

Planning Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

October 20, 2016 – 9:30 a.m.

Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Administrative
 - 3.1. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items- ACTION
 - 3.2. Review Meeting Notes from September 15, 2016* – ACTION
4. Policies related to medical cannabis – County information available here [on the website: http://sonomacounty.ca.gov/CAO/Cannabis/Proposed-Cannabis-Ordinance/](http://sonomacounty.ca.gov/CAO/Cannabis/Proposed-Cannabis-Ordinance/) - and from the City of Santa Rosa [Srcity.org/cannabis](http://srcity.org/cannabis) materials to be handed out at meeting - INFORMATION
5. Regional Government
 - 5.1. One Bay Area Grant land use requirements* - ACTION
 - 5.2. Plan Bay Area – Draft Preferred Scenario update* - INFORMATION
6. Climate Action 2020 – update – INFORMATION
7. Sonoma Clean Power considers customer incentives for electric vehicles and charging equipment – <https://sonomacleanpower.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/2016.10.13-SCPA-BOD-Packet-reduced-pdf.pdf> - INFORMATION
8. Round table members discussion
9. Other Business /Next agenda
10. Adjourn

*Attachment

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held **November 14, 2016**
The next **PAC** meeting will be held **November 17, 2016**

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternate format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact SCTA/RCPA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Transit-Technical Advisory Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours.

Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system. TO REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS: Please consider carpooling or taking transit to this meeting. For more information check www.511.org, www.srcity.org/citybus, www.sctransit.com or <https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay>

PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Meeting Notes of September 15, 2016

Rolling Six-Month Attendance:	December 2015 (November 2015 meeting cancelled)	February	March	April	June (May meeting cancelled)	September (July meeting cancelled)
Jurisdiction						
Cloverdale						
Cotati			X			
County of Sonoma PRMD		X	X	X	X	X
Graton Tribe			X			
Healdsburg						
LAFCO						
Petaluma	X		X		X	X
Petaluma Transit						
Rohnert Park						
Santa Rosa	X	X			X	X
Santa Rosa Transit						
Sebastopol			X	X	X	
SMART				X		X
Sonoma County Transit						
Sonoma						
Windsor		X	X	X	X	

1. ITEM

2. Introductions

Janet Spilman called the meeting to order at 9:38 a.m.

Committee Members: Scott Duiven, City of Petaluma; Gary Helfrich, County of Sonoma PRMD; Olivia Ius, SMART; Lisa Kranz, City of Santa Rosa.

Ms. Spilman summarized changes to the amended agenda. Brant Arthur will address Shift Sonoma County.

Staff: Brant Arthur, Chris Barney, Nina Donofrio, Seana Gause, Suzanne Smith, Janet Spilman.

3. Public Comment

N/A

4. Administrative

- 4.1. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items- ACTION
- 4.2. Review Meeting Notes from April 21, 2016 and June 16, 2016* – ACTION

Meeting notes approved with the following correction to page 8: “...three projects with inclusionary affordable housing...”

- 5. Plan Bay Area Planning Directors Workshop* - update and information from MTC representatives, Ken Kirkey and Matt Maloney – INFORMATION

Matt Maloney of MTC explained that MTC and ABAG have prepared information on the Draft Preferred Land Use Scenario for Plan Bay Area (2010 – 2040) and presented data on employment and housing, noting that from 2011 through 2015 one housing unit was built for every 8 jobs created, citing 300% increases in the cost of housing in some areas, and explaining how the economic boom has strained the transportation infrastructure. He noted the difficulty in addressing land use and affordability issues.

Mr. Maloney reported that, of the 13 Plan Bay Area targets, five are achieved by the Draft Preferred Scenario.

Mr. Maloney next explained the role of UrbanSim in land use model forecasting. He explained that housing growth is focused mainly in PDAs in the region and Sonoma County.

Discussion followed regarding land use data and scenarios, and that the projected housing growth in PDAs is not feasible. It was agreed that MTC would examine their model more closely.

Additional committee comments were that the PDA approach disenfranchises rural areas. Mr.

Maloney responded to questions regarding the status of rural investment areas.

Issues regarding bus transit in unincorporated areas and the need for road maintenance to support this transit were addressed.

Mr. Maloney summarized data sources for 2010 and key strategies for land use in the Draft Preferred Scenario. He reported that 820,000 new households are projected from 2010-2040. Data on housing and employment from 2010 and projected for 2040 was summarized.

Mr. Maloney noted that the Draft Preferred Land Use pattern meets environmental goals but does not address affordability issues.

The need to modernize transportation was addressed, as well as the decline in funding allocated toward expansion projects.

Mr. Maloney referred to County maps of the Williamson Act and protected open space.

Discussion continued regarding land use and open space areas.

- ~~5. Policies related to medical cannabis – materials to be handed out at meeting –~~ INFORMATION
move to October 20 agenda

- 6. OBAG2 Housing requirements - review of local policies – DISCUSSION – new discussion item
Ms. Spilman explained that more clarification is needed on local policies. More details on surplus land act requirements are also needed.

Committee discussion addressed the increased constraints and displacement issues and policies.

Brant Arthur next reported on activities related to the SHIFT Program, explaining that this is a multi-pronged approach to encouraging alternative transportation and reducing the use of single-occupant vehicles. The Feasibility Study is posted online, as well as a draft siting plan for electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

A Board update will likely be presented at the November meeting.

Installation guidelines for charging stations for electric vehicles have been established. He noted that the White House is requesting policies from local jurisdictions.

7. Round table members discussion
SMART: Olivia Ius reported that high speed testing is currently in progress. Applications are being accepted for Ambassadors at rail stations. This is a part-time informational resources position.

Comments are being accepted on the Bicycle Parking Plan until September 19. Clipper installation is in progress.

City of Petaluma: Scott Duiven reported that recent activity includes multi-use commercial and multi-family housing projects. He reported on increased relocation of families to Petaluma from San Francisco, particularly as their children start school.

Sonoma County PRMD: Gary Helfrich reported on the anticipation of the legalization of marijuana, with a connected increase in monetization of rural land for commercial use, and projected developments in this industry from Humboldt and Mendocino County to Sonoma County.

Additional comments included the development of sustainable marijuana cultivation.

8. Other Business /Next agenda
N/A

9. Adjourn
11:10 a.m.

Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee
From: Janet Spilman, Director of Planning
Item: OBAG2 Land use requirements
Date: October 20, 2016

Issue:

What are the requirements for OBAG2?

Background:

OBAG is a funding program developed by MTC to distribute transportation funds, generally CMAQ and STP, to local jurisdictions. The current round – OBAG2, was approved with revisions that require additional housing related policies as eligibility qualifications and criteria for project scoring. Also, SCTA must update the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy with this additional focus. Attached memo from MTC with details. Below is the specific section.

