Planning Advisory Committee

Thursday, October 25, 2018 – 9:00 a.m.
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

Meeting Call-In: 707-565-7154
Access Code: 996 343 485

ITEM

1. Introductions

2. Administrative
   2.1. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items- (ACTION)
   2.2. Review Meeting Notes from August 16, 2018 * – (ACTION)
   2.3. SCTA Planning Activities update*

3. Updates from group - DISCUSSION

4. Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study – Update and Draft Schedule*

5. Caltrans Planning Grant – application by SCTA/DHS for Vision Zero*

6. Planning Data Collection and Coordination
   6.1. General Plan buildout update*

7. MTC/ABAG Horizon and Plan Bay Area presentation update
   7.1. CASA Compact Overview*
   7.2. Horizon Perspective Paper #3 – Regional Growth Strategies – PDA framework*

8. Micro-Mobility Use Cases and Regulation – Presentation and Discussion*

9. Items of Interest – Accelerating Infill in Santa Rosa & Sonoma County by Council of Infill Builders*

10. Other Business /Next agenda

11. Public Comment

12. Adjourn -(ACTION)

*Attachment

** Materials will be handed out at meeting

The next SCTA meeting will be November 5, 2018
The next PAC meeting will be November 15 or 29th, 2018

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 Planning 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 or www.sctransit.com

490 Mendocino Ave. #206, Santa Rosa, CA | 707.565.5373 | scta.ca.gov | rcpa.ca.gov
We’re moving!

As of November 1, 2018, our location will be 411 King Street, Santa Rosa, 95404. Phone numbers and email addresses will not change.
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES
Meeting Notes of August 16, 2018

ITEM

1. Introductions

Meeting called to order at 9:10 a.m. by Janet Spilman.

Committee Members: John Kessel, County of Sonoma; Jeff Beiswenger, City of Rohnert Park; Clare Hartman, City of Santa Rosa; Jessica Jones, City of Santa Rosa; Eric Gage, City of Santa Rosa; Milan Nevajda, City of Petaluma/M-Group; Jane Riley, County of Sonoma; Kari Svanstrom, City of Sebastopol; Elizabeth “Libby” Dipple (via phone), SMART; Nancy Adams (via phone), City of Santa Rosa.

Guests: Matt Maloney, MTC/ABAG; Steve Birdlebough, Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition; Teri Shore, Greenbelt Alliance.

Staff: Janet Spilman; Suzanne Smith; Chris Barney; Drew Nichols.

2. Administrative

   2.1. Approval of the agenda

It was requested by Matt Maloney, MTC/ABAG, to present Item 5.2 before Item 5.1. The committee approved the

   2.2. Review meeting notes from June 21, 2018

Jeff Beiswenger clarified under Item 5.2 that the Rohnert Park City Council discussed waiving the requirement for inclusionary housing for the downtown development; an action was not taken on the item by the council.

The meeting notes were approved as submitted.

   2.3. SCTA Planning Activities update

This is included in the agenda packet for the committees. This is an overview of the activities in the Planning Department that are currently being worked on.

3. Update from group

   City of Rohnert Park:

Jeff Beiswenger updated the committee on the University District, apartment complexes and hotel development plans, and the Downtown Area Plan. The old State Farm building is set to be demolished in the next few months and construction is hoped to begin in summer 2019.

   City of Santa Rosa:

Jessica Jones updated the committee on the density bonus. The Planning Commission commented on the item and staff will continue reviewing the policy. No date has been set to bring the item back to the Commission with the updates.

The Inclusionary housing update remains the same since the previous meeting. Downtown stations specific update is anticipated to begin soon. Staff continues to work with MTC to identify funding for the plan. The Plan is aimed to consider incentivizing housing in downtown Santa Rosa.

In terms of the General Plan update, the goal is to begin the update in January 2019.

The Santa Rose City Council has requested a study session for the City’s Climate Action Plan to study the current status and the direction of the plan, with a specific interest toward all electric construction. The RCPA will also be providing assistance.
The plan is anticipated to be presented to the City Council in the fall.

Regarding the rebuilding effort, Ms. Jones spoke on the City’s website that tracks the rebuilding effort with real time data. (https://srcity.org/rebuild)

To date, construction on eight houses have been completed, 493 are under construction, 167 permits have been issued, and 312 in the review process.

Clare Hartman spoke on the lessons learned on the rebuilding effort and noted the successes of the website.

Ms. Hartman continued speaking on the development review process, highlighting a focus on prioritizing applications for downtown Santa Rosa and the PDAs.

Staff is also continuing work on a website to showcase what initiatives are available for downtown Santa Rosa development. There are opportunity sites in this area.

Furthermore, Ms. Hartman commented on the reduced authority for a major design review applications. Instead of going to the Design Review Board for the public hearing and action, an applicant can now receive approval of the concept from the Design Review Board, and then approval by the zoning administrator.

Ms. Jones added this concept requires less time, is faster, and is focused on the PDAs. The Design Review Board has expressed support for this concept.

City of Sebastopol:

Kari Svanstrom reported the Sebastopol City Council is reviewing the wholesale zoning ordinance update that is reflected in the General Plan. This update will also include changes to inclusionary housing ordinance, such as recovery, overlay, and rent gouging.

A housing workshop in conjunction with Supervisor Hopkins is scheduled on November 4th to discuss AUDs and JDDs for the public’s interest.

Jane Riley asked if the changes to the inclusionary housing ordinance are to make the process easier for a resident.

Ms. Svanstrom responded Sebastopol is considering the change from 20% to 15% and exemption elements.

City of Petaluma:

Milan Nevajda reported the City of Petaluma is mainly focusing on the VMT transition, with an anticipated start frame in November or December.

The VMT compliance deadline has been extended by six months.

Nancy Adams asked, referencing the VMT analysis, if the cost estimate for a consultant to conduct the work has been considered.

Mr. Nevajda responded in the affirmative and added the scope is morphing due to the numbers dictated in a grant received.

Teri Shore asked if work on the Petaluma affordable housing updates is continuing.

Mr. Nevajda responded that housing staff has contracted with EPS to do an analysis to see what is feasible, and to look at in lieu or impact basis. This study would help in understanding the most reasonable approach to set the new fees and on-site requirements.

Ms. Shore further asked for a brief summary on the new proposal regarding inclusionary on-site housing.

Mr. Nevajda responded the goal is to have more on-site construction. The feasibility study showed a potential 15% on site.

The most interesting part of the update is in lieu fees set at the maximum as defensible, whereas the on-site slightly incentivized by having a lower
requirement. There is a push to have the on-site more lax than the in lieu requirements.

County of Sonoma:

John Kassel spoke on the county’s recovery framework. The broad vision on how to recover from the wildfires, covering five different areas. Staff continues to understand feedback received from citizens throughout the county and continue to meet with agency groups.

The timetables are not yet set for approval, but noted the importance to understand and to respond to comments appropriately.

Mr. Kassel continued discussing the definition of success in a resilient community.

Janet Spilman asked if this idea will help the General Plan update.

Mr. Kassel, as well as Ms. Riley, responded this will help inform the General Plan update.

Steve Birdlebough asked where the goal for VMT reduction fits, such as considering a 19% per capita reduction and, if so, how this will be achieved.

Mr. Kassel responded that this will be based on the response to the housing element.

4. Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study – Update and Draft Schedule

Chris Barney updated the committee on the Travel Behavior Study and the improvements to the travel model. Mr. Barney provided a brief outline of the study to those who are not familiar with the study.

Over the last six months, the committee has been discussing options to fund the study. Included in the agenda packet is an option considered to share the cost between the jurisdictions.

Currently, staff is working to contract with Fehr and Peers to conduct the study. A draft schedule was included in the agenda packet.

Jane Riley asked if the schedule is dependent on jurisdictions funding the work.

Mr. Barney responded in the affirmative and highlighted the plan to have a consultant under contract in September.

Nancy Adams noted that VMT is useful tool and the City of Santa Rosa is supportive of work on this by SCTA.

Milan Nevajda asked, regarding the funding, if there are set deadlines.

Mr. Barney responded that a deadline has not been set, however it is possible to propose deadlines.

Mr. Nevejda supported the idea of a deadline given the uncertainty of when a jurisdiction can fund the study and considering the jurisdictions why may have already submitted funding and must wait for the remaining jurisdictions.

Mr. Nevajda further asked about the SB 743 support and, since these are white papers with qualitative information, wondered if there will be less dependency on data from the travel model.

Mr. Barney responded the travel behavior study would feed right into the SB 743 work.

The committee further discussed deadlines and the elements included – scope, funding, data, etc. – with these studies.

5. Planning Data Collection and Coordination Housing Updates

5.1. UrbanFootprint Housing Capacity Analysis

Chris Barney presented on the housing capacity in Sonoma County, following the 30,000 units in five years suggested by the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors.
There are three major components to this concept: Rebuild, Housing Pipeline, and the additional construction.

Considering rebuild, 5,000 units were lost in the wildfires and this scenario assumes the units will be rebuilt in place. The location and type of units are known and the base year for UrbanFootprint is 2015.

It was noted that the rebuild housing types are overwhelmingly single family detached.

Mr. Barney described the housing pipeline. Approximately 16,000 units are currently in the pipeline, with locations and types of units known. Nearly half of the projects in the pipeline are in Santa Rosa and Rohnert Park.

Data collection began last September.

The committee discussed the pending residential development. 43% of the projects in the pipeline are approved for construction.

9,000 additional units remain to reach the 30,000 housing unit (after the 5,000 units that will be rebuilt) goal. There is an interest to study whether there is capacity in the PDAs for additional housing units.

Mr. Barney outlined the housing growth scenario in a given PDA. The first step is to determine General Plan Build Out capacity in these PDAs – 20,000 units without considering the pipeline. After remove the pipeline, 15,000 housing unit growth in the PDAs; thus suggesting capacity exists.

The City of Healdsburg and Sonoma do not have a PDAs.

Project limitations and future work tasks were described, such as the General Plan Build Out estimates need to be reviewed and updated and the pipeline projects details may change when translated into UrbanFootprint for analysis.

This was a draft presentation to demonstrate the possibilities of housing countywide.

5.2. Planning Data – MTC/ABAG BASIS project in coordination with SCTA

Matt Maloney spoke on the MTC/ABAG BASIS project. This is aimed to establish a connection between the patterns and the regional housing allocation.

MTC aims to develop a database portal platform that is secure and accessible for single source data sets to help inform regional planning.

Mr. Maloney described the process of the surveys that will be conducted. A copy was provided in the agenda packet and these will be collecting in the next several months.

Kari Svanstrom asked if the survey is active, or if it is a drop form survey.

Mr. Maloney the survey is active and will rework the survey after a few responses to ensure these surveys are clear and understandable.

Chris Barney commented on the discussions around streamlining efforts, such as asking the jurisdictions to submit responses to SCTA.

Teri Shore asked if the Horizons presentation will be presented to the elected officials.

Mr. Maloney answered that staff is willing, and open, to present to anyone interested.

The committee further spoke on the areas of support from MTC/ABAG and SCTA in regards to GIS support.

6. MTC/ABAG Horizon and Plan Bay Area Presentation

Matt Maloney, MTC/ABAG, presented to the committee on the regional long range planning process, specifically the Horizon. The Horizon initiative is set to inform Plan Bay Area 2050 and the theme concentrates on uncertainty in the economic, political, technological, and environmental conditions.
Mr. Maloney described the schedule of the plan. MTC adopted Plan Bay Area 2040 in July 2017. The Horizon effort began in February 2018 and is referred to as a more comprehensive planning document, somewhat akin to a regional plan.

Mr. Maloney further described outreach efforts, perspective papers, the futures concept, and project performance.

The guiding principles derived from the outreach effort include the vision of the San Francisco Bay Area as affordable, connected, diverse, healthy, and vibrant.

Perspective papers aim to be more comprehensive in the planning process. These papers are within a topical area, and reports on challenges and opportunities.

The first perspective paper published was focused on autonomous vehicles. The next paper will study climate mitigation/TDM and is set to be published in September 2018.

