth_on_Housing.pdf
- *Overview of the Regional Housing Need Determination, DOF Population Projections and Plan Bay Area Forecast*
http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/meeting_packet_documents/agenda_2038/06_Overview_of_RHN_D_DOF_Projections_and_Plan_Bay_Area.pdf

- **Issue: Multi-family housing trends and demand**

Response: Several factors point to strong future demand for a wider range of housing options in communities with convenient access to local services and transit:

- ***Existing Housing Stock and Recent Trends.*** *Single family homes account for approximately two-thirds of the region’s current housing stock. Combined with the current stock, modest future production is anticipated to meet new demand for single family housing. Even with very limited production, single family homes will continue to make up the majority of the region’s housing 30 years from now.*

Multi-family housing production has accelerated during the recovery from the recent recession. According to data from the California Department of Finance, homes in buildings with five units or more have made up 58% of new homes since 2010, compared to its overall share of 25% in 2010. In the region’s fastest growing areas, this trend is even more pronounced. In Santa Clara County, for example, homes in buildings with five or more units or more have accounted for 70% of new homes, compared to a 2010 share of 25%.¹ These figures support previous research suggesting a strong pent up demand for multi-family housing in the region.

- ***Demographic Change.*** *The number of Bay Area residents 65 years or older is expected to increase by 137% over the next 30 years. This is dramatically higher than any other age group: residents between 0-24 and 25-44 are expected grow by 25% and 17% respectively. The population between 45 and 64 years old is projected to grow by only 1%.*

Recent research and historic preferences suggest that this explosion of senior citizens will substantially increase demand for multi-family housing. While some seniors will age in place, remaining in their single family homes, many will choose to move to places with greater access to local services, transit and a wider range of housing options. The available stock of single family homes created by this group will help meet the demand of households seeking these homes.

¹ California Department of Housing and Finance, Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011-2013 with 2010 Census Benchmark, Table E-5

The proportion of the region’s population made up of households that have traditionally been most likely to occupy detached single family homes will decline significantly. In addition, this group will be made up largely of Millennials (or Generation Y), who have shown much stronger preferences for multi-family housing in communities with convenient access to transit and amenities than their parents’ generation. The share of this generation that changes its preference toward detached single family homes and suburban locations as they reach middle age is uncertain. However, even an incremental shift toward multi-family housing would further increase demand for this kind of housing.

In addition to shifting toward an older population, the region is expected to grow significantly more diverse. Together, the Bay Area’s Latino and Asian population is expected to increase from 44% of the region’s total population to 59%. Latinos, projected to be the largest ethnic group in the region by 2013, have historically been more likely to live in multi-family housing. In addition, several surveys suggest a stronger preference among Latinos for mixed-use communities with a range of amenities and transit access.² Whether or not this could change as some households become wealthier is uncertain, but available information does not suggest that the region’s shift in ethnic and racial composition will be accompanied by a stronger preference for detached single family housing.

- **Issue: Housing distribution to suburban locations**

Response: *The distribution of housing in the Plan was adopted in May 2012 by the ABAG Executive Board and the Commission as the Preferred Alternative. This followed extensive consultation with local jurisdictions, stakeholders, and the general public. The adopted distribution raised concern among affordable housing advocates, developers, and several jurisdictions. From one perspective, some argue that that the Plan does not provide enough low and moderate income housing in locations with strong job and transit access and high quality amenities including schools. From another, the Plan does not distribute enough housing to greenfield suburban locations with untapped development potential that can help meet the region’s future demand. To address these concerns, the DEIR includes two alternatives developed by developers and equity groups that evaluate the impacts of shifting housing to more suburban locations. Alternative 4, Enhanced Network of Communities, was shaped by the Building Industry Association. Alternative 5, Environment, Equity and Jobs, was developed by equity and affordable housing advocates.*

² Sources include: Mendez, M. “Latino New Urbanism: Building on Cultural Preferences,” *Opolis*, 1.1 (2005). <http://cssd.ucr.edu/Activities/PDFs/Latino%20New%20Urbanism.pdf>; and Americans’ Views on their Communities, Housing, and Transportation, ULI, March 2013. <http://www.uli.org/wp-content/uploads/ULI-Documents/America-in-2013-Final-Appendix.pdf>

The Draft Plan’s housing distribution builds upon local plans by identifying locations that can accommodate future growth, including the scale and type of growth most appropriate for different types of locations. It provides a more focused growth pattern for the region than historic trends, identifies locations for future housing growth while recognizing the unique characteristics of the Bay Area’s communities. To help achieve the region’s GHG reduction targets and support the Plan Bay Area’s targets, the Draft Plan focuses growth in the region’s largest cities and in PDAs with strong transit access. The Plan’s policies invest in disadvantaged communities, increase access to jobs and services, and leverage existing infrastructure.

Implementing proposals to shift the distribution of housing growth in the Plan to more suburban locations would have ripple effects across the region. In addition to increasing the number of housing units distributed to suburban communities without any prior consultation, it would create major distribution changes in other jurisdictions. In the case of shifting low and moderate income housing to job and transit rich suburbs, it would also likely require a dramatic increase in housing subsidies for which no funding source has been identified. Redistributing housing to greenfield suburban locations would likely increase pressure on open space, and create a host of other environmental impacts. Redistributing housing to suburban locations also conflicts with SB 375’s requirement to “utilize the most recent planning assumptions considering local general plans and other factors.” (Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B).)