MTC memo – August 30, 2016
County Program

- **Surplus Land Act:** The Commission added a requirement to the OBAG 2 county program that all general law cities and counties must adopt a resolution entailing their compliance with the State Surplus Land Act (as revised with AB 2135 – 2014) as a condition of funding. The Act requires local agencies disposing of surplus land to give first priority to developers of affordable housing. The Act applies to all public entities, including cities, counties, transit agencies, and any districts empowered to acquire real estate.
The resolution requirement shall not apply to charter cities unless and until a final court decision is rendered that charter cities are subject to the provisions of the Act. For transit agencies and other special districts that may receive OBAG 2 funds, the Commission will rely on the results of MTC’s current Public Lands for Affordable Housing study (scheduled for completion in Spring 2017) to inform how and when to verify compliance with the Act.
- **Project Selection Methodology:** The Commission adopted revisions to the project selection requirements for the county program that require CMAs to adopt a specific scoring methodology for selecting projects within PDAs or TPAs that rewards jurisdictions with the most effective housing anti-displacement policies. Additionally, the Commission directed that MTC and the CMAs will conduct an analysis of the impact of this incentive-based scoring methodology on project selection and local antidisplacement and affordable housing production policy development. The findings will be used to inform future planning and funding priorities.

Local input:

Staff reached out to local planners to create a list of possible criteria related to anti-displacement in the county. There is significant discussion around availability of housing and homelessness and policy for affordable housing and in the case of Santa Rosa, rent-stabilization. The issue of displacement isn't generally addressed specifically in Sonoma County communities. Petaluma provided the following input on relevant policies:

- 1) Condominium Conversion: Municipal Code Chapter 20.30
 - a. Insures a balance between rental and homeownership.
 - b. Maintains a supply of rental and mobile home housing opportunities for low and moderate income households.
 - c. Reduce and avoid the displacement of long-term residents.
- 2) Mobile Home Conversions: Municipal Code Chapter 8.34
 - a. Mitigates the adverse effects of converting existing mobile home parks to another use such as relocation, etc.
- 3) Living Wage Ordinance: Municipal Code Chapter 8.36
 - a. Contractors and subcontractors that provide services to the city are required to pay employees a living wage.
 - b. City employees fall under this ordinance as well - \$15.00/hr.
- 4) Inclusionary Policy: Housing Element Policy 6.1.5
- 5) In Lieu fee (see above): Housing Element also in Goal 4, Policy 4.2, Program 4.3 included below...

4.3 Continue to require residential projects of five or more units to contribute to the provision of below-market rate housing in one of the following ways:

- a. Dedicate 15% of the units on-site or a portion of the project site or property to the City or a non-profit organization for use as affordable housing.
 - b. Within a half-mile radius of the planned SMART stations, developers are encouraged to provide at least 15 percent of the units in a rental housing project at rents affordable to very low- and-low income households for a minimum period of 30 years.
 - c. Within a half-mile radius of the planned SMART stations, developers may be required to provide at least 15 percent of the units in a for-sale project at prices affordable to low- and moderate-income households for a minimum period of 30 years.
 - d. The developer can make an in-lieu payment to the City's Housing Fund.
 - e. Use alternative methods to meet the intent of the inclusionary requirement, subject to approval by the City Council.
- 6) Commercial Linkage Fee: Housing Element Policy 4.2, Program 4.3 also Municipal Code Chapter 19.36
 - a. Requires nonresidential development to help pay for housing demand generated by new employment
 - 7) Preservation of existing affordable housing projects through resyndication of tax credits allows for 55 year extension of affordability requirements to ensure affordable units remain affordable. Over 500 units preserved through this mechanism to date.

Fiscal Impacts

The OBAG2 program is a significant source of transportation funding. Loss of eligibility or low ranking could have a significant impact on potential funding.

Next Steps

SCTA staff is responsible for developing a list of criteria for OBAG2 that includes housing policies. Are the policies listed from Petaluma accurate representations of the policies in your communities? The PAC is asked to identify local policies that address, in some way, anti-displacement in the Sonoma County context and provide input for how the OBAG2 scoring process may acknowledge the issue.

Is your city a charter city? If so, you will be required to adopt a resolution demonstrating compliance with the State Surplus Land act as a condition of funding.

Input on these issues will be accepted up to and including the PAC meeting on Thursday, October 20.

Staff recommendation

Determine a list of locally relevant housing policies that address displacement, to include as OBAG2 scoring criteria. Staff will present OBAG2 criteria that include PAC recommendations to the TAC on October 27 and the SCTA for final approval at the November 14 Board meeting. With SCTA approval the Call for Projects will be released on November 15, 2016.



**METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
TEL 415.778.6700
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Regional Advisory Working Group

DATE: August 30, 2016

FR: Mallory Atkinson, MTC

RE: One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG 2) Project Selection and Programming Policy Revisions and Program Implementation

On July 27, 2016, the MTC Commission approved revisions to MTC Resolution No. 4202, the project selection criteria and programming policy for the second round of OBAG 2. These revisions include the distribution of additional revenues and housing-related program elements. MTC’s website for the OBAG 2 program has been updated to reflect the adoption of these revisions: <http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/obag-2>.

Summary of OBAG 2 Framework Revisions

1. Increased Revenues

The Commission distributed \$126 million in additional revenues to several regional and local programs, projects, and pilot efforts in conjunction with the OBAG 2 framework. The chart below summarizes the distribution of the increased revenues. More information about the sources of these additional funds and the new programs and initiatives supported by the revenue boost, can be found in the July 2016 MTC Commission

materials: <http://mtc.legistar.com/gateway.aspx?m=l&id=/matter.aspx?key=15848>

OBAG 2 Fund Distribution	OBAG 2 (Nov. 2015)	OBAG 2 Framework, Revised (July 2016)	
	Total (in millions)	Add'l Revenues (in millions)	Total (in millions)
Regional Programs (55%)	\$436	\$64	\$500
Regional Planning	\$10		\$10
Pavement Management Program	\$9		\$9
Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning ¹	\$20		\$20
Climate Initiatives ²	\$22	\$1	\$23
Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program	\$16		\$16
Regional Operations ³	\$170		\$170
Transit Priorities	\$189	\$13	\$202
Bay Bridge Forward	-	\$40	\$40
Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH) Pilot	-	\$10	\$10
Local Programs (45%)	\$354	\$62	\$416
County Congestion Management Agency’s (CMAs)	\$354	\$32	\$386
Housing Production Incentive	-	\$30	\$30
Total	\$790	\$126	\$916

¹ Revised PDA Planning & Implementation to prioritize funds in areas facing the greatest risk of displacement and direct \$1.5 million to update CBTPs. ²Add'l \$1 million for Spare the Air Youth. ³Add'l funding for Bay Bridge Forward, listed separately.

2. **Housing Revisions**

The Commission adopted several revisions to the OBAG 2 project selection criteria and programming policy related to affordable housing and displacement, summarized below. Additional detail on the housing-related revisions can be found in MTC Resolution 4202, Revised, Attachment A.

Regional Program

- ❖ **Regional PDA Planning Program:** The planning and technical support grant program is revised to give priority to jurisdictions facing pressures of housing displacement and affordability to tackle these issues. In addition, \$1.5 million from the program is directed to update Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) in communities at risk of displacement.
- ❖ **Housing Production Incentive:** \$30 million in additional revenues is directed to a new housing production incentive program. The “80K by 2020” challenge grant program will reward local jurisdictions that contribute the most toward reaching a regional target of 80,000 housing units that are affordable at the very low-, low-, and moderate-income level by 2020. Grants would be awarded to no more than 10 jurisdictions, and would need to be used for eligible transportation purposes.