The futures scenarios consider “Clean and Green,” (such as a national carbon tax enabling telecommunications and distributive job centers) “Rising Tides, Falling Fortunes,” (federal government cuts spending and reduces regulations, leaving decisions to states and regional) and “Back to the Future” (an economic boom and new transportation options spur development).

A video describing Horizon was displayed to the committee.

Mr. Maloney further described the goals for project performance. The two primary goals are ensuring transparency and accountability and to assess the next generation of transformative projects.

This process is currently open to the general public and the changes in this cycle were described. Traditionally, ideas were sought from transit operators and CMAs, however with the inclusion of the general public, over 300 ideas from the public have been received for transformative projects.

These ideas are not solely focused on capital projects, they also seek ideas for operational, resilience, and mixed-transportation systems. The submission process will remain open until September. The ideas submitted will be evaluated against each future.

The next steps were described to the committee. MTC plans to meet with each jurisdiction through early March 2019. This idea seeks to establish contacts and processes for data collection and sharing between cities and regional agencies.

Janet Spilman spoke on the opportunity for coordination, since SCTA has already started collecting data and establish procedures and noted the wish to avoid duplication of effort.

7. Other Business/Next Agenda
N/A

8. Public Comment
N/A

9. Adjourn
The committee adjourned at 11:12 a.m.
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority - PAC
From: Janet Spilman, Director of Planning
Item: 4.1.1 – Planning Activities Report
Date: October 8, 2018

Issue:
Information only.

DATA MANAGEMENT AND FORECASTING

• **Travel Model Improvement and Countywide Travel Behavior Study** – Work continues to move forward on updating and revalidating the Sonoma County Travel Model. Current work is focused on updating transit inputs (stop locations, headways, fares) and gathering observed or real world data for model validation such as traffic counts and travel behavior survey data, and review of model algorithms and scripting. Fehr & Peers is now under contract to conduct a Travel Behavior Study for Sonoma County and to make focused travel model improvements including weekend estimation and improvements that will allow visitor/tourism travel to be predicted more reliably. Staff continues to work with local staff on funding this work and ensuring that this work supports local planning and engineering efforts.

• **Modeling and analysis support** – Mapping, modeling, and analytic support has been provided for projects in Santa Rosa, Cloverdale, the County of Sonoma, and in the Hwy 101 corridor. This work generally includes providing cartographic products to support project development or analysis or providing estimates of current and future travel demand and traffic. Staff has also provided mapping support for electric vehicle programs and supported the Sonoma County Department of Health Services with the collection of bicycle and pedestrian activity data for selected Sonoma County High Schools.

• **Housing data and analysis** – Staff continues to maintain and improve the Permitted and Pending Development Database, which is used to track pipeline projects in Sonoma County. Current efforts are focused on optimizing the database and on performing quality control checks. Work has also begun on updating SCTA general plan build out estimates.

PLANS

• **Transit Integration and Efficiency Study** – The Steering Committee and consulting team held a meeting to review initial data and outstanding needs. Stakeholder interviews are being scheduled and the Steering Committee continue to hold bi-weekly project management check-in calls.

• **Plan Bay Area 2050** – Staff is participating the development of **Horizon**, the prelude to PBA 2050, which will launch next year. The current priority is the development of MTC/ABAG project performance assessment criteria to be used with MTC’s new travel demand model, Travel Model Two. SCTA staff has performed an in-depth review of Travel Model Two road and transit networks and have provided feedback on where corrections and changes should be made to improve accuracy for Sonoma County.
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

- **Safe Routes to School** – Implementation of the 5 year Safe Routes to School program is underway with approval of the contract with Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition in September.

- **Bike Share Grant** – SCTA and TAM received responses to the Request for Information from a number of bike share operators, planning firms, and technology firms. Staff is in the process of reviewing the submittals and developing recommendations for the procurement process.

- **Emergency Ride Home Program** – Staff continues to promote awareness of the new countywide Emergency Ride Home Program, which will reimburse rides home in cases of a qualifying emergency for anyone who works in Sonoma County and gets to work using an alternative transportation option, such as carpooling, vanpooling, public transit, bicycling, or walking. Program rules, restrictions, and reimbursement forms are available online. [scta.ca.gov/ERH](http://scta.ca.gov/ERH)

- **Santa Rosa Car Share Pilot Program** – Staff continues to work with Zipcar to promote the program. Santa Rosa residents and employees can take advantage of complementary first-year new Zipcar memberships and members who signed up under the previous year promotion may receive $35 in driving credit after annual renewal subsidized by the grant. [Zipcar.com/SantaRosa](http://Zipcar.com/SantaRosa)

ADMINISTRATION OF ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING

- **Transportation for Clean Air Fund, County Program Manager (TFCA, CPM)** – SCTA is undergoing a routine fiscal audit of the TFCA CPM program. The Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Funding Agreement has been executed. Staff is in the process of executing fund transfer agreements with project sponsors for Fiscal Year 2018-2019.

COORDINATION & OUTREACH

Local Activities

- Spare the Air Resources Team – Worked with the Resources Team on outreach to employers on commute programs and website improvements.

Regional Coordination

- MTC/ABAG committees: Regional Advisory Working Group, Regional Modeling Working Group; Transit Finance Working Group, Active Transportation Working Group, Transportation Demand Management Working Group

- CMA Planners meetings

- Bay Area County Transportation Authority meeting

- Bay Area Partnership Board meeting

**Policy Impacts:**

All activities are consistent with SCTA policy.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Information only.
Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee
From: Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner
Item: Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study, Model Updates, and SB 743 Support – Updated Schedule, Contribution Deadlines, and SB743 Deliverables
Date: 10/25/2018

Issue:
What is the status of the Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study? What project deliverables would be useful for helping local agencies with SB743 compliance?

Background:
SCTA is conducting a countywide travel behavior study focused primarily on the collection and analysis of “big data” including mobile-source/cell phone data, GPS location data, and travel data to gather information on travel flows, average trip lengths (miles and minutes), travel modes, major destinations, trip purposes, travel peaks, etc. Deliverables for this project will include a final report summarizing travel flows, trends, and behavior for Sonoma County jurisdictions along with background data and graphics that could be used to support local general plan updates, provide information useful in the development of station area and area specific plans, and to support other local planning and engineering activities. As part of this project, SCTA will be making a number of improvements to the Sonoma County Travel Model and a portion of the budget will focus on providing local support for SB743 implementation. These improvements will be based on data collected as part of the travel behavior study.

Updated Schedule:
The new deadline for SB743 implementation has been delayed from 1/1/2020 to 7/1/2020. Based on this deadline change staff proposes directing Fehr and Peers to proceed with the preparation of the travel behavior study early in 2019, and directing consultants to prepare SB743 support materials in early to mid 2019 in order to provide local agencies with time to use these materials to help implement the required changes. Travel model validation should be completed by TJKM and SCTA by Feb. 2019. The final project would be completed by the end of 2019 with a presentation of the completed travel behavior study at the December 2019 SCTA Board of Directors Meeting. The updated project schedule is attached.

Contribution Deadline:
SCTA is fully funding an update and revalidation of the Sonoma County Travel Model and is contributing funds to complete the travel behavior study and model improvements but is unable to fully fund the project. Local agencies have been asked to contribute $9,000 to complete the travel behavior study and SB743 support...
item. The County of Sonoma is contributing additional funds in order to implement model improvements supporting the County’s general plan update. In order to proceed with data collection in January 2019, staff proposes a contribution deadline of 12/31/2018. A number of jurisdictions would like to participate in the project but are unable to contribute this fiscal year. These jurisdictions have committed to contribute in FY 19/20 (July 1, 2019).

SCTA shall provide an invoice or a memorandum of understanding for local agencies to review and process or execute along with supporting materials, which describe the project and project deliverables.

**SB743 Support Deliverables:**

The project scope includes a task focused on providing support with local implementation of SB743 requirements. The scope directed consultants to recommend possible deliverables for this task. SCTA staff recommends that local staff consider directing the consultant to prepare the following SB 743 deliverables:

- **Project level VMT calculator for Sonoma County** – Adapt the San Jose VMT calculator for use in Sonoma County using information collected as part of the Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study and using information from the Sonoma County Travel Model.

- **White paper providing guidance and recommendations on setting VMT thresholds** – Use information collected as part of the Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study, data from the Sonoma County Travel Model, and other data and resources to provide guidance and recommendations on setting local VMT thresholds in Sonoma County.

- **SB743 Implementation Toolkit** – Develop and deliver a policy toolkit to aid with local SB743 implementation. This toolkit would include model documents that could be adopted at the local level.

- **VMT screening maps** – Develop VMT screening maps for Sonoma County using information collected as part of the Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study and using data provided by the Sonoma County Travel Model.

**Policy Impacts:**

The Sonoma County Travel Behavior study will provide information on travel flows, origins and destinations, and travel behavior in Sonoma County, which could influence policy decisions. SB743 requires that local jurisdictions set VMT thresholds and that VMT be used to estimate transportation impacts in CEQA documents.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Local jurisdictions are being asked to contribute $9,000 to help fund the Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study and consultant support for SB743 implementation. SCTA is funding travel model validation and a portion of the travel behavior study and model improvement projects. The County of Sonoma is contributing additional funds to implement model improvements to support the County’s general plan update.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Review and provide feedback on the updated project schedule. Review and provide feedback on the proposed funding deadline. Review and provide feedback on possible SB743 support deliverables.
### UPDATED SCHEDULE: Sonoma County Travel Model Update - Validation/Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study - SB743 support and model enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>Sept ’18</th>
<th>Oct ’18</th>
<th>Nov ’18</th>
<th>Dec ’18</th>
<th>Jan ’19</th>
<th>Feb ’19</th>
<th>March ’19</th>
<th>Apr ’19</th>
<th>May ’19</th>
<th>June ’19</th>
<th>July ’19</th>
<th>Aug ’19</th>
<th>Sep ’19</th>
<th>Oct ’19</th>
<th>Nov ’19</th>
<th>Dec ’19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Model Validation/Calibration (TIKM - SCTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Invoicing/Funding Agreements (SCTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contracting (SCTA/Fehr &amp; Peers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Project Funding (local agencies - SCTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY18/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY19/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SB 743 Support Work (F&amp;P - SCTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Travel Behavior Study Additional Data Collection and Travel Behavior Study (F&amp;P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Weekend Model Enhancements (F&amp;P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Winery/Ag Enhancements (F&amp;P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Visitor/Tourism Enhancements (F&amp;P)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Expanded Gateways (F&amp;P - SCTA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SB743 Compliance Deadline 7/1/2020**
Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee
From: Tanya Narath, SCTA/RCPA Data Specialist
      Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner

Item: Caltrans Planning Grant – application by SCTA/DHS for Vision Zero

Date: 10/25/18

Issue:
Information only.

Background:
Data Dashboard Project Overview

SCTA/RCPA are consistently developing valuable data products to support transportation, climate, and other planning activities in Sonoma County and the San Francisco Bay Area Region. Storage and distribution of these data products and background data and information is currently done on an ‘ad hoc’ basis generally attached to specific project needs. There has been recent interest in accessing and using these data products more broadly.

Our agencies wish to develop more efficient methods for storing and cataloging the data and data products that are produced, and wish to develop better methods and tools for accessing, displaying, and distributing this data and associated data products. To this end SCTA/RCPA are planning to develop a Data Dashboard that will provide an effective framework to maintain and store data and data products, display and distribute this information, and to ensure that valuable data content is available to the public, elected officials and decision makers, and planning, transportation, engineering, and climate protection staff.

Data Dashboard Project Goals

1. Make SCTA/RCPA data products more accessible and visible to a wide variety of stakeholders. This improved access to data will make it easier for stakeholders to measure progress and provide input on key initiatives such as the SCTA’s Comprehensive Transportation Plan and the RCPA’s Climate Action 2020 and Shift Sonoma County plans.

2. Present data in formats that are accessible and meaningful to community members and organizations representing disadvantaged communities in Sonoma County. By presenting local data in an accessible and understandable format, SCTA/RCPA will help facilitate more informed and effective discussions regarding plans to address housing and transportation needs in the county.