- **Issue: Feasibility of the Draft Plan**

Response: *Plan Bay Area is ambitious. The Plan’s growth distribution meets our regional Greenhouse Gas Emissions reduction target by building upon recent and projected trends toward a wider range of housing options in places with local services and transit. This will require resources—some of which are included in the Draft Plan, such as the One Bay Area Grant—and others that the regional agencies will work in concert with local jurisdictions to obtain. Chapter 6 of the Draft Plan (“A Plan to Build On”) addresses policy changes and legislative actions that can help support implementation.*

To help assess the near-term feasibility of the growth pattern in the Draft Plan and identify additional implementation actions, an assessment of a representative sample of PDAs from throughout the region by consultants at Economic and Planning Systems (EPS) deeply familiar with the market characteristics of each jurisdiction in the Bay Area. Overall, the study concluded that the proposed development pattern contained in the preferred scenario, while ambitious, represents an achievable level of growth with sufficient policy changes, some of which are now underway or currently being examined. The study also found that it is not at all certain that non-PDA areas are more “ready” for significantly more growth than has been allocated to them under Plan Bay Area.

5. Infrastructure and Public Services

- **Issue: Potential growth constraints due to infrastructure and public facilities capacity**

***Response:** The Plan Bay Area Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) includes an assessment of the capacity of existing and planned public services to meet the projected growth in the Plan and the EIR alternatives. Utilities, park districts, school districts, and other service providers are responsible for the provision of these services. MTC and ABAG coordinated with these service providers to assess existing and future capacity. Where necessary, the DEIR identifies mitigations, or actions necessary to address the impact of the Plan on services. For more information, see chapters 2.8, 2.12, and 2.14 of the DEIR.*

The proposed Plan assumes an increase in public service facilities and infrastructure as the population increases. Public services are regulated by local jurisdictions, which often have differing goals, standards, and policies related to the provision of public services. The impacts on public services are likely to vary, with locations experiencing more growth probably requiring additional services.

As stated in the DEIR chapter on Public Services, a detailed assessment of local needs is infeasible at the regional scale. However, the demand for services and their costs are also addressed in Plan Bay Area in several additional ways:

- *First, the compact growth pattern in Plan Bay Area should allow jurisdictions to leverage existing facilities and absorb some of the increased demand with facilities that are currently underutilized. Overall, the higher density of new growth in the region should limit the number of new facilities needed to maintain adequate levels of service, since more residents will have access to these services within the same service area. At the same time, the higher density of new growth will reduce per capita costs to construct and maintain any new facilities that are built. A recent survey of 17 municipalities nationwide found that compact mixed-use development costs one-third less for upfront infrastructure, saves an average of 10 percent on ongoing delivery of services, and generates 10 times more tax revenue per acre than conventional suburban development.³ However, depending on the growth and housing patterns, some school, library, and recreation facilities may become overused. In these cases, implementation of the proposed Plan would require additional facilities to ensure acceptable levels of service.*
- *Second, the regional employment forecast region projects 439,000 new Health, Educational, and Recreational Services jobs and accounts for the new facilities needed to accommodate them. These positions reflect the development needed to accommodate necessary increases in public service facilities. Increases in these sectors occur in every county, with San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Alameda counties forecast to continue to*

³ Building Better Budgets: A National Examination of the Fiscal Benefits of Smart Growth Development, Smart Growth America, May 2013, available at <http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/documents/building-better-budgets.pdf>

have the greatest share of these types of jobs and see the largest increase in total numbers, consistent with the largest increases in total population.

- *Funding for services such as police and fire services, libraries, and recreation facilities will be locally determined, as service standards, performance measures, and policies are typically set by local jurisdictions and agencies. For schools, standards relating to class size are primarily determined at the state level, although local school districts are responsible for the planning and construction of school facilities. Per state funding formulas, schools do receive funding on a per pupil basis. Under California Government Code Section 65995, cities and counties may charge developer impact fees to cover the additional costs of impacts to schools. Developer agreements can also support other community benefits, such as parks and libraries.*

6. Public Health

- **Issue: Potential health impacts of infill development**

***Response:** Plan Bay Area’s growth distribution focuses on infill development with easy access to transit, jobs, and other amenities. This kind of development can reduce average vehicle miles traveled by household by as much as 60 percent compared to traditional suburban developments. Other advantages of compact infill development include preservation of open space and green landscapes that can absorb excess greenhouse gases from the atmosphere. By creating more walkable communities, compact development can also help reduce obesity and diabetes.*

One indirect consequence of infill development, however, is the potential that people living near major freeways, ports, distribution centers or gas stations are disproportionately exposed to higher concentrations of pollutants present in local sources of toxic air contaminants (TAC) and particulate matter (PM).

This increased exposure puts people at a greater health risk and in a way stands at odds with the direct health benefits of compact infill development discussed above. However, as noted in Plan Bay Area, there are effective ways to plan for compact infill development that both protect public health and reduce greenhouse gases.

To accomplish this, regional agencies are collaborating with local jurisdictions to identify a comprehensive set of best practices to lessen or mitigate the potential health risks for developments in areas with high sources of air pollutants. Measures to reduce exposure to emissions include building and site design considerations, installing air filtration features in heating and ventilation systems, and planting trees.

Ultimately, Plan Bay Area’s regional goal of focused growth offers significant health advantages. And in places where the development is close to significant emissions sources, the disproportionate health impacts can also be mitigated, effectively advancing overall positive public health results.