In addition to a requirement that the units be located in PDAs or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs), the Commission approved an additional provision that units affordable at the very low- and low-income level must be deed-restricted in order for the jurisdiction to receive credit towards the challenge grant program. Deed-restriction is not required for units that are affordable at the moderate-income level to count toward the program.

- ❖ **NOAH Pilot:** \$10 million in existing exchange funding is set-aside to establish a revolving loan fund for the preservation of existing affordable housing. Additional information on the pilot program will be available in the coming months.

County Program

- ❖ **Surplus Land Act:** The Commission added a requirement to the OBAG 2 county program that all general law cities and counties must adopt a resolution entailing their compliance with the State Surplus Land Act (as revised with AB 2135 – 2014) as a condition of funding. The Act requires local agencies disposing of surplus land to give first priority to developers of affordable housing. The Act applies to all public entities, including cities, counties, transit agencies, and any districts empowered to acquire real estate.

The resolution requirement shall not apply to charter cities unless and until a final court decision is rendered that charter cities are subject to the provisions of the Act. For transit agencies and other special districts that may receive OBAG 2 funds, the Commission will rely on the results of MTC’s current Public Lands for Affordable Housing study (scheduled for completion in Spring 2017) to inform how and when to verify compliance with the Act.

- ❖ **Project Selection Methodology:** The Commission adopted revisions to the project selection requirements for the county program that require CMAs to adopt a specific scoring methodology for selecting projects within PDAs or TPAs that rewards jurisdictions with the most effective housing anti-displacement policies. Additionally, the Commission directed that MTC and the CMAs will conduct an analysis of the impact of this incentive-based scoring methodology on project selection and local anti-displacement and affordable housing production policy development. The findings will be used to inform future planning and funding priorities.
- ❖ **PDA Investment and Growth Strategy:** The Commission adopted a revision to the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy clarifying that MTC staff will provide a technical memo to CMAs by October 1 to guide the development and implementation of this task. The memo will include data to identify jurisdictions' challenges and listing of the Bay Area's best housing policies that are intended to address a range of housing challenges.

Program Implementation

With the revisions approved at the July meeting, the Commission also delayed the deadlines for the county program. The CMA must submit their Board adopted list of project recommendations to MTC by July 31, 2017. These projects must also be submitted into MTC's Fund Management System (FMS) along with a resolution of Local Support no later than August 31, 2017. Please note that MTC will not take action to program any project for the county program until a checklist (Appendix A-10) and supporting documentation demonstrating CMA compliance with MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised has been submitted to MTC.

MTC staff will provide additional information about the implementation of the various regional programs as they are developed. Additional information about the OBAG 2 implementation timeline is provided as Attachment A.

Attachment:

- Attachment A: OBAG 2 Program Implementation | Draft Timeline

J:\PROJECT\2017 RTP_SCS\RAWG\2016\09_RAWG_Sept 2016\5_OBAG2 Impl Memo_RAWG_v3.docx

OBAG 2 Program Implementation | Draft Timeline

2016		
August	Regional & County	MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised posted on the OBAG 2 website, along with a summary of the adopted program revisions.
September	Regional & County	Overview of the OBAG 2 program revisions and next steps to the September meetings of the Partnership working groups, CMA Planning Directors, Policy Advisory Council, and Regional Area Working Group. Staff is also available to meet individually with CMAs, upon request.
October 1	County	Deadline for MTC to distribute technical memo to guide CMAs in updating their PDA Investment and Growth Strategies.
Fall	Regional	Program development; additional information provided as it becomes available.
2017		
May 1	County	Update to PDA Investment & Growth Strategy to be adopted by CMA Board.
July 31	County	Deadline for CMA to submit list of projects recommended for funding to MTC.
August 31	County	Deadline for projects to be submitted into FMS along with Resolution of Local Support.
Fall	County	MTC adoption of county programs & 2017 TIP amendment.
TBD	Regional	MTC adoption of regional programs & 2017 TIP amendment (timing dependent upon development of each program).
October 1	Regional & County	First year of OBAG 2 funding availability for ongoing efforts such as planning, non-infrastructure and preliminary engineering for capital projects (FY2017-18).
2018		
October 1	Regional & County	First year of OBAG 2 funding availability for capital projects (FY2018-19).
2021		
October 1	Regional	Local housing production incentive challenge grant, "80,000 by 2020," winners announced; projects submitted by grantees.

Staff Report

To: SCTA Board of Directors
From: Janet Spilman, Director of Planning
 Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner
Item: 4.1.1 – Plan Bay Area update
Date: October 10, 2016

Issue:

What is the status of the Plan Bay Area (PBA 2017)?

Background:

In July 2013, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) approved Plan Bay Area (PBA 2013), the first Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for the region that is incorporated into a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as required by Senate Bill 375. Per federal requirements, MTC must update the RTP every four years, and Plan Bay Area (PBA 2017) is slated for adoption next summer. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) will not be updated in this cycle.

PBA 2017 establishes a 24-year regional vision for growth and investments and has the following 13 targets:

- climate protection
- housing
- open space / agricultural preservation
- middle-wage job creation
- goods movement / congestion reduction
- healthy and safe communities
- affordable housing
- non-auto mode shift
- road maintenance
- transit maintenance
- housing and transportation affordability
- displacement risk
- access to jobs

There were three scenarios under consideration when the planning process started and MTC/ABAG have now released their DRAFT Preferred Scenario for PBA 2017. It presents a strategy to address as many of the targets as possible.

Years of meetings and workshops have gone into developing criteria for those targets, and MTC launched a new land development and urban growth model, UrbanSim, to provide a more scientifically based, replicable process that “incorporates current zoning for 2 million individual land parcels across the Bay Area, as well as available information about current regional and local economic and real estate market trends.”

With the release of the DRAFT Preferred Scenario, MTC/ABAG staff have visited all of the counties and appeared at our PAC meeting on September 15 to explain the process, the findings, and to answer questions. Staff has reviewed the document with local planners and will meet with MTC and ABAG staff one on one to discuss concerns about the draft scenario in detail. For the most part our concerns fall into two categories – technical issues directly related to UrbanSim and how policy is applied in the model. Technical problems, including errors in model inputs such as mislabeled parcels or zoning criteria, can lead to large problems with

forecasts for population, jobs and housing in 2040. We are working with MTC/ABAG staff to correct these issues.

Concerns over which policies have been prioritized in the DRAFT Preferred Scenario are more complicated. The policies, which are focused on a wide variety of social issues, may play out differently in one county than another, as the nine counties in the Bay Area region differ in their economics, demographics and a host of other criteria. As policies are developed to solve problems in one area of the region, the consequences in another part may not be optimal.

The policy of Priority Development Areas, for example hasn't always been a great fit for communities in Sonoma County. The focus on PDA growth and development is the primary land use tool in PBA 2017 and the Sonoma County application of this policy highlights how policies that could work well in certain parts of the region may be challenging to implement in others. In this case, PBA 2017 forecasts that 75% of new homes, and 52% of new jobs will be in PDAs, which is quite different than the distribution of growth laid out in most local general plans, especially Santa Rosa. Other PBA policies regarding transit and transit oriented development may be easier to implement here, if they are scalable and reflect the reality of Sonoma County geography and resources.

The DRAFT Preferred Scenario includes forecasts, performance results and priority transportation investments.