3. Improve the ability of local planners, policy makers, and the community at large to understand the current state and trends related to SCTA and RCPA projects (e.g. climate change, housing, transportation, etc.). For example, the SCTA is leveraging the data it compiles for the Sonoma
County Travel Model to provide more detailed information on housing inventory, capacity, and the impacts of local land use decisions on transportation and climate change goals.

4. Implement a technology framework that is sustainable and can easily accommodate additional data sets and indicators in the future.

Application for FY 2019-20 Caltrans Sustainable Communities Grant Program

In preparation for submitting an application to the FY2019-20 Caltrans Sustainable Communities Grant Program for the Data Dashboard project, SCTA/RCPA staff have reviewed feedback from SCTA’s FY2018-19 application that was not selected for funding by Caltrans. Caltrans staff noted that SCTA's application could be strengthened by addressing safety, increasing community engagement with a focus on disadvantaged communities, and describing how the sharing of SCTA/RCPA data would lead to more concrete programs.

Based on Caltrans’ feedback, STCA/RCPA staff have identified an opportunity to strengthen this year’s application by collaborating with the Department of Health Services (DHS) on a Vision Zero planning project for Sonoma County. Vision Zero is a strategy adopted by cities such as San Francisco and Portland to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries by a goal date.

One of the foundational elements of successful Vision Zero projects is a robust data framework which provides the analysis and sharing of data required to identify safety opportunities and priorities. SCTA/RCPA’s Data Dashboard project will provide this essential data analysis and data sharing platform for the Sonoma County Vision Zero planning project. While injury and crash data from various sources will constitute the initial data included in the Data Dashboard, the dashboard will be designed to incorporate additional SCTA/RCPA data over time.

SCTA/RCPA staff recently presented a draft scope of work for the combined Vision Zero/Data Dashboard project to Caltrans District 4 staff and received positive feedback on the concept. Therefore, SCTA/RCPA has decided to partner with DHS and submit one application to Caltrans requesting funding for the combined project. SCTA will be the lead agency and DHS the sub-applicant on the grant application. The final grant application is due on November 30, and grant awards are anticipated for release by Caltrans in spring of 2019.

Policy Impacts:
None.

Fiscal Impacts:
None.

Staff Recommendation:
Information only.
Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee
From: Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner
Tanya Narath, Data Specialist
Item: Sonoma County Travel Model – Updating General Plan Buildout Estimates
Date: 10/25/2018

Issue:
What is the status of Sonoma County Travel Model land use update?

Background:
SCTA maintains a number of different land use scenarios which are used to estimate existing and future travel conditions in Sonoma County. Modeling data products are used directly as part of SCTA’s travel demand modeling program, but are also being used with greater frequency to support efforts associated with housing production and fire recovery. Modeling and other data analysis activities are greatly enhanced when the information being used is current and accurate. Existing conditions estimates have already been updated from 2010 - 2015 and staff is in the process of revising general plan build out (GPBO) estimates.

Existing Conditions (2015):
Travel model existing land use conditions have been updated from 2010 to 2015. Assessor’s parcel data, information on permitted and completed projects, and other data and estimates from local jurisdictions have been used to complete this update. Existing conditions data is summarized at the parcel level. SCTM existing conditions data outlines the number of housing units, square feet of commercial or industrial uses, hotel rooms, students, hospital rooms, and recreational acres for each parcel. Updated parcel level housing and employment estimates were validated using US Census estimates (American Community Survey, LEHD, etc.), CA Department of Finance housing and demographic projections, State and national employment and school enrollment databases, and other data sources available at the census tract and jurisdiction level.

General Plan Buildout Estimates:
SCTA develops and maintains a GPBO scenario as part of the SCTM to provide a future modeling alternative which is more consistent with local planning expectations and documents. MTC/ABAG forecasts, which are used to develop future year land use forecasts for the SCTA Comprehensive Transportation Plan, consider local general plans, land use policies, and zoning in their growth estimates, but also consider market and regional policies that may not be completely consistent with local planning assumptions and published estimates. SCTA staff used the methods and data sources outlined in Attachment C to produce 2012 GPBO estimates.
These estimates are now out of date and staff are in the process of updating GPBO estimates of future housing and employment growth potential. GPBO estimates broadly represent projected capacity based on land supply, infrastructure, and permitted development. GPBO estimates used by the travel model are summarized at the TAZ level and are calibrated or adjusted to match published build out estimates or ranges found in general plans and other local policy documents (see Attachment A for a list of referenced documents).

Staff have completed a review of GPBO housing estimates and have included them for review in Attachment D. This table summarizes existing housing, jurisdiction level GPBO housing capacity estimates, and comments outlining the sources that were used to update these estimates. Based on this review, countywide housing capacity has increased by just over 2,500 units (around a 1% increase) from the 2012 GPBO housing estimate. Jurisdiction level changes appear to be relatively minor with a few exceptions. Once summary estimates have been reviewed by local staff, staff will begin the process of allocating potential housing to travel model TAZs using the countywide pending and permitted projects database and the methods and tools outlined in Attachment C.

SCTA staff will begin working on updating non-housing GPBO estimates in November. Estimating non-housing related growth capacity is generally more difficult than estimating housing potential. Local planning documents generally provide less information on these types of uses, especially when considering long term capacity. Staff will use information available in general plans, employment forecasts, and the countywide pending and permitted projects database to update GPBO estimates of commercial and industrial square footage, hotel rooms, school enrollments and other non-housing uses. GPBO estimates of non-housing related growth should be available for review by the December PAC meeting.

**Policy Impacts:**

The GPBO scenario can be analyzed using the Sonoma County Travel Model to estimate project and plan transportation impacts. GPBO estimates have been used to analyze and better understand the regional and countywide housing crisis in Sonoma County.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Staff will complete the general plan buildout update in-house and will coordinate with local planning staff to review updated model inputs. No additional fiscal impacts beyond staff time will be required for this update.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff will reach out to each jurisdiction individually to review updated GPBO estimates for their jurisdiction. Please review information provided in Attachments A, B, & D for reasonableness and completeness.
# ATTACHMENT A: Summary of Local Planning Documents Reviewed for GPBO Updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>Adopted May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last amended January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Element</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>Draft EIR</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopted Housing Element</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Element Update Public Draft</td>
<td>April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>General Plan Policy Document</td>
<td>Adopted July 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last amended January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Element</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>Draft EIR</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Plan 2025</td>
<td>Adopted May 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last amended January 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Element</td>
<td>Adopted December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last amended November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last amended February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Element</td>
<td>November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Rohnert Park Priority Development Area Plan</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>General Plan FEIR</td>
<td>June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>November 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Element</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roseland Area Sebastopol Road Specific Plan</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>General Plan FEIR</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Element</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>General Plan EIR</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>October 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Element</td>
<td>March 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>General Plan EIR</td>
<td>February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Element</td>
<td>Adopted January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last amended December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>Housing Element</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Land Use Element</td>
<td>Adopted September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last amended August 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTACHMENT B: Local Build-out Assumptions Used in SCTM 2010 Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Build-out Horizon</th>
<th>Density Ratio</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>Provided TAZ level build-out last update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>varies by use</td>
<td>Within UGB to 2018, expansion of UGB after 2018. Data provided at TAZ level last update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Res. - varies by use, near or at max. density. Non-res. – max. adjusted down based on identified constraints</td>
<td>Residential holding capacity provided at parcel level, non-res at TAZ level last update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>72% Res., 40% Non-res.</td>
<td>From GP EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Development Potential varies by site</td>
<td>Calculated by city staff. Provided at parcel level last update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>Max. allowable density also calculated. Data provided at parcel level last update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Non-res. - max 75% of potential acres, Res. - max of 25 units/year</td>
<td>Growth management plan determines maximum residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Res. - max for all but MF, Non-res. greater than 50%, but less than max.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>varies by site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>maximum build-out potential</td>
<td>From GP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT C: GPBO Methodology and Data Sources:

Countywide Build-out Model:
Build-out data is not available at the TAZ or parcel level for all jurisdictions. Staff developed a simple GIS model to estimate build-out at the TAZ level for areas for which no locally generated build-out information is available. A basic outline of the general plan build-out estimation model is provided below:

1. Update GIS layer to incorporate local zoning code including the following information:
   a. Min/max units per acre.
   b. Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for commercial, industrial, and institutional land
   c. Generalized land use designation

2. Transfer zoning information to existing land use parcel layer.

3. Calculate parcel level maximum build-out using zoning designation:
   Housing: Parcel acres * maximum housing units per acre
   Non housing: Parcel square feet * maximum FAR

4. Calculate remaining capacity/development potential by subtracting existing uses from calculated maximum build-out. Summarize development potential/capacity at the Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) level.

   Development potential = Calculated Maximum build-out - Existing Land Use

5. Gather most current published General Plan build out by use from General Plans or GP EIRs to use as city-wide control total for build-out calculations.

   Jurisdictional Build-out Control Total (by land use type) = published number by land use type.

6. Update general plan build-out control total to include build-out published in area specific plans, specific area plans, or other localized planning documents which provide more detailed information on desired or permitted development for subsections of the city/jurisdiction. These subarea plans are generally detailed enough that ASP/SAP control totals can be assigned to individual or a few TAZs.

7. Assign ASP/SAP build-out growth to individual TAZs and subtract ASP/SAP TAZ level control totals from the citywide/jurisdictional control total. Use calculated development potential for TAZs to assign build-out for specific plan areas which cover multiple TAZs.

   Example: A SAP indicates that 100 single family homes may be built in the plan area. The plan area spans 2 traffic analysis zones (zones 3 & 4). Using zoning code and parcel area information, zone 3 has capacity for 150 new single family homes, and zone 4 has capacity for 50 new single family homes. Zone 3 contains 75% of calculated capacity and zone 4 contains 25% of calculated capacity, so 75 single family
homes are assigned to zone 3 and 25 single family homes are assigned to zone 4 in the build out scenario using this methodology.

**General Plan Build-out Estimation Model Input Data and Data Sources:**

1. *Countywide Planned Land Use Layer* – This GIS polygon layer summarizes zoning policy at the county level.
2. *Countywide Parcel Base* – Zoning restrictions can be applied to each parcel to determine development capacity for each parcel. Development capacity for each parcel was compared to existing development on each parcel to determine development potential beyond existing conditions.
3. *Local General and Area Specific Plans* – Local general and area specific plans were consulted to determine development minimum or maximums for different types of land uses in specific zoning areas. Zoning typically uses housing units, sq. ft., or floor area ratios as metrics of development.
4. *Existing build-out calculations or assumptions regarding infrastructure requirements for development* - Most jurisdictions do not use 100% build-out in their calculations. They generally default to 50-70% of maximum build-out to account for infrastructure and parking. *Attachment B* outlines local approaches to calculating build-out potential.
## Attachment D: Sonoma County Travel Demand Model - Housing Unit Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>3,562</td>
<td>4,826</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>(126)</td>
<td>Maximum housing units 4,700 in 2025 (GP, Exhibit 2-3 Historic and Projected Growth Rates, p. 12); 2010 count from HE Table 2.14 p. 2-32; HE Table 2.17 states 3,182 occupied units in 2010; Table 2.32 Capacity to meet 2014-2022 RHNA p. 2-48 states capacity for 750 more units; Section 2.4.1 Land Inventory - 156 units planned/approved, 455 units possible on vacant land, 139 units possible on underutilized land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>4,204</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>5,534</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>per GP DEIR (Table 2-3, p. 2.0-10) max new development of 1541 units in city limits, includes development from Downtown and Santero Way specific plans; max dev within City Limits + SOI = 2,140 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>4,858</td>
<td>5,147</td>
<td>5,547</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>5,547</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Per HE (Nov 2014, Table 42, p. 93), potential units range from low of 340 to high of 656; current GPBO estimate is increase of 400 units from 2015 estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>22,189</td>
<td>23,302</td>
<td>27,787</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>27,949</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Total units at buildout 27,949 (GP DEIR Table ES-1 p. E-4); Housing element appendix A p. 9: 2013 housing unit count = 22,868; total housing units per ACS 2012-2016 estimates = 22,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>16,265</td>
<td>16,634</td>
<td>23,420</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>23,882</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>Revised RP GPBO = 2015 estimate plus 4656 &quot;reasonable&quot; units (housing element p 9-65) plus 1757 (housing element p 9-84) from long term growth areas outside of city limits (Canon Manor, NE Specific Plan, NW Specific Plan); Added 835 units per Central Rohnert Park Priority Development Area Plan (Table 4.2, p. 4-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>71,693</td>
<td>74,973</td>
<td>94,750</td>
<td>5,184</td>
<td>94,869</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Added 119 units to GBPO per Roseland Area Specific Plan Table 3-3 Development Potential by Land Use Type. Relative to GP 2035, SF decreases by 255 units and MF increases by 374 units for total increase of 119 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>3,527</td>
<td>3,798</td>
<td>4,834</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Added 1,185 units to 2015 using max buildout scenario from GP DEIR (Table 2.0-4, p. 2.0-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>5,093</td>
<td>5,253</td>
<td>6,648</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>5,742</td>
<td>(906)</td>
<td>Added 489 units to 2015 per HE (p. 9); HE (p. 5) states that housing stock was 5,544 (291 more than 2015 estimate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>9,079</td>
<td>9,106</td>
<td>12,160</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>13,544</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>Revised per GP Final EIR (p. 41) - 9,660 existing dwelling units in 2017 + 3,910 estimated net new dwelling units 2015-2040 = 13,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Unincorporated</td>
<td>49,038</td>
<td>49,826</td>
<td>57,369</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>57,369</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COUNTYWIDE</td>
<td>188,487</td>
<td>194,995</td>
<td>241,545</td>
<td>16,649</td>
<td>244,119</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: 2010 US Census occupied HU estimate - 185,825
** Note: 2015 US Census American Community Survey (1 year estimate) occupied HU estimate - 190,662
CASA Compact Overview
Bay Area Specific Legislation- Bold, Effective, Shared, Best Practices