TO: MTC Planning Committee, ABAG Administrative Committee DATE: June 7, 2013

FR: Executive Director, MTC
Executive Director, ABAG

RE: Draft Plan Bay Area – Key Issues and Preliminary Recommendations

MTC/ABAG received a large volume of written comments from public agencies, stakeholder organizations, and members of the public during the comment period for Draft Plan Bay Area in addition to oral comments received at public hearings. This memo provides staff’s recommendations for: (1) potential revisions to the Draft Plan in advance of the adoption of the Final Plan and Final EIR on July 18, 2013 and (2) Plan implementation-related issues identified in the comment period that staff believes would serve to advance successful implementation of Plan Bay Area. Staff is seeking committee direction on these recommendations.

Cap and Trade Revenue in the Investment Strategy

The Draft Plan does not account for revenue from Cap and Trade that the region may be granted to administer by the Legislature. These revenues will be available starting in 2015 and the program is currently set to expire in 2020. State legislation has not yet been enacted to establish a framework for how these funds will be administered by state and regional agencies and what types of projects would be eligible. However, AB 574 (Lowenthal) includes eligible uses for transportation and affordable transit-oriented development consistent with the investment strategies proposed in the Draft Plan Bay Area. Staff recommends that the Plan revenue estimates be revised to include \$120 million per year over the life of the Plan, for a total of \$3.1 billion. This estimate assumes that the program will be extended after 2020, similar to the Plan’s assumption that existing county sales tax measures will be extended by voters before they expire.

Corrections/Clarifications

In some cases, comments about Draft Plan Bay Area encompass information and statements regarding the purpose and intent of the Plan and/or implementing authority of MTC/ABAG that require clarification prior to discussion about potential changes to the Plan:

Statement: “Plan Bay Area usurps local land-use authority”

Correction: Per Senate Bill 375, “Nothing in a Sustainable Communities Strategy shall be interpreted as superseding the exercise of the land use authorities within the region.” Plan Bay Area does not regulate local land use authority or preclude a local jurisdiction from planning or approving growth that is different than the level or location of growth described in the Plan.

Statement: *“All transportation funding is being shifted to the urban core because of the Plan”*

Correction: In Plan Bay Area, MTC continues its long-standing Fix-It-First Policy by dedicating 88% of the plan’s \$289 billion in funding to maintaining the region’s existing transportation system across our urban, suburban, and rural communities. The vast majority of these maintenance funds flow by formula or long-established policy to the region’s transit operators and local governments, which is unaffected by any changes in Plan Bay Area. The Draft Plan invests 5% of total revenue (\$14.6 billion) in the new One Bay Area Grant Program which supports focused growth by requiring that 70% (Central and South Bay) or 50% (North Bay) of program funding is invested in or proximate to Priority Development Areas.

Statement: *“The Draft Plan puts 95% of housing growth into 15 cities with PDAs”*

Correction: The Draft Plan directs 64% of housing growth to the region’s top 15 employment centers. The Draft Plan directs 62% of housing growth to the region’s 15 largest cities.

Statement: *“The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) does not adequately address the impacts of individual projects.”*

Correction: Any transportation project or development proposal in the region will face more public review and, if applicable, will be subject to additional project-level CEQA review before being approved at the local level. The Plan’s EIR is a programmatic review of the plan itself.

Statement: *“The EEJ scenario significantly outperforms the Draft Plan.”*

Correction: CEQA requires lead agencies to identify the environmentally superior alternative. The EEJ alternative developed as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Report was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative, predominantly due to slightly greater Greenhouse Gas (GHG) and Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) emission reductions than the proposed project, the Draft Plan. However the overall differences in environmental impacts are minimal at the regional scale and in some respects the proposed Plan performs better than the EEJ alternative.

Statement: *“The Plan should focus on technological advancements that result in more sweeping reductions in greenhouse gas emissions than land-use changes and public transit that people do not want.”*

Correction: SB375 calls for the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of Regional Transportation Plans in California to reduce per capita greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks through integrated land use and transportation planning and to identify locations for a region’s future housing growth. The purpose of the SCS is to provide a tool for regional governing bodies, such as MTC and ABAG, to meet CARB’s GHG reduction targets specific to the land use and transportation planning sector. The land use and transportation planning sector accounts for a small portion of overall Scoping Plan GHG reductions, but it is still an important contribution to the State’s GHG emissions reduction efforts and is entirely separate and

in addition to other Scoping Plan measures, such as vehicle efficiency and clean fuel technologies. In meeting GHG emissions reduction targets for the land use and transportation sectors, MTC and ABAG must follow CARB direction to exclude regulation-driven changes to vehicle fuels and performance from our modeling in meeting SB375 emission targets. The plan does support and assume technology changes and other advancements to reduce green gas emissions within the requirements of the law.

Key Issues and Policy Alternatives

A number of key issues and policy alternatives were identified and highlighted by various entities and individuals during the Draft Plan Bay Area comment period. Staff has prepared analysis and developed recommendations about the following issues for your consideration, as outlined in Attachments A-F:

- Regional Population and Housing Forecast (Attachment A)
- Housing Redistribution to Suburban Locations (Attachment B)
- Affordable Housing (Attachment C)
- Reducing Potential Risk of Displacement (Attachment D)
- Transportation Investments (Attachment E)
- Regional Express Lanes Network (Attachment F)

Additional Initiatives and Priorities for Plan Implementation

A number of implementing agencies or organizations identified priorities as we work together to advance the implementation of Plan Bay Area. Some of these issues to be explored further are already identified in the Draft Plan, such as sea level rise, climate adaptation, and earthquake and hazards resiliency. However, the comments also identified new implementation issues that were not directly addressed in the Draft Plan. Staff recommends that the following key initiatives and policy-related efforts be added to the final Plan Bay Area as key areas for additional work by ABAG and MTC. That work will permit these issues to be considered more fully in the 2017 update of Plan Bay Area.