Forecasts

Although the forecasts will not be translated into RHNA allocations this cycle, population, housing and employment estimates are sensitive points of reference that are often used to estimate local project impacts or develop local plans. Specific numbers are not included in this staff report because they are still fluid and likely to change before they are finalized. Local planning staff is involved in reviewing the draft forecasts and making adjustments.

The regional forecast totals – from 2010 and 2040 – have been set and are not expected to change: 820,000 new homes; population growth of 2.4 million people; and 1.3 million new jobs are estimated for the Bay Area by 2040. The region has experienced an employment surge focused in the big cities of 501,000 jobs being added during the period from 2011 to 2015. This makes up nearly half of the 30 year regional job growth forecast in the Bay Area after only 5 years. While the population forecasts for Sonoma County at the countywide level are generally similar to PBA 2013 forecasts the PAC and staff have the following concerns:

- 1) The method of determining distribution of growth has changed. In the past ABAG developed the forecast at the staff level using a series of models and data gathered from local jurisdictions. In response to the need for a more scientifically based, replicable process MTC and ABAG are using a regional growth model called UrbanSim that “incorporates current zoning for 2 million individual land parcels across the Bay Area, as well as available information about current regional and local economic and real estate market trends.” The Sonoma County portion of UrbanSim includes approximately 185,000 parcels. Staff is working with MTC/ABAG to verify all of the local data assumptions including existing parcel level conditions, zoning assumptions, urban growth boundary locations, and to review market based assumptions that are used to allocate growth.
- 2) In general, regional forecasts for growth (housing and jobs) within PDAs is higher than local plans prescribe, and, in that same context, growth within the cities but outside of PDAs is lower than expected. This is directly related to PBA 2017 policy of placing growth within PDAs.

- 3) SCTA staff and many of the jurisdictions are concerned that, in general, housing growth is overestimated and employment growth looks to be underestimated. Housing growth estimates are higher than those that were included in PBA 2013 forecasts. This is partially a result of a requirement that the region provide housing for the regional workforce and not import workers from neighboring counties. Employment growth estimates for Sonoma County are lower than those included in PBA 2013. This is due to employment growth in San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland which makes up over 1/3 of the forecasted employment growth for the entire region for the 30 horizon of the regional plan.

Performance Results

Plan Bay Area has ambitious goals that cover a wide swath of social issues. The first two, to plan for adequate housing and reduction, through transportation measures, of greenhouse gases, are mandatory. MTC/ABAG have limited leverage over housing and social issues and the performance results demonstrate that. Success in reducing GHG target is attained largely through the Climate Initiatives program. MTC/ABAG was also able to demonstrate success in reducing per capita delay on the freight network and to preserve open space and agricultural lands by directing future development to existing urbanized areas. Other targets related to equity were a harder task and PBA 2017 falls short in those areas.

Transportation Investments

MTC proposes a \$309 billion, 24 year budget that falls into 4 large categories:

- Operate and Maintain Transit - \$158 billion
- Operate and Maintain Roads, Freeways and Bridges - \$68 billion
- Modernize Transit, Bike/Ped, Goods Movement, Mobility and Access and BART Metro - \$54 billion
- Expand High Speed Rail, BART to San Jose, Caltrain, and Silicon Valley Express - \$29 billion

For Sonoma County that means that, with the exception of SMART to Cloverdale and local bus transit expansion, our projects were either 1) within the acceptable performance criteria or 2) too small to assess. MTC determined that SMART to Cloverdale did not perform well enough (ridership) and did not have enough identified funding to be included in this plan. Bus transit expansion performed well and is among a handful of projects that may be eligible for additional regional funding.

Policy Impacts:

Plan Bay Area is the long term Sustainable Communities planning document for the Bay Area Region. Our Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) reflects SCTA priorities and is, in the primary policy areas, complementary to PBA 2017.

Fiscal Impacts:

Plan Bay Area will have a project approval process that will complement our CTP project list approval. Regional projects are generally limited to large (“regionally significant”) projects. Smaller projects are aggregated into project categories. Staff will continue to work with MTC and potential project sponsors to promote our local priorities and to keep the process as streamlined with the current CTP process as possible.

Staff Recommendation:

This item is for information only.

DRAFT PREFERRED SCENARIO BREAKDOWN:

BACKGROUND:

1. What is it? The draft preferred scenario is a 2010 – 2040 forecast of housing and employment growth that has been developed as part of the regional transportation planning process and that is used to demonstrate how the plan does at meeting Plan Bay Area Performance Targets and complies with SB 375 GHG reduction targets.
2. Regional control totals were set and adopted by ABAG and were presented to the board by Cynthia Kroll, the Chief Economist at ABAG, at the June 8, 2015 board meeting. The regional control totals predict that the following housing, population, and employment growth will occur in the Bay Area by 2040.
 - a. 820K housing units
 - b. 2.4 million people
 - c. 1.3 million jobs
3. MTC and ABAG have tracked recent growth which has been characterized by a 2011-2015 economic surge of 500k jobs with only 65k HU being developed during this time period, which works out to 1 unit constructed for every 8 jobs developed by the region. The growth has been focused on SF and Silicon Valley and the housing crisis continues to escalate. This recent growth has been factored into the Draft Preferred Scenario.
4. A new process is being used to generate county and jurisdiction level forecasts which leans heavily on the land use model UrbanSIM. UrbanSIM considers individual parcel level data in forecasting growth including inputs such as:
 - a. Zoning
 - b. UGBs and other development prohibitions
 - c. Market and demand factors
 - d. An increased focus on PDAs

NOTE that one of the main goals in developing the scenario has been to meet Plan Bay Area Performance Targets and SB 375 GHG reduction targets.
5. SCENARIO PERFORMANCE: Scenario meets environmental goals, moves in right direction for transportation goals (maintenance, congestion, mode shift), but fails at making a positive difference on affordability and equity.

SONOMA COUNTY:

What does the Draft Preferred Scenario look like for Sonoma County?:

1. You can see the draft household and employment growth estimates for the county as a whole, individual jurisdictions, and PDAs on page 6 of 6 the MTC memo.
2. As a whole, Sonoma County is forecasted to add approximately **44k Households & 39k jobs** from 2010 – 2040.
3. SCTA staff has compared the draft preferred scenario to the Sustainable Communities Strategy and the growth forecasts from the existing adopted Plan Bay Area and the housing/population growth estimates are higher and employment growth estimates are lower than they were in the last set of regional forecasts.

CONCERNS:

1. PDA allocations are higher than they were in the previous forecast, and in some cases make up the overwhelming majority of predicted growth in some jurisdictions.
2. Growth rates in some jurisdictions are quite different than they were in the previous set of forecasts and are sometimes, much different than forecasts for similar sized jurisdictions in the county.
3. When looking at detailed results many site or local allocations are strange and don't appear to sync up completely with local planning policy:
 - a. Growth outside of urban service areas in the unincorporated county
 - b. Very high residential growth estimates on problematic parcels within PDAs.
 - c. Conversion of school sites or shopping center parking lots to housing.
4. Regional staff may have been paying more attention to getting things right in high growth parts of the region, since these areas have a larger impact on meeting performance and GHG reduction targets. We'd like to get the targets right for Sonoma County because the forecasts are often used in local planning studies and are used to estimate project and traffic impacts. *NOTE: SCTA maintains a general plan build-out scenario as part of the Sonoma County Travel Model which can be used in these types of analyses as well, but we'd like our model to be as consistent as possible with the regional model.*

5. SCTA staff is working closely with MTC and ABAG staff and local planning staff to identify and correct technical issues with the forecast at the jurisdiction and site level.