Protection
1. Just Cause Eviction Standards
2. Anti-Gouging Cap
3. Right to Legal Counsel for Eviction Proceedings

Preservation
4. Amendments to State Housing Element Law/RHNA
5. No Net Loss of Units with Right of First Refusal

Affordable Housing Production
6. Significant Regional Revenue Streams
7. Increase Utilization of Public Land for Housing Production
8. Recreate Redevelopment for Housing and Housing-Related Infrastructure
9. Regional 10-15% Inclusionary Standards with Waivers, Luxury Unit Fee

All Housing Production (Affordable, Missing Middle, Homeless, Market)
10. Remove Regulatory Barriers to ADU’s
11. Align Density Bonus/Inclusionary Zoning Laws to Improve, Even, Fair Application for All Housing
12. Streamline Housing Approvals Through Fair, Predictable, Faster Process
13. Cap Mitigation Impact Fees to Control Fees Evenly in Region
14. Improve Effectiveness and Fairness of State Housing Streamlining (SB35)
15. Minimum Zoning on Transit for Housing
16. Amend Product Defect Liability Standards so Attached Housing Forms Insurable for Builders/Contractor
17. Creation of New Regional Housing Entity
Compact Element #1: Just Cause Eviction Standards

Protection Policy

Brief Description:
Just cause eviction protections ensure that tenants are protected from arbitrary evictions, requiring landlords to cite specific “just causes” (both fault and no-fault) for termination of tenancy, such as failure to pay rent or violation of lease terms. Just cause often includes relocation assistance for no-fault evictions. All renter households would benefit from just cause eviction protections.

Desired Effect:
Just cause would protect tenants from arbitrary evictions. Studies show that eviction can cause health issues, emotional trauma, school disruptions for children, longer and more costly commutes and reduced wage earnings for adults. By preventing no-cause evictions, just cause eviction protections promote tenant stability—particularly in low vacancy and expensive housing markets—and limit eviction-related monetary, health, school and other costs. Eviction-related costs can pose a particular burden for tenants who are low and fixed income, have physical disabilities, or are elderly.

Scale:
State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

Models:
New Jersey statewide Just Cause Law, large cities in California (San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, Los Angeles)

References:
Action Plan 2.1

Negotiation Points:
Definition of permissible causes for eviction, define property types excluded, discuss relocation assistance, means of enforcement

Compact Element #2: Anti-Gouging Cap

Protection Policy

Brief Description:
Establishes reasonable annual increases in rent.

Desired Effect:
Anti-gouging/rent stabilization would prevent extreme rent increases in rent on a year-to-year basis, thereby decreasing the number of households who are risk of displacement and homelessness, decreasing the number of households that are rent burdened, and promoting tenant and community stability. Extreme rent increases can pose a particular burden for tenants who are low and fixed income.

Scale:
State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

Models:
Forthcoming if available/applicable

References:
Action Plans Referenced: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3

**Negotiation Points:**
Annual rent increase limits, vacancy decontrol, define property types excluded; limits on number of years increases can be banked and percentage of increases banked; enforcement mechanisms; duration: permanent program or tied to emergency declaration with sunset provisions

**Compact Element #3: Right to Legal Counsel for Eviction Proceedings**

**Protection Policy**

**Brief Description:**
All tenants facing eviction would have the right to legal counsel, leveling the playing field and protecting tenants from illegal evictions.

**Desired Effect:**
Access to a lawyer can be the difference between losing a home and keeping it. Ensuring that all tenants facing eviction have the right to legal counsel would create a fairer justice system; prevent evictions and homelessness; improve health, stability and opportunity for thousands of residents, including children; and preserve existing affordable housing. With proper implementation, research suggests that the right to legal assistance for eviction proceedings can lead to a net savings for local jurisdictions.

**Scale:**
State legislation supported by regional funding

**Models:**
San Francisco Prop F passed in June, New York City

**References:**
Action Plan 3.1

**Negotiation Points:**
Funding source, identifying providers/administration; fees: means testing or sliding scale

**Compact Element #4: Amendments to State Housing Law/RHNA**

**Preservation Policy**

**Brief Description:**
Amend State Housing Law and RHNA to add:
- Site feasibility analysis
- Categories, reporting for zoning and production of homeless housing, missing middle
- Tenant Protections, Preservation
- Reducing cost of housing for feasibility at range of prices (fees, process, inclusionary, elevated standards other impositions)
- Require RHNA compliance to include backlog and zoning in excess of RHNA

**Desired Effect:**
Require local agencies to analyze the totality of their actions on housing production and preservation, report this to the State, and use this information to evaluate their zoning and programming to improve housing outcomes.

**Scale:**
State legislation (may not be able to be limited to 9 Bay Area counties); alternative to legislation to be explored is to amend the Housing Element certification process to provide for desired impacts outlined above.

**Models:**
Forthcoming if available/applicable

**References:**
SB 828 Weiner (land use: housing element/RHNA). This compact element to be revised as needed based on pending action by Governor on SB828 (veto; allow into law; sign). Action Plans Referenced: 8.1, 12.4.

**Negotiation Points:**
Missing middle definition; impacts on affordable housing

**Compact Element #5: No Net Loss of Deed Restricted Units with Right of First Refusal**

**Preservation Policy**

**Brief Description:**
This policy would be an overlay/subset of other policies recommended on this list that encourage rezoning/upzoning and or intensification of existing uses that currently include housing (example: Redevelopment 2.0)

**Desired Effect:**
The goal of the policy is to preserve opportunities for low-income households to return to newly redeveloped areas and prevent the loss of low and middle income housing opportunities in a redevelopment project or area.

**Scale:**
9 Bay Area counties

**Models:**
Public Housing Redevelopment, former redevelopment requirements, City of Portland No Net Loss Policy, City of Arlington, VA Conservation Districts

**References:**
Action Plan 8.2
http://housing.arlingtonva.us/affordable-housing/housing-conservation-district/

**Negotiation Points:**
Relocation assistance; location and amount of replacement housing; right to return; how to pay- funding sources and/or developer incentives; 1:1 replacement definitions and requirements including whether it applies beyond just deed restricted unites; balancing size of requirement vis-à-vis having sufficient revenue sources and offsets to cover the cost

Compact Element #6: Significant Regional Revenue Streams
Production Policy
Brief Description:
In order to properly implement a number of the CASA compact proposals, we must identify billions of dollars in new revenue to support the three P’s. Given California’s complex tax and fiscal rules, it is likely that we need to explore a number of vehicles/proposals throughout the region. Successful implementation of CASA proposals will likely call for a new, on-going (as opposed to one-time) dedicated funding for affordable housing subsidies, access to legal counsel, tenant protections proposals, infrastructure related investments, preservation fund proposals and revenue to localities to offset fee reductions. Ideas include regional housing trust fund; 2020 ballot measure for funding, etc.

Desired Effect:
Secure new, dedicated revenue sources for CASA implementation priorities.

Scale:
9 Bay Area counties with potential state legislative implications.

Models:
MTC working on comprehensive analysis of options

References:
Action Plan 9.1; 13.1; 13.2; 14.2

Negotiation Points:
Types of taxes, fees and who pays, expenditure plans and rules, roles of cities and counties in governance and administration, timing considerations, labor standards, whether to link to other CASA proposals (ex. Fee reductions) for successfully securing revenue

Compact Element #7: Strengthen Utilization of Public Land for Housing Production
Production Policy
Brief Description:
Promote increased utilization of public land for affordable housing through enhancements to a variety of legislation, regulatory tools and regional coordination and planning actions including strengthening the surplus land act, amending housing element law or amending the regulatory certification process, and embedding coordinating, technical support and monitoring functions in a regional housing entity. Goals are to achieve:

• Barrier reduction to developing on public land by ensuring that land is adequately zoned
• Create mechanism for coordination/monitoring of regional public land supply
• Provide technical support and draft legislation that encourages public to be reused for housing.

**Desired Effect:**
Encourage the reuse of public land for the creation of mixed-income or affordable housing development.

**Scale:**
State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties; may impact housing element law; to be addressed in coordination with other CASA policies.

**Models:**
Puget Sound region of Washington including Seattle;
http://www.prsc.org/public-land-affordable-housing
Enterprise report:
http://www.enterprisecommunity.org/download?fid=3257&nid=3739

**References:**
Action Plan 16.1; 16.2

**Negotiation Points:**
Intent: is it to “encourage” or to “create stricter requirements for affordability”. Incentive structure options, revenue source to cover localities cost to implement; levels of affordability; pricing and conveyance of land ranging from donated in full to conveying at below-market value.

**Compact Element #8: Recreate Redevelopment for Housing and Housing-Related Infrastructure**

**Production Policy**

**Brief Description:**
Reinstate redevelopment as a tool for local governments to address the need for affordable homes. RDA laws and plan areas still exist in the Health and Safety Code, though RDA Plan areas had time limits. Instead of creating a whole new law, amend the dissolution law to allow jurisdictions to bring back their redevelopment agencies, but with few changes: Funding collected would only be for housing and housing-related infrastructure, Added reporting and oversight to ensure that funds are being spent appropriately and timely, Consider adding a focus on the missing middle, Consider a TI cap that limits the total amount of the pie that RDAs can capture, Relocation and replacement housing requirements stay in place.

**Desired Effect:**
Redevelopment at its peak created $1 billion annually in subsidy dollars to address the State’s housing crisis. With the dissolution of redevelopment in 2011, that funding was lost and has not been replaced. Although there have been several attempts at “RDA 2.0”, none of these has been productive, and few (if any) units have been built as a result. Assembly
Member Chiu had a proposal this last session that started this conversation. That could be the framework for this new proposal.

**Scale:**
State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

**Models:**
Former California redevelopment program

**References:**
Action Plans Referenced: 14.3, 14.4

**Negotiation Points:**
Base year, Time limits, Dissolution logistics, Legacy agency housing assets, Bond obligations, Pass throughs, Oversight and administration logistics; discuss adding protections for existing tenants and communities.

**Compact Element #9: Regional 10-15% Inclusionary Standards with Waivers, Luxury Unit Fee**

**Production Policy**

**Brief Description:**
Create uniform, reasonable and feasible inclusionary zoning standards in the region with affordable units taxed at affordable prices and use of alternative means of compliance that can be applied at request of applicant if on-site affordability not achievable.

**Desired Effect:**
Pre-cursor to achieving expanded housing production with on-site affordable throughout the region- inclusionary rates set too high, or inflexibly, can make new housing projects infeasible thereby suppressing both market rate and affordable housing production. Conversely, lack of inclusionary housing may be a missed opportunity to create mixed income housing.