- 1 Goods Movement and Industrial Lands: The movement of freight and the protection of production and distribution facilities has important environmental, economic and equity implications for the region. Building on MTC's *Regional Goods Movement Study* and related land use analysis, MTC/ABAG will evaluate the needs related to the development, storage and movement of goods through our region and identify essential industrial areas to support the region's economic vitality. This issue will also be considered as part of MTC's participation in the update of the State of California's freight and rail plans and as MTC/ABAG prepare for the update of Plan Bay Area.
- 2 Inter-Regional Coordination: The nine-county Bay Area is closely connected with its adjacent counties and metropolitan areas through issues such as inter-regional commuting, housing needs, and job access. To advance the goals of Plan Bay Area and ensure that the region is planning efficiently with adjacent regions, MTC/ABAG staff propose to advance coordinated planning and modeling efforts with MPOs in key

neighboring counties, particularly SJCOG (San Joaquin), SACOG (Sacramento), and AMBAG (Monterey/Santa Cruz).

- 3 State of the Region Report: Plan Bay Area is a performance-based plan. MTC has long tracked the state of the region's transportation system, while ABAG has monitored housing growth and development. In 2015 at the mid-point between release of the first Plan Bay Area in July 2013 and the update of the Plan in 2017, MTC/ABAG staff propose to release a State of the Region Report that examines a variety of relevant issues directly related to Plan Bay Area and more broadly to quality of life in the region.
- 4 Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program Expansion and Refinement: MTC/ABAG will expand and refine the PCA program to strengthen regional coordination around open space preservation and maximize the impact of available funding. This will involve defining the role of different kinds of PCAs in supporting agriculture, recreation, habitat, and other ecological functions and using this analysis to seek additional funding for PCA conservation efforts.
- 5 Integration of Economic Development into Regional Planning: MTC/ABAG will consider relevant findings from the Regional Prosperity Plan, and the Bay Area Business Coalition-led economic development strategy to craft policies for the update of Plan Bay Area. This will include both worker-based strategies for career pathways, model land use guidelines for growing industries, and place-based strategies to support the growth of different kinds of Priority Development Areas, including small towns, mixed use corridors and existing office parks.
- 6 Local Project Consistency with Plan Bay Area: To provide greater clarity to local jurisdictions and other stakeholders about the process for utilizing the environmental review provisions of SB375 and CEQA streamlining provisions for infill projects, per SB226, MTC/ABAG will prepare guidance for local municipalities to determine the consistency of projects with the plan and ensure that SB375 CEQA streamlining provisions are readily available to local jurisdictions.
- 7 Regional Planning: As outlined in SB792 (DeSaulnier), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) should join with MTC and ABAG in preparing and adopting the 2017 update of Plan Bay Area with the Air District taking the lead on planning issues related to criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants. Likewise, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) should join its three regional agency partners in preparing and adopting the update Plan by taking the lead on planning issues related to sea level rise and adaptation to climate change.



Steve Heminger



Ezra Rapport

J:\COMMITTE\Planning Committee\2013\June\5b From T drive\FINAL_PBA_Potential_Revisions_060713.kkdocx.docx

Attachment A

Key Issue/Policy: Regional Population and Housing Forecast

Issue Area: A number of organizations and local jurisdictions have suggested that the population and housing projection in the Draft Plan be either increased or decreased. This stems from concerns about the validity of the methodology used to create the forecast on the part of some jurisdictions and members of the public, and about the adequacy of the forecast's projection of housing growth to meet the region's long-term housing needs on the part of some developers and housing advocates.

Key Considerations: The population and housing forecast included in the plan has undergone significant scrutiny and has been validated by the California Departments of Finance (DOF) and Housing and Community Development (HCD). The methodology used to create the forecast starts with projected regional job growth, which is the main determinant of ABAG's regional population and housing growth forecast—consistent with other major regional forecast models in California and the models used by the three major national economic forecasting firms.

Forecasted job growth to 2040 is estimated as a share of U.S. projected job growth, based on an assessment of regional competitiveness by major industry sector. The Bay Area's strength in industry sectors that are expected to grow, such as professional services and information, results in a higher rate of projected job growth than the rate for the nation as a whole. While the expected economic growth by 2040 is lower than in previous decades, it still reflects a healthy regional economy. During the economic recovery over the past two years, the region has experienced employment growth at a faster rate than the Plan forecast.

Population growth is projected in terms of natural increases from births and deaths and migration into the region. The ABAG forecast uses California Department of Finance (DOF) fertility and mortality assumptions to determine the amount of natural increase in the population to develop a population profile. Migration, rather than being tied to recent trends, is forecasted as a function of job growth. From population growth, a forecast of households and housing units is developed. The final forecast incorporates all of these factors, as well as assumed availability of funding to support affordable housing.

This regional forecast was used as the basis for developing the employment and housing growth pattern adopted by the MTC and the ABAG Executive Board in May 2012 as the Preferred Alternative and included in the Draft Plan. Changes in the regional forecasts that occurred prior to the selection of the Preferred Alternative reflected changing data regarding national, state, and regional demographic and economic conditions, most notably the sustained economic recession.

The population projections incorporate the most recent data and trends, and were developed through sound methodology in collaboration with DOF and HCD. Plan Bay Area and its related forecast will be updated every four years.