PROPOSED APPROACH TO COMMENTING ON AND WORKING WITH REGIONAL STAFF TO REVISE THE DRAFT PREFERRED SCENARIO:

1. Focus first on city and PDA totals which will be published in plan documents and that will be used more widely in other planning processes. In essence updating the table on Page 6 of the MTC memo, to ensure that staff and local jurisdictions feel that the housing and employment growth estimates are reasonable. THIS PLAN
2. Work with MTC/ABAG staff to improve the more detailed growth estimates by reviewing and revising UrbanSIM inputs and outputs. FEED INTO PROCESS FOR NEXT PLAN WHICH WILL INCLUDE allocation of RHNA (Regional Housing Need Allowance) numbers.
3. Comments were due are to MTC/ABAG by Oct 14.
 - a. We have already submitted many detailed technical comments to MTC/ABAG at the staff level and continue to work with MTC/ABAG.
 - b. SCTA sent the attached letter.



DATE: August 30, 2016

RE: Plan Bay Area 2040 DRAFT Preferred Scenario

Dear Colleagues,

The *Plan Bay Area 2040 Draft Preferred Scenario* is now ready for review and MTC and ABAG are seeking the input of local jurisdictions to inform the development of the Final Preferred Scenario slated for adoption in November 2016. As outlined in the attached Introduction, the *Draft Preferred Scenario* builds upon the current Plan Bay Area adopted in 2013 and represents a projected pattern of household and employment growth in the Bay Area through 2040. Combined with the corresponding transportation investment scenario and incorporating additional refinements based, in part, upon local jurisdictional feedback it will form the core of Plan Bay Area 2040 slated for final adoption in Summer, 2017.

For many local communities, the distribution of 2040 employment and household forecasts may be viewed as the most important output of this effort. This draft information is included in Attachment A to the introduction, organized by local jurisdiction and split into PDA and jurisdiction totals. We understand that some adjustments may be necessary as we continue to refine the *Draft Preferred Scenario's* assumptions. Regional Agency Staff are currently working with county-level Planning Director organizations and Congestion Management Agencies to schedule staff-level presentations of the *Plan Bay Area 2040 Draft Preferred Scenario* in each county. Information on the date/time and location of these meetings is available here: <http://planbayarea.org/misc/county-planning-directors-meetings.html>.

Regional agency staff will also be available during the month of September to meet with local planners from individual jurisdictions at the Bay Area Metro Center in San Francisco, via teleconference, or onsite with local jurisdictions to hear feedback as to where and how the *Draft Preferred Scenario* allocates the region's growth. This dialogue will be informed by model output, as well as local economics, pipeline projects, proposed policies, local plans and current zoning. Requests for jurisdictional meetings should be directed to Megan Espiritu, mespiritu@mtc.ca.gov. Any written comments on the *Draft Preferred Scenario* should be submitted no later than October 14, 2016. In response to this upcoming cycle of feedback, MTC and ABAG will make adjustments as appropriate during the month of September and October, with the goal of the MTC Commission and ABAG Executive Board adopting the Final Preferred Scenario on November 17, 2016.

Please do not hesitate to contact Ken Kirkey kkirkey@mtc.ca.gov or Miriam Chion miriamc@abag.ca.gov with any questions or comments. We greatly appreciate your involvement and input in the development of Plan Bay Area 2040.

Best Regards,

Steve Heminger
MTC, Executive Director

Ezra Rapport
ABAG, Executive Director

Introduction to the Draft Preferred Scenario for Plan Bay Area 2040

Welcome to *Plan Bay Area 2040's Draft Preferred Scenario*. This vision for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area builds on the groundbreaking *Plan Bay Area*, adopted by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in 2013 after extensive analysis and outreach. Plan Bay Area 2040 continues to be guided by Senate Bill 375, requiring California's metropolitan areas to adopt an integrated long range regional transportation plan (RTP) and sustainable communities strategy (SCS) — a roadmap to reduce per-capita greenhouse gas emissions and house the region's population at all income levels.

Plan Bay Area 2040's *Draft Preferred Scenario* largely reflects the foundation established by its predecessor. The Plan creates a blueprint for providing sufficient housing for current residents and newcomers alike, at all income levels. It focuses development toward Priority Development Areas (PDAs) — neighborhoods that are close to public transit and identified by local jurisdictions as being appropriate for smart, compact development. Lastly, it confines growth to established communities, and protects the Bay Area's legacy of vast and varied open spaces.

What is the Draft Preferred Scenario?

The Draft Preferred Scenario represents a projected regional pattern of household and employment growth in 2040. Together with the corresponding transportation investment strategy, it forms the core of Plan Bay Area 2040. The Preferred Scenario and transportation investment strategy are evaluated against a set of regionally-adopted performance targets to measure how well the Plan addresses regional goals including climate protection, transportation system effectiveness, economic vitality, and equitable access. Only two targets are mandatory for the region to achieve under Senate Bill 375 – Climate Protection and Adequate Housing. The remaining 11 targets are voluntary, but provide a useful reference point for policymakers and the public to consider.

For many local jurisdictions, the distribution of 2040 employment and household forecasts may be viewed as the most important output of this effort. This draft information is included in Attachment A, organized by local jurisdiction, and split into PDA totals. These numbers stem from distributing ABAG's economic and demographic forecasts through use of an advanced regional land use model. The land use model, UrbanSim, went through an iterative set of adjustments in response to expert reviews, public input, and dialogue with local officials. ABAG regional planners developed a set of targets informed by local dialogue against which the model output could be evaluated.

Simply put, the most fundamental challenge faced by MTC and ABAG when developing these forecasts is to create a Plan that supports local plans while accommodating the region's total forecasted growth and meeting the state mandated sustainability goals. Thus, the Draft Preferred Scenario must assess potential opportunities for new housing and jobs while reflecting local aspirations and numerous local, regional, and state public policy decisions that affect growth and protect our natural areas.

The Draft Preferred Scenario does not mandate any changes to local zoning rules, general plans or processes for reviewing projects, nor is it an enforceable direct or indirect cap on development locations or targets in the region. As is the case across California, the Bay Area's cities, towns

and counties maintain control of all decisions to adopt plans and permit or deny development projects. Plan Bay Area 2040 also does not establish new state-mandated Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers for each jurisdiction. RHNA operates on an eight-year cycle, with the next iteration not due until the 2021 RTP/SCS. Because RHNA numbers are not at stake this cycle, this update to the region's long-range plan has been characterized as **limited and focused**.

What's new and different?

The Bay Area economy has exploded over the past four years, attracting thousands of new people and jobs. Regional growth forecasts have been revised upward as a result. ABAG forecasts an additional 1.3 million jobs and 2.4 million people and therefore the need for approximately 820,000 housing units between 2010 and 2040. This represents an increase of 15 percent in the projected employment growth and a 25 percent increase in projected household growth, relative to the last Plan.