**Scale:**
State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

**Models:**
Seattle, New York

**References:**
Action Plan 10.8

**Negotiation Points:**
Terms and requirements for a local waiver; monitoring and enforcement to ensure not suppressing production, Exclusions, Maximums. Alternative means of compliance

**Compact Element #10: Remove Regulatory Barriers to ADUs**

**Production Policy**

**Brief Description:**
Amend existing state ADU law to remove regulatory barriers to building including ministerial approval for ADUs and Junior ADUs in residential zones, allowance for multiple ADUs in multi-family homes, and creation of a small homes building code (AB 2890 Ting)
**Desired Effect:**

Extremely High Impact; Short Term. Assuming 20% of 1.5 million single family homes in Bay Area = 300,000 new homes distributed into existing neighborhoods. In PDAs alone would be 50,000 new homes. Distribute green, more affordable homes into every existing neighborhood quickly. Existing local zoning rules and fees prevent widespread safe and legal ADU expansion uniformly in region. State must reduce zoning barriers to: (1) Create significant, rapid increase in less costly homes for more diverse population including stabilizing vulnerable households including seniors, disabled, and lower income homeowners in all existing neighborhoods (missing middle housing, Preservation); (2) Reduce GHG by improving utilization of buildings/land build more small, infill, low GHG/sustainable homes. Help expand and stabilize labor force and construction.

**Scale:**

State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

**Models:**

Forthcoming if applicable from other states

**References:**

Action Plans Referenced: 10.3; 10.4; UCB Chapple 2015; UCB Terner Center 2017; Legislative history SB1069, AB2890

**Negotiation Points:**

---

**Compact Element #12: Streamline Housing Approvals Through Fair, Predictable, Faster Process**

**Production Policy**

**Brief Description:**

Amend State Housing and Permitting Laws (Permit Streamlining Act, Housing Accountability Act, CEQA) to disallow backsliding to avoid compliance with State law, and to restore transparency, certainty, fairness, deadlines, predictability to housing approval process for all housing types. Reinstate fairness, reasonableness, certainty, and deadlines in housing permitting through entitlement reform for homeless, affordable, and market rate housing. Case-by-case public disputes and opposition to many if not most housing projects, even when these are consistent with local plans and rules, prevent the region from supplying needed housing at any income level. Good government must be transparent, fair, predictable, and even-handed across the region, with clear rules that apply to everyone equally.

**Desired Effect:**

High Impact; Short Term for proposed housing or housing stuck in approval pipeline that is otherwise prevented from advancing. Not possible to document the number of units “not proposed” or “slowed down until became infeasible”. Required precursor to increasing housing production of market rate, affordable, homeless, and all forms of housing.

**Scale:**
State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

Models:
Forthcoming if available/applicable

References:
Action Plan 12.1

Negotiation Points:
Terms and requirements for a local waiver; monitoring and enforcement to ensure not suppressing production; exploration of “deemed approved” language.

Compact Element #13: Cap Mitigation Fees to Control Fees Evenly in Region

Production Policy
Brief Description:
Cap impact fees and equalize between local agencies so as not to penalize residential construction differentially, and increase uniformity and transparency of residential fees, and increase housing production, especially of smaller homes with lower overall costs like ADUs.

Desired Effect:
Effect of legislation will be to allow legal safe construction of thousands of homes cannot be built or are being built without permits today in part due to high impact fees, and to allow more and more evenly distributed housing production throughout the region that is not affectively barred except for luxury renters or buyers through the imposition of escalating impact fees.

Scale:
State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

Models:
Forthcoming if available/applicable

References:
Action Plans Referenced: 12.1, UCB Terner Center 2017, SB831, HCD Impact Fee Study

Negotiation Points:
Cap level/rate/exclusions, account for differences in project size, Replacement sources of revenue

Compact Element #14: Improve Effectiveness and Fairness of State Housing Streamlining (SB35)

Production Policy
Brief Description:
SB35 was intended to streamline housing for projects with fully skilled and trained labor and on-site affordable. Amendments are needed to improve effectiveness so more projects to make use of this section to increase housing production. Amendments proposed:
• To allow reasonable local review
• Allow smaller projects to access expedited review without added labor or affordability standards
• For larger projects add tax 15-year abatement (modeled on New York) and other offsets to pay for labor and affordable requirements

Desired Effect:
Projects that have labor standards should get benefit of additional tools (benefits/offsets) to pay for living wage jobs. Pre-cursor to achieving expanded housing production with labor standards and on-site affordable throughout the region. Essential to easing construction labor shortage increasing number and predictability of high quality desirable construction jobs.

Scale:
State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

Models:
New York

References:
SB35
Action Plans Referenced: 12.2; 12.3; 17.1; 17.2

Negotiation Points:
Opt-out provisions for communities of concern, economic offsets and tools, confirm 15-year time period for real estate tax abatement; define: small project, affordability levels, limits/requirements on use of real estate abatement.

Compact Element #15: Minimum Zoning on Transit for Housing

Production Policy

Brief Description:
Increase number of market rate and affordable homes near transit on low density residential, commercial, and public sites with limited parking in a manner that fits in with existing neighborhoods and expands at a minimum missing middle housing (housing built to height of 36’, 75% lot coverage, no parking, no density restrictions), to significantly increase overall housing production in areas targeted by Plan Bay Area and Sustainable Communities.

Desired Effect:
High Impact, Medium to Long term but essential to achieve compliance with PBA and SCS. Required precursor to increasing housing production of market rate, affordable, homeless, and all forms of housing.

Scale:
State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

Models:
Forthcoming if available/applicable

References:
Action Plans Referenced: 8.2; 10.3; 10.5; 10.6
SB827
**Negotiation Points:**
Temporary opt-out provisions for communities of concern for 3-5 years; height added density above missing middle, define qualifying transit (bus, rail, ferry, major transit stop?); note bus/rail pinch point; protections, affordability expectations, and labor standards.

---

**Compact Element #16: Amend Product Defect Liability Standards**

**Production Policy**

**Brief Description:**
Adjust liability standards to make more homes insurable. Home ownership cannot be achieved in infill buildings without modifying existing liability laws that prevent reasonable attached home ownership products because they are uninsurable.

**Desired Effect:**
Medium to long term but essential to achieve compliance with PBA and SCS. In regions such as Cascadia which has more reasonable liability laws for ownership, up to 50% of attached housing new construction is in ownership forms. If the Bay Area could increase production by being able to offer homes for sale in addition to for rent, could increase overall housing production by being able to offer homes for sale in addition to for rent, could increase overall housing production significantly. Also may be the only way to create new home ownership opportunities in existing developed communities including in small missing middle type projects that could create more ownership opportunities at a range of incomes.

**Scale:**
State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

**Models:**
Liability standards and insurance markets in most US States and Canada

**References:**
Action Plan 11.3
Legislative History

---

**Compact Element #17: Creation of New Regional Housing Entity**

**Production Policy**

**Brief Description:**
Create, resource, and staff a new regional housing department or quasi-public entity. This department or entity could (a) gather and track data including tracking deed restricted units and public land. (b) assist in planning and technical assistance for topics such as expanded PDA grants, and (c) support programming funding through a Regional Housing Trust Fund which could function similarly to the Bay Area Toll Authority model. The housing entity would not play a regulatory/enforcement role.

**Desired Effect:**
Our regional agencies currently are not equipped with the capacity and authority to tackle our pressing displacement and affordable housing crisis. For housing, the regional agencies already have an overwhelming amount of work to do to execute on existing goals to reach that vision, and while Bay Area Metro is well positioned to plan, it has insufficient bandwidth, tools and expertise to implement. CASA will create a Compact and even more capacity will be needed regionally to execute on additional outputs and goals.

**Scale:**
- State legislation applied to 9 Bay Area counties

**Models:**
- Forthcoming if available/applicable

**References:**
- Bay Area Toll Authority

**Negotiation Points:**
- Implementation, Resources, Authority
MEMORANDUM

TO:     Regional Advisory Working Group
FR:     Mark Shorett
RE:     Horizon Perspective Paper #3 Preview – Regional Growth Strategies

DATE:   September 26, 2018

Summary
At its October meeting, staff will provide the RAWG with a preview of work completed to date on the third Horizon Perspective Paper - Regional Growth Strategies. The paper considers the successes and shortcomings of the Bay Area’s current regional growth framework, which aims to focus new housing and jobs in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) while preserving Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs). Staff is seeking input on preliminary findings and potential framework options.

Perspective Paper Objectives
The Regional Growth Strategies Perspective Paper is intended to:
- Identify successes and shortcomings with the current PDA-based growth framework
- Investigate potential new options for a regional growth framework that meets our housing needs, reduces GHG emissions, and supports Horizon’s Guiding Principles
- Develop planning, policy, and funding strategies for each option
- Spur a larger conversation about updating the region’s growth framework next year in preparation for Plan Bay Area 2050

Work to Date: Key Findings
Staff analysis of recent regional growth trends and local plans reveals that:
- The Bay Area is trending toward focused growth in PDAs and open space preservation. The share of the region’s housing growth in PDAs has increased dramatically since the last recession. Development outside of the region’s urban footprint has slowed significantly, while the amount of open space permanently protected continues to grow.
- We are not doing enough to address our housing crisis and reduce auto travel — inside or outside PDAs. The Bay Area continues to permit only a small fraction of the housing units needed for very low-, low-, and moderate-income households. Meanwhile, the number of miles driven by Bay Area residents remains stubbornly high, threatening our ability to meet GHG reduction targets.
- The current Regional Growth Framework excludes many locations that could help the region meet its targets. Like PCAs, PDAs are nominated voluntarily by Bay Area cities. While this approach has helped build consensus around the region’s current growth framework, it has resulted in the exclusion of many transit-rich locations that local jurisdictions do not choose to nominate as PDAs. Overall, the set of places currently targeted by the region for focused growth may not be adequate to solve the region’s housing crisis and climate challenge.
- **The complexity of current and future challenges calls for a more holistic framework.** While focusing growth in locations with a reduced carbon footprint is essential, it is clear that other goals from the *Horizon* Guiding Principles should be considered as well. Going forward, the region would benefit from continued land use-transit coordination while also including housing and land use strategies to retain the region’s diversity, address a full range of environmental hazards, improve access to opportunity, and maximize affordability for all.

**Next Steps: Regional Growth Framework Options and Strategies**

To advance regional dialogue, staff will introduce three preliminary growth framework options through the Perspective Paper for further discussion:

1) **Double Down on PDAs** - the region would pursue strategies to continue the focus on PDAs as primary location for housing growth and to increase the share of employment growth in those locations. Policies and investments would be tailored to the market and socioeconomic conditions of different PDAs to improve the ability of cities to concentrate new housing close to transit.

2) **PDAs Plus** - the region would expand its focus to include PDAs as well as transit-rich areas and other opportunity sites, such as aging malls and office parks. Context-driven strategies would focus on housing production and GHG reduction throughout the region while mitigating impacts and boosting access to opportunity.

3) **Clean Slate** - the region would continue to support transit-oriented, infill locations, but housing needs would also be met through a focus on middle-density housing in existing neighborhoods and the strategic expansion of the urban footprint.

Policy and funding strategies supporting the options will also be introduced in the paper, as well as “potential focus areas”—types of locations to consider prioritizing regional resources to achieve our full housing needs.

Feedback from MTC/ABAG committees, local staff, CASA participants, and stakeholders will shape the *Growth Strategies* Perspective Paper released in December 2018. The paper’s key strategies will be tested across a series of divergent futures (“what if…” planning scenarios). The paper will also inform a dialogue leading to a potential update of the regional growth framework in 2019 that will shape *Plan Bay Area 2050*.

**Requested Feedback**

Staff request RAWG feedback on the following questions:

- Which aspects of the current PDA-focused framework are most and least effective?
- What opportunities and challenges are associated with each framework option?
- Which strategies could be pursued by cities, ABAG/MTC, and the state to implement each framework option?