Recommendation:

1. Retain the population and housing forecast utilized in the Draft Plan.

Attachment B

Key Issue/Policy: Housing Redistribution to Suburban Locations

Issue Area: Housing advocates, developers, and some stakeholders raised concerns about the concentration of future housing production in core urban areas in the Plan. From one perspective some argue that, the Plan does not provide enough low and moderate income housing in locations with strong job and transit access and high quality amenities including schools. From another, the Plan does not distribute enough housing, including market rate housing to greenfield suburban locations with untapped development potential that can help meet the region’s future demand. These questions have led some entities to question the “feasibility” of the Draft Plan.

Key Considerations: The distribution of housing in the Draft Plan was adopted in May 2012 by the ABAG Executive Board and the Commission as the Preferred Alternative. This followed extensive consultation with local jurisdictions, stakeholders, and the general public. The Draft Plan’s housing distribution identifies the locations that can accommodate future growth, including the scale and type of growth most appropriate for different types of locations. It provides a more focused growth pattern for the region than historic trends, identifies locations for future housing growth while recognizing the unique characteristics of the Bay Area’s communities. Relative to the assertion that the Draft Plan’s land-use pattern is not feasible, the consultant team responsible for the PDA Readiness Assessment that was developed to evaluate the distribution of future growth in PDAs believe that the Draft Plan’s growth allocations represent an achievable, if not easy, outcome consistent with the scope and purpose of a comprehensive regional plan. The team also has stated that in their opinion, it is not at all certain that non-PDA areas are more “ready” for significantly more growth than has been allocated to them under Plan Bay Area.

Shifting the distribution of housing growth in the Plan to more suburban locations would have ripple effects across the region. In addition to increasing the number of housing units distributed to suburban communities without any prior consultation, it would create major distribution changes in other jurisdictions. In the case of shifting low and moderate income housing to job and transit rich suburbs, it would also likely require a dramatic increase in housing subsidies for which no funding source has been identified. Redistributing housing to greenfield suburban locations would likely increase pressure on open space, and create a host of other environmental impacts. Redistributing housing to suburban locations also conflicts with SB 375’s requirement to “utilize the most recent planning assumptions considering local general plans and other factors.” (Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B).)

Recommendation:

1. Retain the housing distribution in the Draft Plan.

Attachment C

Key Issue/Policy: Affordable Housing

Issue Area: A large number of comments on the draft Plan Bay Area cite concerns about the lack of financial support for affordable housing. Given today's soaring housing costs, housing production costs in the Bay Area, and the complexity of developing housing in locations near transit, additional resources are needed to facilitate the preservation of currently affordable housing and the construction of new affordable homes in the future. The loss of redevelopment funding combined with reduced funding levels at the state and federal level leaves a structural financing gap of at least 10-20% on most affordable housing projects in the region after accounting for typical equity investments from banks, local trusts and fees, and other lenders.

The success of Plan Bay Area implementation hinges on increasing the availability of affordable housing. Production of affordable housing and community stability have been raised as critical issues to retain and improve the quality of life of existing neighborhoods, accommodate future growth, and address the labor needs of our business community.

Key Considerations: For the 1999-2006 Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) period, the region produced 44% of its Very Low and 75% of its Low Income housing units needed, leaving approximately 23,000 very low and low income units un-built. The current RHNA period includes 78,000 very low and low income units. Production is again expected to fall short of the region's needs unless new funding sources and strategies are identified. Also, a substantial amount of otherwise affordable housing is in need of rehabilitation.

The Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) Fund established with \$10 million from MTC created a \$50 million fund by leveraging investments from banks (Citi and Morgan Stanley), community development financial institutions (CDFIs), two community foundations, and two national foundations. An additional investment of \$10 million set to take place in late 2013 will grow the fund to at least \$90 million, a leverage of 3:1 on this second investment.

Funding for the production and rehabilitation of affordable housing will require local planning and entitlement processes that support this effort. Coordination with Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) as well as the provision of incentives for local jurisdictions will be essential. Priority Development Areas (PDAs) provide a policy framework that can support investments in disadvantaged communities as well as encourage housing production in communities with access to employment and educational opportunities based on regional and local collaboration.

CMAs are providing a new level of support through their PDA Investment and Growth Strategy reports. Most CMAs already have compiled an inventory of affordable housing and displacement policies by local jurisdictions.

Recommendation:

1. Reserve \$600 million over the life of the Plan from Cap and Trade revenues to a regional affordable housing fund. Based on the experience with TOAH and local jurisdictions' contributions to affordable housing production and preservation, this \$600 million can be leveraged to a large degree to support the creation and rehabilitation of affordable housing units. The fund can support the preservation of currently affordable units and assist with the development of new affordable units. The specific provisions and identification of partners in the fund and leveraging opportunities will be determined following adoption of Plan Bay Area.
2. Continue the use of Regional PDA Planning funds to facilitate the entitlement of affordable housing in transit corridors.

Attachment D

Key Issue/Policy: Reducing Potential Risk of Displacement

Issue Area: Cities, housing organizations and individuals have raised concerns about the potential for involuntary renter displacement associated with the transit oriented growth pattern in Plan Bay Area, especially in the region's low and moderate income neighborhoods. While cities have actively supported planning and funding for PDAs, investments in neighborhoods with transit access and urban amenities may increase rents and result in a net loss of unrestricted affordable housing. At the same time, low-income neighborhoods are in need of investments and increasing income diversity that can support a broader range of services and amenities as well as provide economic mobility.

Key Considerations: The Plan's goal is to house the region's current and future population without displacement. The Plan's sustainability strategy is to increase affordable housing near transit. The Plan has assessed the potential risk of displacement by location based on areas of major growth where people pay more than half of their income in rent. This includes approximately 30,000 households or about 1 percent of the total Bay Area households. Displacement risk does not affect all or even the majority of PDAs. However, the effectiveness of the Plan relies on the social, cultural and economic vitality of our existing neighborhoods, which could be disrupted through displacement.