The economic surge has been both a blessing and a challenge, offering employment opportunities unseen since the Bay Area's dot-com boom, while also clogging freeways and public transit, and triggering an unprecedented housing squeeze, particularly for lower and moderate income workers, many of whom have been displaced or are at risk for displacement. Moving forward, some cities will welcome new residents and housing with open arms, seeing the opportunity to revitalize depressed areas, or to make better use of prime land around transit nodes. For other communities, accommodating future growth may be an acute challenge, practically and/or politically. The Draft Preferred Scenario recognizes the diversity of the region's communities, and that there is no "one size fits all" in terms of the type of future development desired by our residents.

To address the challenges of planning for an increasingly complex region, MTC and ABAG have continued to evolve technical methods for creating regional scenarios. UrbanSim incorporates current zoning for 2 million individual land parcels across the Bay Area, as well as available information about current regional and local economic and real estate market trends. UrbanSim is an ambitious project which compiles a large amount of data at a very detailed geographic resolution. The detailed level of UrbanSim output is used for the analysis of performance measures.

UrbanSim builds upon the methodology used by the Agencies in the prior Plan. The prior methodology combined a land use allocation process based on observed historic growth patterns with jurisdictional expectations described in local plans. This time, UrbanSim also incorporates zoning tools, the most recent PDA assessment, and household, business, and developer choice models. The agencies ran the model hundreds of times, testing the effects that different regional strategies could have on affecting the distribution of housing and employment growth. The output was measured against a set of growth targets put together by ABAG regional planners working with planners from local jurisdictions. Overall, the growth allocation results of the UrbanSim model align fairly closely with these growth targets at a summary level as well as for most localities, though, there are substantial differences for some individual localities. The extent of the differences between local plans and the UrbanSim output is a discussion for the agencies, regional stakeholders, and individual jurisdictions.

The *Draft Preferred Scenario* accommodates 100 percent of the needed housing units, and offers a rationale that these units can be built given future market conditions and existing or expected policies to support focused growth at the local, regional or state level.

How did we get here?

In May 2016, MTC and ABAG released three alternative land use and transportation scenarios illustrating the effects that different housing, land use, and transportation strategies would have on the adopted goals and performance targets. The three scenarios represented a progression of plausible regional futures, from more intense housing and employment growth in the urban core — called the “Big Cities Scenario”; to more evenly apportioned development among PDAs in medium-sized cities with access to rail services — labeled the “Connected Neighborhoods Scenario”; to a more dispersed development pattern, with more relative growth occurring outside of PDAs — known as the “Main Streets Scenario.”

The release of the scenarios initiated a public process in May and June 2016 to garner input from the public, stakeholders, community groups, and local officials, via public open houses in each county, an online comment forum as well as an online interactive quiz (the “Build a Better Bay Area” website). By July, MTC and ABAG had received comments from more than 1,100 residents. During this time period, the agencies received direct feedback from the local jurisdictions on the scenarios.

Additionally, the results of a 2015 PDA Assessment have also directly informed our confidence in the Draft Preferred Scenario. This assessment examined 65 of the nearly 200 locally identified PDAs. The analysis evaluated the likelihood of housing actually being built in each PDA, by examining local planning and permitting processes; community support for development; market forces, including the attractiveness of the area to investors, developers and builders; the capacity of water and sewer systems and other infrastructure; and the availability of financing. The PDA Assessment was a reality check. It found that under existing conditions — meaning with current zoning laws, policies and market conditions — only about 70 percent of housing allocated to PDAs in *Plan Bay Area 2013* would get built with these results being boosted to nearly 90 percent with a range of fairly aggressive policy and investment strategies. The results of the *Draft Preferred Scenario* align with the results of the PDA Assessment, providing added confidence in the regional forecast’s consideration of both market conditions and local policy.

Strategies included in the Preferred Scenario

Beyond built-in assumptions on local planning and market conditions, the Draft Preferred Scenario also works to incorporate a number of regional land use strategies, which can affect land use patterns by changing a community’s capacity for new development or incentivizing a particular type or location of growth. This combination of strategies is necessary to create a *Draft Preferred Scenario* that can achieve or move toward the region’s adopted targets.

The land use strategies incorporated in the Draft Preferred Scenario include the following:

- Current urban growth boundaries are kept in place.
- Inclusionary zoning was applied to all cities with PDAs, meaning that these jurisdictions are assumed to allow below-market-rate or subsidized multi-family housing developments.

- All for-profit housing developments are assumed to make at least 10 percent of the units available to low-income residents, in perpetuity (via deed restrictions).
- In some cases, PDAs were assigned higher densities in the future than are currently allowed.
- The cost of building in PDAs and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) is assumed to be reduced by the easing of residential parking minimums and streamlining environmental clearance.
- Subsidies are assumed to stimulate housing and commercial developments within PDAs.

These measures are not prescriptive—again, there are many potential public policy options that could help the region attain its adopted targets. Rather, these strategies should be considered as illustrations of what it would take to keep the Bay Area an economically vibrant, diverse and sustainable region in the year 2040.

Moving Forward

Although the levels of new housing and jobs may appear daunting, the challenge becomes much more achievable when viewed through the long-range lens of a 25-year plan. For instance, a medium-sized city of 50,000 residents slated to absorb 1,000 more new housing units by 2040 than previously anticipated would in actuality need to only add 40 units a year to meet the target. That yearly figure could be reached by adding two 10-unit apartment buildings (or one 20-unit building) per year, and creating another 20 accessory dwelling units associated with single-family homes each year. In other words, in nearly all cases, jurisdictions should be able to absorb their housing allotments while fully retaining the character of their communities.

It is important to keep in mind that the process of refining the Bay Area’s ideal development pattern is nearly continuous to stay synced with the four-year mandated update cycles— we will revisit all the assumptions in the adopted Preferred Scenario as we launch the next update to Plan Bay Area. We learn more with each cycle, and are able to take those lessons and apply them to the forecasting and modeling as well as our public outreach methods for the next cycle.

Such assurances aside, regional planners and policymakers understand that some adjustments may be necessary as we continue to refine the *Draft Preferred Scenario’s* assumptions. To this end, a careful balancing act regarding future growth patterns is as much an art as a science, and we look forward to working with local planners and policymakers, stakeholders and members of the public in the coming weeks to advance our mutual understanding of the development climate and capacity in various jurisdictions, and to refine and improve this *Draft Preferred Scenario*.