**Attachments**

- Attachment A: *Regional Growth Strategies* Perspective Paper Preview (PowerPoint Presentation)
Regional Growth Strategies

Perspective Paper #3 - Work to Date/Preview
Mark Shorett - Regional Advisory Working Group
October 2, 2018
Horizon is exploring how economic, environmental, technological, and political uncertainties may create new challenges - or exacerbate existing ones - for the Bay Area over the coming decades.

For more information, go to: bayareametro.gov/horizon
Perspective Papers

1) Autonomous Vehicles
2) Toward a Shared Future
3) Growth Strategies
4) Crossings
5) Future of Jobs
6) Governance
7) Sea Level Rise

More to Come?
Perspective Paper 3: Regional Growth Strategies

Purpose

To identify successes and shortcomings with the current PDA-centric growth framework

To investigate potential new options for meeting regional housing needs and reducing GHG emissions, while aligning with Horizon Guiding Principles

To develop planning, policy, and funding strategies for each option

To spur a larger conversation about updating the regional growth framework next year in preparation for Plan Bay Area 2050
What is a regional growth framework?

How is our current framework doing?

What’s missing from our current framework?

What are some options & strategies going forward?

Paper 3 slated for release in December/January
Seeking input this month from stakeholders
Perspective Paper 3
Work to Date
Overview of Today’s Presentation

1. What is a regional growth framework?
2. How is our current framework doing?
3. What’s missing from our current framework?
4. What are some options & strategies going forward?

Paper 3 slated for release in December/January
Seeking input this month from stakeholders
Examples from Across the Globe
Growth Frameworks for the Bay Area

Regional Plan (1970)

Plan Bay Area (2013)

1. Non-urbanized land
2. Urbanized land
3. Priority Development Areas (PDAs)
The Current Growth Framework

**PDAs** Focus Housing and Jobs in **Priority Development Areas**
- Voluntarily adopted by cities; planned, or being planned, for housing
- Within walking distance of frequent transit & inside an existing community

**PCAs** Protect Open Space in **Priority Conservation Areas**
- Voluntarily nominated by cities and special districts (e.g. park districts)
- Regionally significant open spaces
The Current Growth Framework

Invest in PDAs and PCAs via

**One Bay Area Grant (OBAG)**

OBAG devotes a share of regional transportation funds to planning and projects in PDAs and PCAs
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Successes & Challenges

Current Framework

- Effective open space protection
- 188 adopted PDAs

- Share of housing permits in PDAs increasing
- OBAG aligns investment with growth strategy

- Stronger real estate markets in PDAs across region

- Some PDAs not aligned with program guidelines
- Many cities do not designate transit-rich areas PDAs

- Current share well below PBA 2040 forecast
- Low and moderate income housing needs not met

- Increasing displacement pressure in many PDAs
Greenfield Development: Limited Growth

Acres of Urbanized Land by County: 2004-2014

Source: Vital Signs/California Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

Current Framework
Open Space: Increased Protection

Acres of Permanently Protected Open Space by County, 2002-2016

Source: California Protected Areas Database

Current Framework
Plans Underway or Complete in 75% of PDAs

Progress Toward Plan* Adoption in PDAs, 2018

Number of PDAs

- None: 44
- Adopted for Part of PDA: 23
- Plan Underway: 21
- Adopted for All of PDA: 100

Level of Planning Completed

* = defined as specific plan or equivalent
Source: MTC/ABAG Survey of Locally Adopted Plans

Current Framework

Broadway-Valdez
Specific Plan
Oakland

Central Petaluma
Specific Plan
Petaluma

Downtown
Precise Plan
Redwood City
Some PDAs Do Not Meet Guidelines

1/4

of PDAs are not well-served* by frequent transit as defined by PDA program guidelines**

* = defined as less than 50% of PDA
** = defined as a rail station, ferry terminal, or bus service with 20 minute headway at peak hours
Many Transit-Rich Areas Are Not PDAs

>50% of land within 10 minutes’ walk of frequent transit is not designated a PDA

Source: Regional Transit Database
Current Framework

Location of Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)

- **Rail Transit**
- **Inside PDA**
- **Outside PDA**

Santa Rosa
San Francisco
San Jose
Oakland
Fremont
Concord

Map showing the location of transit priority areas (TPAs) with rail transit lines and areas designated as inside or outside PDAs.
PDA Progress on Housing Varies by County

Percentage of Plan Bay Area 2040 PDA Housing Targets Achieved (2014-16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2014-16 permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>11,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>3,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>10,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>7,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Framework
PDA Progress on Housing Varies by Transit Corridor

Percentage of Plan Bay Area 2040 Housing Targets Achieved (2014-16)

- All PDAs
- SMART
- Capitol Corridor
- BART
- Caltrain

Current Framework
Currently Not Meeting RHNA Needs - Inside or Outside of PDAs

Housing Units Permitted by Affordability Level, 2014-2016

- Very Low - Low
- Moderate
- Above Moderate
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What’s Missing from Our Framework?

Full Suite of Guiding Principles

AFFORDABLE
CONNECTED
DIVERSE
HEALTHY
VIBRANT

Geographies Beyond PDAs/PCAs
Exploring Areas Best Suited for Growth

Full Suite of Guiding Principles

- Housing costs
- Vehicle miles traveled per person
- Community stability
- Hazard protection
- Access to opportunity

Geographies Beyond PDAs/PCAs

Developed an index for the entire nine-county Bay Area
Housing Costs

*Most affordable*

- 5
- 4
- 3
- 2
- 1

*Least affordable*

Affordability Definition: Monthly Contract Rent (rent asked), 2016

Source: US Census ACS 2012-2016
Vehicle Miles Traveled (per person)

**VMT Definition:** simulated weekday vehicle miles traveled per person, 2015

Source: Travel Model One - MTC
Community Stability

**Most stable: no displacement**

- 5
- 4
- 3
- 2
- 1

**Least stable: high displacement**

**Community Stability Definition:** Lack of displacement risk as defined in Plan Bay Area 2040/Vital Signs, 2015

**Source:** Vital Signs; US Census
Healthy Rail Transit

Least vulnerable to natural hazards

Most vulnerable to natural hazards

Protection Definition: lack of exposure to wildfire, earthquake, flooding and/or sea level rise risks

Source: MTC, Cal Fire, USGS, FEMA, BCDC
Access to Opportunity

Greatest access to healthcare, education, and jobs

Least access to healthcare, education, and jobs

Opportunity Definition: combination of access to high-quality healthcare, good schools, and diverse job opportunities

Source: California TCAC/HCD, DOE, OES; US Census ACS/LEHD
Highest combined score:
- 19+
- 17-18
- 15-16
- 13-14
- 5-12

Lowest combined score:

What's Missing?
Where Are the Highest-Ranked* Places?

PDAs are generally in lower-VMT locations with reduced transportation costs.

However, the vast majority are vulnerable to natural hazards & displacement, and nearly all lack adequate access to the Bay Area’s best schools & hospitals.

* = top 20% of Census blocks in the Bay Area for each indicator
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Three Potential Frameworks for Growth

A: Double Down on PDAs
B: PDAs Plus
C: Clean Slate
A Double Down on PDAs

- **Concept**
  - PDAs remain the primary focus area for housing growth & take on a larger share of job growth
  - PDAs evolve to reflect local context, including market strength and displacement risk
  - “High-performing” PDAs prioritized for the greatest levels of growth and investment

- **Example Strategies**
  - Increase share of regional funding in PDAs
  - Direct transit investments to bring all PDAs to minimum frequency requirement
  - Tailor assistance and investments to PDA market strength

**PROS**
- Builds on locally-supported approach
- Leverages recently-adopted plans

**CONS**
- Growth footprint may not be adequate to meet housing needs
- Does not fully leverage transit network
PDAs Plus

• **Concept**
  • Expand growth geographies beyond PDAs to include TPAs served by high-capacity transit and “regional catalyst sites” for mixed-income housing
  • Expand growth framework to include entire region with supportive land use strategies as appropriate

• **Example Strategies**
  • Provide incentives and funding to support development of “catalyst sites”
  • Provide assistance and investments to spur “missing middle” and modular housing

**PROS**
• Leverages the full extent of the regional transit network
• Greater diversity of places to meet housing needs, including high-opportunity areas

**CONS**
• Requires revised guidelines and designation process
Clean Slate

**Concept**
- Continue supporting growth in transit-served infill locations as part of larger strategy
- Allow for strategic expansion of urban footprint and prioritize middle-density housing
- Consider “new towns” to meet housing needs

**Example Strategies**
- Provide planning support and infrastructure for urban reserves
- Fund first/last mile mobility solutions in lower-density locations
- Streamline development processes

**PROS**
- Provides the greatest geographic footprint to meet housing needs
- Spreads responsibility for accommodating growth more broadly, including high-opportunity areas

**CONS**
- May require significant infrastructure investment
- Likely requires changes to urban growth boundaries
Testing Frameworks & Strategies via Futures

A. Double Down on PDAs

B. PDAs Plus

C. Clean Slate

Clean and Green
Rising Tides, Falling Fortunes
Back to the Future
What’s Next?

- Framework/Strategy Development
- Perspective Paper Release
- Framework/Strategy Testing via Futures
- Growth Framework Update
- Draft Preferred Scenario

- Ongoing: December/January 2019
- Winter & Spring 2019
- Spring & Summer 2019
- Fall 2019 & Winter 2020

Next presentation to committees
Discussion Question #1

- Which aspects of the current PDA-focused framework are:
  - Most effective?
  - Least effective?
Discussion Question #2

- What are the opportunities and challenges associated with:
  - Framework Option A - Double Down
  - Framework Option B - PDAs Plus
  - Framework Option C - Clean Slate
Discussion Question #3

• Which strategies could be pursued to implement each option by:
  • Cities
  • ABAG/MTC
  • State
Memorandum

To: Planning Advisory Committee
From: Dana Turrey, Transportation Planner
Re: Micro-Mobility Use Cases and Regulation
Date: October 25, 2018

Travel in cities is becoming more multimodal and many people are depending more on a menu of mobility options. Cities can help reach goals of reduced congestion, parking demand, pollution and GHG emissions, and more convenient and affordable transportation by relying more on micro-mobility solutions such as shared and private bikes, electric bikes, scooters, etc. These solutions support the Shift Sonoma County Low Carbon Transportation Action Plan by offering clean multimodal options for residents and visitors.

As new micro-mobility options emerge, cities often grapple with effectively matching options with travel purposes and regulating the private companies that are providing these services. This memo provides a brief overview of 1) use cases for micro-mobility modes, 2) regulating free-floating bikeshare and scootershare, and 3) current and upcoming programs in Sonoma County.

Use Cases for Micro-Mobility and Shared Micro-Mobility

Micro-mobility is inherently multi-modal and can help people move away from the more common choice to use a privately owned vehicle for most trips. No one mode of micro-mobility is likely to solve our transportation issues on its own, but when coupled with other modes can provide efficient alternatives to driving alone. For example, transit or carshare can be used for longer trips to complement micro-mobility.

Personal Bikes and E-Bikes

Personal bikes have been around since the 1850’s and today’s varieties are an excellent form of transportation for home-based trips of three miles or less. Personal bikes are generally purchased to meet the size and riding preferences of the owner. Traveling by bicycle is fun and provides the health benefits of physical activity.

Electric bikes (e-bikes) allow users to get around more quickly and with less effort than a regular bike. E-bikes make it easier to climb hills and travel without sweating or exhaustion, extending the distance most people are willing to ride and making a good alternative to a car. The most common e-bike is a Type-1 E-bike, or “pedelec,” meaning the motor only engages when the pedals are turned and assisted speeds are capped at 20-mph. Personal e-bikes work well for home-based trips and include models that work well for transporting groceries and children.
Type-1 e-bikes may use Class-I bike paths like the SMART pathway. While riding bicycles on sidewalks is discouraged, most cities in Sonoma County do not have ordinances prohibiting this behavior.