Displacement risk can be primarily addressed by increasing resources for the creation and preservation of affordable housing (as described in Attachment C "Affordable Housing") and improving economic opportunities for current residents.

To ensure that growth and investments support vertical mobility for existing residents rather than horizontal displacement, the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program provides a framework for local government and Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to adopt appropriate neighborhood stabilization and affordable housing policies through the OBAG-related Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategies. The success of this effort will require monitoring and appropriate revisions as well as the development of additional regional initiatives. These initiatives will need to recognize the unique qualities of each neighborhood and the need for policy interventions that are locally defined.

In March 2012, MTC and ABAG launched the HUD-funded Bay Area Regional Prosperity Plan. The Prosperity Plan is envisioned as an implementation component of Plan Bay Area. The Prosperity Plan's Housing Initiative will support capacity-building and knowledge sharing, community-response, policy and tool development, and funding analysis activities across the region to address the potential risk of displacement of low- and moderate income households.

Recommendation:

1. Target neighborhood stabilization investments, including housing rehabilitation, small site acquisition and land banking, in the allocation of projects funded by the Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) fund. All of these uses are currently eligible for funding.
2. Based on local input gathered in the CMA's Investment and Growth Strategies and ABAG's housing development and policies inventory over the next 24 months, ABAG/MTC will provide a menu of affordable housing and anti-displacement policies for consideration in the next round of One Bay Area Grant funding. This strategy will provide the flexibility to address unique local conditions as well as incentives for local jurisdictions to guide and direct resources to affordable housing production.
3. Consider implementing and funding best practices with regard to neighborhood stabilization and anti-displacement efforts that emerge from research projects funded by the HUD Regional Prosperity Grant

Attachment E

Key Issue/ Policy: Transportation Investments

Issue: A large number of comments addressed the level of investment for public transit and local streets and roads. Many stakeholder organizations and individuals requested more funding for transit, specifically funding for local bus operations and youth bus passes. In addition, letters from several agencies flagged the need to address the remaining unfunded transit capital needs. Many others questioned the cost-effectiveness of additional transit services and emphasized the importance of maintaining the existing infrastructure, both transit and streets and roads. Others called for a larger investment in the region's road network to better maintain the roads and expand them, alongside comments from many stakeholder organizations critical of roadway expansion.

Key Considerations: After accounting for the transit and local road investment proposed in the Draft Plan, the region faces a \$17 billion transit capital shortfall and a \$20 billion shortfall in local street and road rehabilitation needed to achieve the Plan's adopted performance targets for this critical infrastructure. The Draft Plan fully funds the operating shortfalls of the existing transit system but also recognizes the importance of controlling costs, improving service and attracting new riders. The Transit Sustainability Project seeks a five percent drop in operating costs by 2018, and then indexes those costs to inflation. The Draft Plan also assumes an investment of \$500 million over the Plan period to support infrastructure improvements in ridership and service productivity.

Cap and Trade revenues will be available starting in 2015 and staff is recommending that the Plan revenues be increased to reflect a total of \$3.1 billion from this revenue source through 2040. After accounting for an investment of \$600 million of these funds for transit-oriented affordable housing (see Attachment C), the balance of funds totals \$2.5 billion.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the balance of Cap and Trade revenues (\$2.5 billion) be reserved for transit operating and capital rehabilitation/replacement, and for local street and road rehabilitation, consistent with the focused land use strategy outlined in Plan Bay Area. The share of funds reserved for these purposes, the specific project sponsors, and investment requirements (i.e., consistency with the goals of Transit Sustainability Project and complete streets elements, etc.) would be subject to further deliberation and public outreach following adoption of Plan Bay Area.

Key Issue/Policy: Regional Express Lanes Network

Issues Area: The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Plan Bay Area included three versions of the Regional Express Lanes Network (see attached map).

1. **Regional Express Lanes Network:** The Draft Plan includes a Regional Express Lane Network of approximately 350 miles that aims to close gaps within the existing high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane system on I-80, I-880, I-580 and I-680 to increase travel time savings and reliability for carpools and buses in those corridors. The Express Lanes Network converts existing carpool lanes to express lanes and uses the revenue generated to finance completion of the carpool/express lane system.
2. **Reduced Scope Express Lanes Network:** A Reduced Scope Express Lanes Network, as evaluated in Alternative 3 of the DEIR, includes HOV lane conversions and HOV lane gap closures in the inner Bay Area for a total of approximately 300 miles. This alternative removes the proposed expansion express lanes on I-580 and I-80 at the outer edges of the Bay Area (shown in red on the attached map).
3. **Committed Express Lanes Only:** Alternative 5 of the DEIR includes only Committed Express Lanes. This alternative removes express lanes on I-80, I-880 and portions of I-680 and I-580. It includes only the existing express lane on I-680 and express lanes on I-580 east of Livermore for a total of approximately 40 miles.

We received a significant number of comments requesting changes to the Regional Express Lanes Network, as defined in the draft Plan. The requests include:

- Limit Express Lanes Network to only include segments that are conversions of existing HOV lanes.
- Include expansion express lanes (those segments where no HOV lane currently exists) only if they are conversions of a general purpose lane to an Express Lane.
- Modify the network approach to allow toll revenue to fund expanded transit operations and other non-single occupant transportation choices in each corridor concurrent with the opening of each new express lane.
- Ensure low income families receive an equitable share of the benefits of express lanes.