Attachment A: Distribution of 2040 Household and Employment Forecasts

Attachment A: Distribution of 2040 Household and Employment Forecasts
 Plan Bay Area 2040 *Draft Preferred Scenario*

County	Jurisdiction	Summary Level	Households 2010	Household Forecast 2040	Employment 2010	Employment Forecast 2040
Alameda	Alameda	Total	30,100	41,700	29,200	39,600
		PDA	1,850	6,000	6,900	15,200
	Albany	Total	7,350	7,850	4,400	5,600
		PDA	300	550	2,100	2,450
	Berkeley	Total	46,500	55,700	90,300	139,400
		PDA	6,700	13,300	28,500	42,000
	Dublin	Total	14,900	23,300	18,100	31,400
		PDA	3,100	8,500	5,000	14,000
	Emeryville	Total	5,600	14,300	15,850	20,550
		PDA	2,400	10,500	13,500	16,850
	Fremont	Total	70,000	89,900	86,200	114,500
		PDA	23,000	41,200	38,200	46,000
	Hayward	Total	45,100	53,200	60,900	92,400
		PDA	4,350	8,600	7,600	10,300
	Livermore	Total	28,600	30,900	42,600	48,800
		PDA	850	2,100	23,800	27,750
	Newark	Total	12,900	15,450	17,300	25,600
		PDA	200	2,150	200	450
	Oakland	Total	157,200	235,000	179,100	257,500
		PDA	115,500	190,500	158,200	229,400
	Piedmont	Total	3,800	3,850	1,800	1,750
	Pleasanton	Total	24,700	34,600	60,100	69,900
		PDA	1,300	8,000	12,500	19,600
San Leandro	Total	30,800	38,500	49,700	66,800	
	PDA	4,700	11,700	9,750	11,000	
Union City	Total	20,300	24,200	21,000	30,700	
	PDA	500	3,450	250	250	
Alameda County Unincorporated	Total	50,000	56,300	28,850	33,700	
	PDA	10,450	12,850	6,850	8,850	
County Total	Total	548,000	724,700	705,500	978,300	
	PDA	175,100	319,300	313,400	444,000	

County	Jurisdiction	Summary Level	Households 2010	Household Forecast 2040	Employment 2010	Employment Forecast 2040
Contra Costa	Antioch	Total	32,400	41,900	20,200	25,400
		PDA	1,400	5,200	2,050	2,300
	Brentwood	Total	16,800	29,700	11,600	12,150
	Clayton	Total	3,950	4,050	2,000	2,100
	Concord	Total	45,000	66,000	54,200	95,200
		PDA	4,000	22,200	10,200	41,400
	Danville	Total	15,300	16,550	11,800	12,450
		PDA	1,350	2,000	6,300	6,600
	El Cerrito	Total	10,300	11,950	5,300	5,750
		PDA	750	2,000	3,800	4,550
	Hercules	Total	8,300	10,600	4,850	6,050
		PDA	900	2,650	1,150	1,500
	Lafayette	Total	9,200	10,750	9,050	9,650
		PDA	1,700	2,700	6,650	7,250
	Martinez	Total	14,250	15,450	20,800	26,200
		PDA	700	850	6,800	9,650
	Moraga	Total	5,600	5,750	4,500	5,800
		PDA	30	40	1,400	1,650
	Oakley	Total	10,600	16,700	3,350	6,050
		PDA	800	6,400	1,550	4,050
	Orinda	Total	6,500	7,050	4,850	5,150
		PDA	250	550	2,650	2,800
	Pinole	Total	6,550	7,300	6,850	9,000
		PDA	350	950	5,250	6,950
	Pittsburg	Total	19,400	27,400	11,800	16,400
		PDA	5,150	8,900	4,600	6,100
	Pleasant Hill	Total	13,500	14,000	16,300	19,600
		PDA	850	950	5,750	7,100
	Richmond	Total	36,700	56,500	30,800	63,500
		PDA	8,600	22,300	13,400	37,000
	San Pablo	Total	8,950	9,600	7,400	10,000
		PDA	2,000	2,350	4,850	6,700
San Ramon	Total	24,400	31,100	47,900	46,100	
	PDA	200	5,800	25,650	22,400	
Walnut Creek	Total	30,400	38,200	51,050	54,550	
	PDA	4,950	9,550	27,400	29,500	
Contra Costa County Unincorporated	Total	57,800	70,700	0	0	
	PDA	4,400	16,100	0	0	
County Total	Total	375,900	491,200	360,200	472,700	
	PDA	38,300	111,500	138,200	209,400	

County	Jurisdiction	Summary Level	Households 2010	Household Forecast 2040	Employment 2010	Employment Forecast 2040
Marin	Belvedere	Total	900	1,000	300	300
		PDA				
	Corte Madera	Total	3,900	4,350	6,650	7,450
		PDA				
	Fairfax	Total	3,400	3,550	1,550	1,700
		PDA				
	Larkspur	Total	5,850	6,300	7,450	8,800
		PDA				
	Mill Valley	Total	5,900	8,150	6,000	6,600
		PDA				
	Novato	Total	20,150	21,350	26,400	29,500
		PDA				
	Ross	Total	800	900	350	400
		PDA				
	San Anselmo	Total	5,200	5,450	3,300	3,650
PDA						
San Rafael	Total	22,550	25,950	43,300	49,100	
	PDA	1,650	2,750	9,000	10,100	
Sausalito	Total	4,150	4,500	5,200	5,800	
	PDA					
Tiburon	Total	3,600	3,850	2,850	2,900	
	PDA					
Marin County Unincorporated	Total	27,450	30,600	17,500	21,350	
	PDA	1,500	2,050	650	750	
County Total	Total	103,900	115,900	120,800	137,600	
	PDA	3,150	4,800	9,650	10,850	
Napa	American Canyon	Total	5,400	7,000	5,450	8,150
		PDA	400	1,500	1,350	1,700
	Calistoga	Total	2,050	2,400	2,200	2,650
		PDA				
	Napa	Total	28,100	30,250	34,000	36,500
		PDA	350	1,200	5,300	6,300
	St. Helena	Total	2,400	3,000	5,700	5,650
		PDA				
	Yountville	Total	1,100	1,200	2,750	2,750
		PDA				
Napa County Unincorporated	Total	10,200	11,850	20,550	23,250	
	PDA					
County Total	Total	49,200	55,700	70,700	79,000	
	PDA	800	2,700	6,600	8,050	
San Francisco	San Francisco	Total	347,100	475,500	576,900	887,800
		PDA	184,000	302,300	473,800	765,000

County	Jurisdiction	Summary Level	Households 2010	Household Forecast 2040	Employment 2010	Employment Forecast 2040
San Mateo	Atherton	Total	2,350	2,500	2,150	2,300
		PDA	2,500	2,850	3,500	4,450
	Belmont	Total	8,800	9,600	7,900	10,000
		PDA	2,500	2,850	3,500	4,450
	Brisbane	Total	1,800	6,300	5,200	17,600
		PDA	0	4,400	0	10,900
	Burlingame	Total	12,250	13,800	28,000	38,300
		PDA	6,950	8,300	11,500	15,700
	Colma	Total	850	1,250	3,950	4,900
		PDA	700	1,050	1,450	1,950
	Daly City	Total	30,700	37,000	18,400	23,150
		PDA	8,500	13,500	4,650	5,800
	East Palo Alto	Total	6,950	9,950	5,100	7,000
		PDA	800	2,200	950	1,750
	Foster City	Total	11,900	14,250	15,800	21,800
	Half Moon Bay	Total	4,200	4,700	4,900	5,200
	Hillsborough	Total	3,750	3,950	2,100	2,300
	Menlo Park	Total	12,300	17,800	34,600	45,000
		PDA	200	1,050	6,200	7,950
	Millbrae	Total	7,950	11,000	5,900	12,900
		PDA	600	3,350	2,800	9,100
	Pacifica	Total	13,900	14,300	5,950	7,300
	Portola Valley	Total	1,700	1,750	2,700	3,000
	Redwood City	Total	27,800	36,000	59,200	85,000
		PDA	600	6,700	20,700	27,600
	San Bruno	Total	14,600	18,300	12,900	15,350
		PDA	3,700	6,750	9,300	11,300
	San Carlos	Total	13,200	13,700	16,300	21,700
		PDA	50	100	1,200	1,650
	San Mateo	Total	37,900	49,200	51,000	67,600
		PDA	11,200	19,200	25,300	34,000
	South San Francisco	Total	20,450	23,450	38,800	55,400
PDA		5,300	7,650	8,250	11,350	
Woodside	Total	2,050	2,500	1,950	2,150	
San Mateo County Unincorporated	Total	21,400	24,500	20,600	27,500	
	PDA	2,400	2,950	3,200	4,100	
County Total	Total	256,900	315,800	343,300	475,300	
	PDA	43,500	80,100	99,000	147,600	