California has adopted clear standards for classifying e-bikes through California Electric Bike Policy (http://peopleforbikes.org/blog/new-e-bike-law-passes-in-california/):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BICYCLE</th>
<th>PEDAL OPERATED</th>
<th>MAXIMUM MOTOR-ASSISTED SPEED (MPH)</th>
<th>MINIMUM AGE (YEARS)</th>
<th>DRIVER’S LICENSE</th>
<th>LICENSE PLATE</th>
<th>HELMET</th>
<th>BIKEWAY ACCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 1 E-BIKE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>17 AND UNDER</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 2 E-BIKE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>17 AND UNDER</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 3 E-BIKE</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPEDE</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bikeshare and e-bikeshare**

Bikeshare systems provide on-demand access to a network of publicly rentable bicycles. Bikeshare eliminates the barriers to owning and maintaining or traveling with a personal bike and is an effective solution for “first/last mile” connections to transit. Bikeshare works best in city centers and university areas where there are a mix of uses and high pedestrian traffic.

Students and residents who work and/or live near city centers and universities often make up the highest portion of bikeshare users. E-bikeshare is gaining popularity in the US and Europe as e-bikes extend the distance users are willing to ride, help avoid sweaty commutes, and make it easy to get up hills. E-bikeshare systems use the Type-1 e-bikes described above.

Traditional bikeshare systems are **dock-based** allowing users to pick up and return bikes from docks located throughout the service area. These docks include technology that locks the bicycles and facilitates bicycle rental and return.

Bikeshare systems using **smart-bikes** that either have a “lock-to” mechanism or are “free-floating” are emerging rapidly due to lower implementation costs and system flexibility. Smart-bikes are generally locked and unlocked using a smartphone app or a card. **Lock-to** bikeshare systems use bikes with the GPS for
locating bikes, payment, and locking technology on the bike and include a lock that can be used at proprietary or public bicycle racks. **Free-floating** bikeshare also uses bikes with the GPS, payment, and locking technology on the bike but locks only to itself, enabling the bike to be parked anywhere.

**Scootershare**

Scootershare systems provide on-demand access to a network of publicly rentable electric scooters. Scootershare can be more attractive than bicycles for quick trips around town due to the ease of use and comfort people feel using them in any attire. Like bikeshare, scootershare works best in city centers and university areas where there are a mix of uses and high pedestrian traffic, and are an effective solution for “first/last mile” connections to transit. Most scootershare systems are **free-floating**, meaning that they use a smartphone app to lock and unlock the scooter to itself and can be located by GPS. Some **lock-to** scootershare systems are in development but are not currently common.

Electric scooters and scootershare fall under Section 21235 of the California Vehicle Code, which requires a valid driver’s license or learners permit, helmet use if you are under 18 years of age, a speed limit of 15 mph; prohibits riding on the sidewalk, riding on highway with a speed limit over 25 mph unless in a bike lane, and taking the full lane.

**Regulating Free-Floating Bikeshare and Scootershare**

Free-floating bikeshare and scootershare have drawn the attention of media and local leaders due to cases where they have obstructed sidewalks and driveways, piled up in the public right of way, or been involved in pedestrian collisions.

Local governments have the authority to regulate operations of shared mobility within the public right of way. Many cities use a local license, contract, or permit instrument to regulate bikeshare or scootershare, and companies are often now working with municipalities before dropping off equipment. Local licenses, contracts, or permits are often used to regulate which areas of a city shared bikes or scooters may park, which company or group of companies may operate, how long a company may operate, how many bikes or scooters may operate, what level of customer service is required, what data is required, what type of equity programs are required, etc.

Proper parking of free-floating bikes and scooters can be encouraged though in-app education and notifications. Some systems impose user fees for improper parking, and include pavement stencils indicating preferred parking areas and other infrastructure solutions.

Local governments can also help curb riding on sidewalks, and encourage safe speeds on multi-use paths and helmet use through educational materials, group rides, and helmet incentive programs. Helmet use and riding on sidewalks are typically a greater concern for e-bikeshare and scootershare.

The National Association of City Transportation Officials recently released guidance on regulating and managing bikeshare and scootershare: [https://nacto.org/home/shared-active-transportation-guidelines/](https://nacto.org/home/shared-active-transportation-guidelines/).
Current and Upcoming SCTA and RCPA Programs

Santa Rosa Carshare Pilot Program
SCTA launched a carshare pilot program with Zipcar in Santa Rosa in August 2017. The program is subsidized marketing, free first year memberships, and some operations costs through a grant from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) using Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding. Zipcars can be rented by the hour through an app and include insurance and gas. Zipcars are located at the Railroad Square Depot parking lot and the surface parking lot at D Street and 5th Street.

Sonoma Marin Bikeshare Pilot Program
SCTA, in partnership with the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM), were awarded a grant from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for implementation of a bikeshare system focused around SMART Phase 1 Stations in Sonoma and Marin counties. In September, SCTA and TAM received responses to an RFI for bikeshare and related services. SCTA and TAM are using the responses to the RFI to develop recommended system requirements and evaluation criteria for review by partner agencies. SCTA and TAM expect to release an RFP in spring 2019. Once a bikeshare vendor is selected, SCTA and TAM will work with the vendor to conduct public outreach and further design the system. Should e-bikes be included in the bikeshare program, they would be limited to Type-1 e-bikes to ensure personal and public safety.

E-Bike Incentive Program
RCPA was awarded a grant from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's 2018 Climate Protection Grant program to develop and implement an e-bike incentive program in the portion of Sonoma County that falls within the district. This program includes development of an outreach and marketing campaign as well as building partnerships with participating local bike retailers. The project is designed to increase e-bike use in Sonoma County by addressing two key barriers to adoption: (1) the lack of awareness about e-bikes and (2) the price premium for e-bikes over conventional bicycles. The program will provide a financial benefit to individuals who purchase an e-bike. The requirements for the e-bike program would limit incentives to Type-1 e-bikes to ensure personal and public safety. The incentive program is expected to launch in the spring of 2019 and wrap up in the fall.

Current Programs Not Operated by SCTA and RCPA
Sonoma State University partnered with Zipcar to host two vehicles on campus in early 2016. [https://www.zipcar.com/universities/sonoma-state](https://www.zipcar.com/universities/sonoma-state)

Healdsburg partnered with Zagster in early 2018 to launch the first bikeshare system in Sonoma County. Bike Share at Healdsburg currently includes 40 bikes at seven stations in central Healdsburg. [http://bike.zagster.com/healdsburg/](http://bike.zagster.com/healdsburg/)
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On October 8, 2017, wildfires swept through Sonoma County and destroyed about 6,000 homes. The City of Santa Rosa alone lost over 3,000 homes (at least five percent of its housing stock), many of which housed multiple families, core workforce members, and long-term residents on fixed incomes. In addition to the physical, human, and ecological damage, the fires exacerbated an already dire regional housing shortage and need for more sustainable, downtown-oriented development throughout the county.

This report focuses on solutions to accelerate the construction and rebuild of more infill housing in Santa Rosa and other cities and urban areas throughout Sonoma County. “Infill” refers to building on unused and underutilized lands within existing development patterns. Infill is critical to accommodating growth and redesigning our cities to be environmentally and socially sustainable.

To identify promising solutions to boost infill in Sonoma County and key cities like Santa Rosa, the Council of Infill Builders convened builders, public officials, financial leaders, affordable housing developers, architects and consultants in Santa Rosa in May 2018. The group identified key barriers to infill development and recommended solutions to encourage and expedite infill development in Santa Rosa and throughout Sonoma County. This report discusses these priority solutions, challenges, and next steps.
Participants first described a vision for the ideal development patterns in Santa Rosa and Sonoma County. They envisioned a region that could:

- Build at least 30,000 new housing units in the next five years to meet demand
- Focus new development in existing urbanized areas and areas devastated by the fires
- Reduce the need for car travel
- Reduce inequities in housing
- Shorten permitting time and expense for infill housing
- Create “24-hour” downtowns, with downtown residents and amenities that create activity beyond standard business hours
- Make it easier for employers to recruit and retain workers through a more affordable housing stock and exciting infill neighborhoods
- Rebuild from the fires with a more resilient, infill-focused housing stock, not sprawling into fire-prone areas

The group described four key barriers that generally limit infill opportunities in Santa Rosa and Sonoma County:

1. Market uncertainty due to unknown demand for infill in key cities and urban areas in Sonoma County
2. Lack of demonstrated viability and financing for infill and car-free living
3. Lack of policy and process commitment to support infill development
4. High costs and fees to build infill

While additional barriers exist, participants agreed that these four represent the most common barriers that render infill difficult to accomplish in cities like Santa Rosa and Sonoma County in general.
“Following the fires, we’ve had an interest in rebuilding with more infill. Downtown Santa Rosa in particular is ripe for more infill development, with a lot of underutilized sites and many people who have lost their homes.”

- Geof Syphers, Sonoma Clean Power

To help overcome these barriers, the group recommended **seven near-term, priority solutions**:

1. **Pilot projects with public partnership** with possible concessions regarding fees, land purchase, and streamlined entitlements.
2. **Rent guarantees** for employees from employers to boost demand for infill.
3. A Joint Powers Agency (JPA)/Renewal Enterprise District (RED) to **guide and fund infill development**.
4. **Zoning, parking requirement, and development fee reforms** to encourage rather than stymie infill development.
5. **Improved availability of public sector infill financing** and enhanced access to sales and use taxes.
7. A **market study and project development** navigator to help streamline infill investment and deployment.

These and other solutions are discussed in more detail in this report. Ultimately, Santa Rosa and Sonoma County leaders should consider adopting these recommendations to achieve a more affordable, sustainable, and resilient future for its residents.
Santa Rosa and Sonoma County’s housing supply was deficient and unaffordable even before the fires.

The October 8, 2017, wildfires in Sonoma County destroyed about 6,000 homes, including 3000 in the City of Santa Rosa alone (constituting at least five percent of Santa Rosa’s housing stock). Many of these structures housed multiple families, core workforce members, and long-term residents on fixed incomes. The tragic fires exacerbated an already dire regional housing shortage. Even before the fires, Sonoma County and Santa Rosa had housing supply and affordability problems. In the City of Santa Rosa, the majority of the housing stock consists of single-family subdivisions. As a result, the Great Recession of 2008 hit the city’s housing market hard. The subsequent rise in foreclosures flooded the market with single-family homes, depressing demand for Santa Rosa’s new market-rate houses. Because construction costs remained high (consistent with the rest of the San Francisco region), developers were wary of building multi-family product that was priced at or above existing detached single homes. Yet while sales of houses declined for a number of years, rental-housing construction was not as negatively affected. A few infill housing developments (mostly rentals) proceeded during the economic downturn, while other large infill housing projects faced significant obstacles.

As with Santa Rosa, Sonoma County’s housing market had not recovered from the Great Recession before the 2017 fires. The housing supply had not yet matched pre-recession levels. For example, in 2016, the county issued 581 building permits for single-family homes, with 296 of...
those homes in Santa Rosa, compared to an annual average before the recession of 904 permits. In the long term, the state’s regional housing needs allocation (RHNA) for Sonoma County through January 31, 2023 was 8,444 units, which the region was not on pace to meet (See Table 1).

### Table 1: Housing Production in Sonoma County and City of Santa Rosa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>SANTA ROSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units 2017</td>
<td>207,058</td>
<td>67,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Single-Family Permits issued in 2016</td>
<td>581 (includes unincorporated areas and cities)</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)</td>
<td>8,444 (includes unincorporated areas and cities)</td>
<td>4,662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing affordability has also been a major problem for all of Sonoma County, including Santa Rosa. The median single-family home price for Sonoma County was approximately $620,000 in September 2017, with the annual minimum income necessary to afford that price at approximately $120,000. Yet the median income in Sonoma County that month was $83,600. Meanwhile, the median rent in September 2017 was approximately $2,364 per month, with the annual minimum income needed to afford that rent at $94,560 (See Table 2).

### Table 2: Housing Affordability in Sonoma County and City of Santa Rosa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>September 2017</th>
<th>February 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Single-Family Home Price (for the Entire County)</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
<td>$689,000 (11 percent increase from September)⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Asking Rent Per Month</td>
<td>$2,651</td>
<td>$2,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Asking Rent for Complexes Over 5 Units</td>
<td>$2,028</td>
<td>$2,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Income Needed to Purchase</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$133,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income (4-person household)</td>
<td>$83,600</td>
<td><strong>$83,600 (estimated, with the fastest-growing income group between $100,000 to $149,000 per year)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“We really have momentum, and the political will is there. The city council majority supports more resources for planning, and downtown housing and homelessness are part of the City Council’s top five priorities. Downtown is now a test case for the city.”