Key Considerations: Closing the gaps in the HOV network is a critical aspect of the express lanes strategy because of the benefit provided to carpools and express bus services in the affected corridors. While state and federal laws do not currently allow conversion of an existing general purpose lane to an express lane, there is no prohibition on studying this approach. Plan Bay Area already reflects a significant regional commitment to funding transit operations and maintenance as well as expansion. In addition, as described in Attachment E, staff is recommending additional revenue for transit investments.

Data from other regions, including Minneapolis, San Diego, Orange County and Seattle, indicates that low-income travelers use express lanes and value having the choice to use them.

This finding is reinforced by initial outreach to low-income travelers in the Bay Area.¹ Implementation of the Regional Express Lanes Network will include project-level environmental clearance that will comply with all applicable requirements for environmental justice analysis. In addition, focused outreach will be conducted with low income communities as part of the Express Lanes network roll out.

Recommendation:

1. Continue to include the full Regional Express Lanes Network in the Final Plan
2. MTC/BAIFA should study the potential benefits and impacts of converting general purpose lanes to Express Lanes in order to inform implementation of the express lanes network and future long-range plans.

¹ Staff presentation to the MTC Policy Advisory Council, March 13, 2013.
http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/meeting_packet_documents/agenda_2008/5_Express_Lanes.pdf

Attachment F-a



YEAR 2040 PROPOSED EXPRESS LANE NETWORKS

[Blank Page]



Date: June 20, 2013
To: ABAG Executive Board
From: Ezra Rapport, Executive Director, ABAG
Subject: **Consistency of Local Projects with Plan Bay Area**

Summary:

After adoption of Plan Bay Area (Plan) and certification of the programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Plan, cities and counties will have options for making the development entitlement process more efficient, utilizing provisions of SB 375 and SB 226.¹ To activate these provisions, and potentially provisions included in future legislation, the regional agencies can adopt language in the Plan and EIR that will allow for certain development in PDAs to be considered consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

On May 16, 2013, the ABAG Executive Board authorized staff to develop the appropriate language for action by the Executive Board and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Based on such consultation staff recommends that we and MTC work jointly to prepare the findings necessary to support a regional consistency finding for CEQA.

Some State programs require a determination from regional agencies that a project is consistent with an adopted regional plan. Staff recommends that it work with MTC staff on recommendations for criteria for making such a determination for adoption by ABAG and MTC at the joint meeting on July 18.

Background and Discussion:

A. CEQA:

As required by SB 375, ABAG and MTC have prepared the Draft Plan and a programmatic Draft EIR (DEIR) for the Plan. The land use component of the Draft Plan Bay Area is based on the Priority Development Areas nominated by local jurisdictions and approved by ABAG. Each PDA includes a specified range of residential uses based upon density and for commercial and office uses based on intensity, along with a place type designation that coordinates these uses and ensures the development of complete communities. The Plan Bay Area Draft EIR has analyzed, at the regional level, the environmental impacts of a PDA's designated densities, intensities, land uses and place type.

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the final adopted programmatic EIR for the Plan can be used by cities and counties to (a) exempt a local project that meets criteria related to density, transit proximity and, in some cases, mitigation and community benefits, from preparing an

¹ SB375 and SB226 provide identical language defining project consistency with a SCS or APS: "consistent with the general use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy" (CA PRC 21155(a); CA PRC Section 6, 21094.5(c)(1)(4);

Consistency of Local Projects with Plan Bay Area

June 14, 2013

2

environmental impact report; (b) allow a local project that meets similar criteria and provides mitigations necessitated by additional environmental impacts, to use a Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (SCEA); or (c) allow the EIR for a local project to tier off the EIR for the Plan. A local project benefits from using a SCEA or from tiering because the entitlement process becomes more efficient by drawing on the analysis from the EIR for the Plan. In addition, there is a tougher threshold for a legal challenge to the SCEA.

Cities and counties may exempt a local project, use a SCEA or tier off the EIR for the Plan only if the local project is consistent with the Plan. In theory, the determination of consistency can be made at the local or regional level. Staff believes that a process with both a regional and local component could provide clear criteria based upon the characteristics of the PDAs in the Plan while also allowing local flexibility. This would not require changes to local zoning, general plans, or other land use policies.

The Plan projects growth in areas outside of PDAs. However, unlike the PDAs, these areas do not have an associated range of densities or intensities, or place type. Therefore, staff proposes that ABAG and MTC not make any regional determination of consistency for non-PDA areas.

B. Other State Programs:

ABAG expects that access to some State resources and programs will be conditioned, in part, on a determination that a proposed local project is consistent with a regional plan. One example is the Infill Infrastructure Grant Program (IIG) conducted by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). ABAG and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) have jointly responded to past requests from projects applying for IIG funding and provided the requisite determination for projects located within PDAs. Applications for the current round of IIG funding are due on July 31.


Staff proposes working with MTC staff to prepare an analysis of the criteria for how such determinations should be made in the future and recommendations for Executive Board and MTC action on July 18.

Recommended Action:

A. Direct staff to develop the findings necessary to support action by the Executive Board and the Commission determining that for CEQA purposes, future local projects are consistent with Plan Bay Area if the project:

- is located within a PDA that is in the Plan,
- has the same range of densities and intensities of the place type designation of the PDA,
- has uses specified for the place type designation of that PDA, and
- is determined by the local jurisdiction to be consistent with Plan Bay Area.

B. Direct staff to prepare an analysis of how such determinations should be made in the future and recommendations for Executive Board and Commission Action on July 18.