County	Jurisdiction	Summary Level	Households 2010	Household Forecast 2040	Employment 2010	Employment Forecast 2040
Santa Clara	Campbell	Total	16,550	18,950	25,200	31,800
		PDA	600	1,650	5,250	6,950
	Cupertino	Total	20,900	24,450	26,800	53,100
		PDA	2,250	4,900	9,800	13,950
	Gilroy	Total	14,000	19,600	17,850	20,800
		PDA	1,400	3,350	4,500	5,300
	Los Altos	Total	10,500	12,000	14,050	16,750
		PDA	0	200	2,200	2,650
	Los Altos Hills	Total	2,850	3,050	1,550	1,750
	Los Gatos	Total	11,900	12,400	19,000	21,250
	Milpitas	Total	19,000	30,800	42,000	56,400
		PDA	800	8,800	5,700	9,900
	Monte Sereno	Total	1,250	1,350	550	550
	Morgan Hill	Total	12,550	15,500	19,250	20,700
		PDA	250	900	1,550	1,400
	Mountain View	Total	31,800	58,500	48,500	69,600
		PDA	5,800	29,300	25,200	39,000
	Palo Alto	Total	26,550	29,150	102,000	123,200
		PDA	500	950	3,850	4,800
	San Jose	Total	297,700	440,600	387,700	502,600
		PDA	67,200	201,700	229,200	299,400
	Santa Clara	Total	42,100	54,900	102,900	189,100
		PDA	300	6,200	10,200	13,100
	Saratoga	Total	10,650	11,000	8,750	9,500
	Sunnyvale	Total	52,600	80,700	65,800	116,000
		PDA	6,200	32,000	21,900	29,000
	Santa Clara County Unincorporated	Total	26,100	33,600	29,500	36,500
County Total	Total	597,100	846,600	911,500	1,269,700	
	PDA	85,300	289,800	319,200	425,500	

County	Jurisdiction	Summary Level	Households 2010	Household Forecast 2040	Employment 2010	Employment Forecast 2040
Solano	Benicia	Total	10,700	11,800	12,900	18,600
		PDA	600	900	2,050	2,050
	Dixon	Total	5,850	6,950	4,850	6,100
		PDA	450	550	300	350
	Fairfield	Total	34,200	38,700	43,100	51,600
		PDA	2,300	5,000	6,450	7,100
	Rio Vista	Total	3,700	10,400	2,350	2,450
	Suisun City	Total	9,000	9,650	2,500	3,000
		PDA	1,100	1,550	1,100	1,300
	Vacaville	Total	31,000	33,050	29,300	35,000
		PDA	850	2,250	4,900	4,950
	Vallejo	Total	40,950	45,050	30,900	35,300
		PDA	400	1,150	2,600	3,050
	Solano County Unincorporated	Total	6,900	14,700	4,250	4,400
County Total	Total	142,300	170,300	130,200	156,500	
	PDA	5,700	11,400	17,350	18,800	
Sonoma	Cloverdale	Total	3,250	5,250	1,750	1,600
		PDA	800	2,850	550	500
	Cotati	Total	3,050	3,550	2,700	3,000
		PDA	350	700	700	700
	Healdsburg	Total	4,400	4,700	8,400	9,900
	Petaluma	Total	21,800	27,100	30,000	35,700
		PDA	500	4,450	3,500	4,050
	Rohnert Park	Total	15,000	21,100	12,050	13,350
		PDA	1,300	5,300	4,250	4,900
	Santa Rosa	Total	63,800	78,800	76,400	91,700
		PDA	16,800	30,300	41,100	48,600
	Sebastopol	Total	3,300	5,000	5,000	5,050
		PDA	2,050	3,750	4,650	4,650
	Sonoma	Total	4,900	6,250	7,150	8,050
	Windsor	Total	9,050	10,550	7,600	9,200
		PDA	1,100	2,300	900	1,200
	Sonoma County Unincorporated	Total	58,300	68,600	51,700	63,900
	County Total	Total	186,800	231,000	202,700	241,400
PDA		23,000	49,700	55,800	64,600	
Regional Total	Total	2,607,000	3,427,000	3,422,000	4,698,000	
	PDA	559,000	1,172,000	1,433,000	2,094,000	

October 10, 2016

MTC Chair Cortese and Commissioners
Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

We understand that the Regional Governments are charged with planning for GHG emissions reductions, improving the regional transportation system, and for encouraging the provision of adequate housing in Plan Bay Area. Plan Bay Area also facilitates the development of the regional transportation project list, which was once the primary plan deliverable to many of the jurisdictions, along with the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) numbers.

At the countywide level, we are concerned at the differences between the draft preferred scenario and the adopted Plan Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy housing and employment forecast. We observe that housing growth estimates have increased from the previous forecast, and that employment growth estimates have been reduced. We are concerned that higher housing growth which is not accompanied by similar levels of employment growth could increase vehicle trips, trip lengths, and increase countywide and regional VMT and GHG emissions.

We are concerned with the technical accuracy of modeled growth output generated using UrbanSim. We recognize that the processes and tools used for forecasting population, housing and employment and modeling transportation projects are extremely data intensive. While this is not, in itself a bad thing, it should be accompanied by rigorous validation of modeled results and in some cases parcel by parcel verification. Unfortunately, there appear to be many errors in the detailed growth forecasts for Sonoma County parcels that may have the potential, if not corrected, to lead to unreasonable forecasts for Sonoma County jurisdictions. Regional forecasts are often used by local jurisdictions in planning studies and to estimate project and development impacts. These forecasts are also used to develop forecasts which are used by SCTA in the Sonoma County Travel Model, and SCTA would like to continue to ensure that forecasts used in local modeling are consistent with regional forecasts and the regional travel demand model. SCTA also recognizes that forecasts developed for this regional transportation plan may be used to develop future regional, county, and

local forecasts which may be used to develop future RHNA allocations, and recommends that this process use a reasonable forecast which has been vetted by local jurisdictions.

We urge MTC and ABAG to continue working with local jurisdictions and CMAs to verify and validate inputs and assumptions that are used by the region growth model UrbanSim. We recommend that MTC/ABAG work with local jurisdictions and SCTA staff to develop reasonable countywide, jurisdictional, and PDA housing and employment forecasts before the final adoption of the Plan Bay Area Preferred Scenario, and that regional planning and modeling staff continue to work with local and SCTA staff to correct detailed modeling inputs and output errors.

Chair David Rabbitt
Sonoma County Transportation Authority