Date: June 18, 2013

To: Executive Board

From: Brad Paul
Deputy Executive Director

Subject: **General Assembly Delegate Engagement Strategy**

At its annual retreat in February, ABAG's Administrative Committee requested that staff explore more intentional ways to engage ABAG delegates. In order to do that, we propose canceling the Fall General Assembly and substituting a series of conversations with local delegates at the county level to talk about this issue.

As we begin implementing Plan Bay Area, these discussions would also allow us to hear from our delegates regarding what they feel they need from us to succeed. Before taking this action we wanted to get your feedback and ask whether you thought one of these delegate meetings should be held your county. Once we've carried out a number of these meetings we will report back to the Administrative Committee with our recommendations.

We should also note that staff is also working with Kaiser to put on a half day Community Health Forum on September 12th for public officials and staff from local jurisdictions.

Action

Cancel the Fall General Assembly this year to be substituted by a series of meetings with General Assembly delegates at the county level to explore ways to develop an engagement strategy.

[Blank Page]

PRESIDENT	Supervisor Mark Luce, County of Napa
VICE PRESIDENT	Mayor Julie Pierce, City of Clayton
IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT	Mayor Mark Green, City of Union City
SECRETARY-TREASURER	Ezra Rapport
LEGAL COUNSEL	Kenneth K. Moy

County of	Representative	Alternate
ALAMEDA	** Supervisor Richard Valle	Supervisor Keith Carson
ALAMEDA	** Supervisor Scott Haggerty	Supervisor Nathan Miley
CONTRA COSTA	* Supervisor Karen Mitchoff	Supervisor Candace Andersen
CONTRA COSTA	* Supervisor John Gioia	Supervisor Mary Piepho
MARIN	** Supervisor Katie Rice	Supervisor Susan L. Adams
NAPA	** Supervisor Mark Luce	Supervisor Bill Dodd
SAN FRANCISCO	** Supervisor Eric Mar	To Be Appointed
SAN FRANCISCO	** Supervisor Malia Cohen	To Be Appointed
SAN MATEO	* Supervisor Warren Slocum	To Be Appointed
SAN MATEO	* Supervisor Dave Pine	To Be Appointed
SANTA CLARA	** Supervisor Mike Wasserman	To Be Appointed
SANTA CLARA	** Supervisor David Cortese	Supervisor Joe Simitian
SOLANO	* Supervisor Linda Seifert	Supervisor Erin Hannigan
SONOMA	* Supervisor David Rabbitt	Supervisor Susan Gorin


Cities in the County of	Representative	Alternate
ALAMEDA	* Mayor Bill Harrison (Fremont)	Mayor Michael Sweeney (Hayward)
ALAMEDA	* Jerry Thorne (Pleasanton)	Mayor Marie Gilmore (Alameda)
CONTRA COSTA	** Mayor Julie Pierce (Clayton)	Councilmember Brandt Andersson (Lafayette)
CONTRA COSTA	** Vice Mayor Dave Hudson (San Ramon)	Councilmember Ben Johnson (Pittsburg)
MARIN	* Mayor Pat Eklund (Novato)	Vice Mayor Daniel Hillmer (Larkspur)
NAPA	* Mayor Leon Garcia (American Canyon)	Mayor Ann Nevero (St. Helena)
CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO	* Mayor Edwin Lee	Jeff Buckley, Senior Advisor
CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO	* Jason Elliott, Dir, Legislative/Government Affairs	Kelly Pretzer, Dep Dir, Legislative/Gov Affairs
CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO	* Joaquin Torres, Dir, Economic/Workforce Dev	Gillian Gillett, Dir, Transportation Policy
SAN MATEO	** Mayor Pedro Gonzalez (S San Francisco)	To Be Appointed
SAN MATEO	** Vice Mayor Richard Garbarino (S San Francisco)	To Be Appointed
SANTA CLARA	* Councilmember Joe Pirzynski (Los Gatos)	Councilmember Gilbert Wong (Cupertino)
SANTA CLARA	* Councilmember Ronit Bryant (Mountain View)	Mayor Greg Scharff (Palo Alto)
SOLANO	** Mayor Harry Price (Fairfield)	Mayor Jack Batchelor (Dixon)
SONOMA	** Councilmember Jake Mackenzie (Rohnert Park)	To Be Appointed
CITY OF OAKLAND	* Mayor Jean Quan	Councilmember Lynnette Gibson McElhaney
CITY OF OAKLAND	* Councilmember Libby Schaaf	Councilmember Dan Kalb
CITY OF OAKLAND	* Councilmember Desley Brooks	To Be Appointed
CITY OF SAN JOSE	* Councilmember Sam Liccardo	Councilmember Rose Herrera
CITY OF SAN JOSE	* Councilmember Kansen Chu	Councilmember Donald Rocha
CITY OF SAN JOSE	* Councilmember Ash Kalra	Mayor Chuck Reed

Advisory Members	Representative	Alternate
RWQCB	William Kissinger	Terry Young

* Term of Appointment: July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2014

** Term of Appointment: July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2013

[Blank Page]



ABAG

Meeting Schedule 2013

Executive Board Meetings

January 17

March 21

May 16

June 20 – Special Meeting

July 18

Time: To Be Determined

Joint Meeting with Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Oakland Convention Center—West Hall

1001 Broadway, Oakland

September 19

November 21

START TIME:

7:00 PM

LOCATION:

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter Auditorium

101 8th Street

Oakland, California 94607

Across from the Lake Merritt BART Station

Spring General Assembly

April 18

98 Broadway—Pavilion

(Old Barnes and Noble Site)

Jack London Square

Oakland

Fall General Assembly

October 24

San Francisco

[Blank Page]