- David Guhin, City of Santa Rosa

Santa Rosa and Sonoma County’s commitment to more infill development predated the fires but requires more action

Santa Rosa’s regulations had historically made infill development difficult, in part due to high parking requirements, height restrictions, and setback requirements, among others. Besides the market conditions and parking and permitting constraints, the city’s development fees have risen steadily for decades. Many developers noted that the fees became prohibitive for infill housing because the existing house prices had declined while construction costs remained high. Additionally, funds for affordable housing declined with the demise of redevelopment agencies earlier in the decade and funding for older infrastructure improvements in infill areas dwindled.

Prior to the fires, Sonoma County and Santa Rosa made a commitment to encourage sustainable development. Starting in 1990, Santa Rosa voters adopted and then re-adopted an urban growth boundary (UGB), which has since been renewed through 2035. The eight other incorporated cities in Sonoma County also have these growth boundaries, which are complemented in the county by designated “community separators.” While these policies have been nominally successful in focusing development within city limits, the types of development that local leaders have permitted continue to be largely of the suburban sprawl variety. When voters approved the urban growth boundaries, Santa Rosa’s land use policies were not immediately changed to encourage infill development within the boundary. Most policies continued to favor low-density development, until recently (as discussed below).

With the adoption of Senate Bill 375 (Steinberg, Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008), community leaders around the state and within Sonoma County began planning for more housing near transit and encouraging infill. SB 375 required regional planning entities such as the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation
Commission (MTC) to adopt transportation plans that would serve more housing near transit in order to reduce vehicles miles traveled (VMT) and limit associated greenhouse gas emission from cars and light trucks. The resulting Plan Bay Area provided a strategy for meeting 80% of the region’s future housing needs in “Priority Development Areas” (PDAs), which are neighborhoods within walking distance of frequent transit service. Five of Sonoma County’s twelve PDAs are located in Santa Rosa, including several areas near rail stations operated by Sonoma-Marin Area Regional Transit (SMART). The City of Santa Rosa has since enacted plans and policies for higher density mixed-use development in these PDAs, particularly around SMART stations.

After the fires, Sonoma County commissioned a housing and fiscal impact report by Beacon Economics in February 2018, which found that:

1) even before the fires occurred, Sonoma County faced a housing market characterized by rising home prices and rents, declining vacancy rates and insufficient new supply of units; and
2) in total, when accounting for employment growth, fire losses and overcrowding, Sonoma County needs an additional 26,000 housing units by 2020, which is equivalent to 6,500 units per year.

By comparison, the county had only permitted 730 units in 2016 and 609 in the first three quarters of 2017.9 The Sonoma County Community Development Commission estimated that Sonoma County needs 30,000 units by 2023. This total translated to 7,000 units per year. Yet from 2013 to 2017, the county averaged only 716 permitted units per year. At this rate from 2018-2020, the county would see only 3,754 new units constructed, well below the number needed, as cited above (see Table 1).

Santa Rosa and Sonoma County also need more infill development as a resiliency strategy to limit damage from future wildfires. To the extent practicable, the city seeks to direct new housing to areas less prone to fire and encourage housing types that are denser, more compact, less dependent on the automobile, and closer to transit. To that end, the Santa Rosa City Council adopted the Resilient City Measures Ordinance in June 2018, which is a set of rules intended to fast-track building of housing, child care centers, and farmworker housing in downtown and the SB 375-identified PDAs. Infill advocates and city officials seek to narrow the fast-tracking to downtown Santa Rosa and other areas of the city already prioritized for housing to ensure that homes are built near transit, services, and jobs to revitalize the city’s core, benefit the environment, reduce fire risk, and avoid sprawl on the edge of the city.10
California’s climate goals require land use patterns that reduce the need for driving

As California continues its efforts to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that cause climate change, the state will need to see more progress on sustainable land use patterns that discourage driving, with the rebuilding effort in Sonoma County presenting a prime opportunity. Specifically, California seeks to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 per Assembly Bill 32 (Nuñez, Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006), representing a 15 percent reduction over business-as-usual “(achieved four years early in 2016), with an additional goal for 2030 to achieve reductions of 40 percent below 1990 levels per Senate Bill 32 (Pavley, Chapter 249, Statutes of 2016). Governor Brown’s 2015 Executive Order B-30-15 further sets a target of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.

Given that more than 40 percent of greenhouse gas emissions in the state come from the transportation sector (including from excessive per capita vehicle miles traveled), building walkable, bike-able housing near transit is essential to meeting these long-term targets, even with greater adoption of zero-emission vehicles and use of improved low-carbon fuels (see Figures 1 and 2). As a result, the state’s scoping plan to achieve these greenhouse gas goals through improvements in the transportation sector stated, “plan and build communities to reduce vehicular [greenhouse gas] emissions and provide more transportation options,” as one of four strategies to be employed.11

As an additional climate benefit, infill housing also often requires less water and energy usage due to the smaller lot sizes and reduced square footage. New housing construction in Sonoma and Santa Rosa can therefore help all of the state’s residents meet long-term climate goals and achieve improved quality of life through reduced driving miles.
Figure 1: California’s Greenhouse Gas Emission Sources (Source: California Air Resources Board)

Figure 2: The Need for Reduced Vehicles Miles Traveled to Achieve California’s Climate Goals (Source: California Air Resources Board)

WTW = well-to-wheel emissions
MMT CO2e = million metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent
RPS = renewable portfolio standard
Participants at the May 31, 2018 convening first described a vision for the ideal development patterns in Santa Rosa and Sonoma County. They envisioned a region that could:

- Build at least **30,000 new housing units** in the next five years to meet demand
- **Focus new development in existing urbanized areas** and areas devastated by the fires
- **Reduce the need for car travel**
- **Reduce inequities** in housing
- **Shorten permitting time and expense** for infill housing
- Create “**24-hour downtowns**, with downtown residents and amenities that create activity beyond standard business hours
- Make it easier for employers to **recruit and retain workers** through a more affordable housing stock and exciting infill neighborhoods
- **Rebuild from the fires** with a more resilient, infill-focused housing stock, not sprawling into fire-prone areas

Achieving this vision requires identifying and overcoming the obstacles that make it unlikely otherwise to be realized. The following section describes those obstacles and offers solutions for state and local leaders as well as industry actors.

“Every great city has had this dilemma about how to reinvent itself, and it takes a long-term commitment. Look at Freiberg, Germany, as an example. But if civic leaders make a commitment, it will happen.”

- Curt Johansen, TerraVerde Ventures
Common barriers often prevent infill development from getting built in optimum locations, such as in downtowns and near regular transit. For the May 31, 2018 convening, the Council of Infill Builders surveyed participants in advance and discussed the most common barriers to infill in Santa Rosa and Sonoma County more generally. Participants identified the following four priority barriers to infill development and offered numerous solutions to overcome them, discussed below.

**Barrier # 1: Market Uncertainty Due to Unknown Demand for Infill in Key Cities and Urban Areas in Sonoma County**

Multi-story infill projects usually cost more to build per square foot than low-rise suburban housing (as discussed below). As a result, in order to achieve financial feasibility, infill projects must be able to attract buyers from specific market segments, including young professionals, seniors, and singles who are willing to live in smaller spaces, as well as higher-income individuals, couples and families.  

Participants noted that Santa Rosa and Sonoma County in general do not have high-rise infill projects, so project developers cannot yet determine the level of demand for this type of housing and associated lifestyle. They also questioned the marketability of a high-rise infill project compared to building single-family homes in other suburban locations such as Petaluma. Participants...
described price point limitations: can the market afford this type of product, given the demographics and incomes of potential local buyers and renters? Some participants noted that if the average sales price is approximately $700,000, they would need to know the number of households with incomes over $150,000 to support the associated monthly housing costs of $3,500 to $4,000.

In addition, because cities like Santa Rosa still lack a mature public transit system downtown, these cities do not have market data to determine the demand for car-free urban living (the Sonoma-Marin Area Rapid Transit [SMART] station in downtown Santa Rosa only recently opened in August 2017). Additionally, a lack of amenities, concerns about personal safety, and branding for downtowns like in Santa Rosa add to the uncertainty about whether demand exists for infill housing in the downtown area.

Solutions for Barrier #1: Improve Downtown Amenities & Undertake a Comprehensive Market Study

To address the market uncertainty, Santa Rosa and Sonoma County could seek to make downtown a neighborhood where people want to live and work, identify promising infill sites, and produce a market study for high-potential infill areas, such as the SMART corridor, which developers could then rely upon to make financial decisions.

SPECIFIC SOLUTIONS:

City and county leaders could accelerate improvements to downtown amenities, creating an appealing “24-hour” downtown atmosphere to attract full-time residents. They could continue to promote land uses in Santa Rosa and other Sonoma County downtown areas that create foot traffic, such as grocery stores and new restaurants. City leaders could also bring in more events such as the Iron Man, which provide good exposure and identity for downtown. In addition, civic leaders could improve the branding and marketing for downtown. The brand should be linked to clear policy to develop downtown as an infill community. Once civic leaders have established the brand, the city could market infill sites as a portfolio, in order to spread the risk and attract funding for infrastructure and affordable housing.

“The threat is economics. The price of a house now in Sonoma County is over $600,000, which requires an income of at least $130,000 per year.”

- Jeff Roberts, Granville Homes
a successful market, participants proposed that employers encourage their employees (via rent guarantees) to consider renting or buying in infill projects (this solution is described in more detail below). Finally, the involvement of downtown associations, increased police presence, improved lighting, and visible security measures such as emergency call boxes could address any concerns about personal security.

**City and county leaders could conduct a market study and generate a project development navigator for market-rate housing and other housing types in infill areas.** Such a study and project development navigator would help developers make more strategic decisions about investment and redevelopment, identify any ongoing policy needs, and potentially attract more infill developers to the region. The study and guide should at a minimum consider the SMART corridor’s potential for residential uses. Some of the other PDAs, enterprise areas, and opportunity zones (among other similar areas) may be candidate geographies for the study. The study could also assess the demographics of groups that could pay market rates to live in downtown housing and encourage a downtown marketing campaign targeting these potential residents. Participants recommended that the market study effort also include an open-sourced feasibility analysis available to the public.

**Civic leaders could communicate a sense of urgency about downtown development.** The community now has a window of opportunity to revitalize downtown and create transit-friendly environments because people are leaving the region due to the fires and lack of affordable housing. The community will need ideas that are actionable in the near future, given the urgency. In pre- and post-fire interviews conducted by the City of Santa Rosa Economic Development Division, the primary reason interviewees gave for the region’s major employers’ inability to expand, retain, or attract new workers is housing – specifically housing availability, followed by housing affordability, as well as a lack of housing option diversity. On the last point, medical and technology-related companies in particular have identified the need for downtown urban density-type housing in order to attract a younger workforce that desires housing with easy access to urban amenities and transportation (see the discussion below on employer-assisted housing for suggestions about how employers could encourage infill).14
“Santa Rosa lacks a 24-hour downtown. The downtown area needs activity-generating land uses that extend beyond standard business hours.”

- Patrick Streeter, City of Santa Rosa

**Barrier #2: Lack of Demonstrated Viability and Financing for Infill and Car-Free Living**

Lenders tend to be cautious about financing new housing types in places like Santa Rosa and other key cities in Sonoma County. Infill developers often face challenges securing financing for otherwise meritorious projects, particularly for the missing “gap” that redevelopment agencies used to cover. Financial institutions may be unlikely to help finance pioneer projects in untested markets without comparable projects to assess risk. Meanwhile, public sector budgets are strapped, and the state has so far been unable to replace redevelopment funds with alternative sources. As a result, pioneer infill developers often are unable to finance meritorious projects that could otherwise be catalytic in stimulating more infill development.

**Solutions for Barrier #2: Boost Infill Pilot Projects with the Capacity to Scale**

Local government leaders can address concerns about the viability of infill by launching select pilot projects, with associated policy assistance. They can also address the financing challenge with solutions ranging from encouraging local banks and other lenders to invest in infill housing and leveraging public sector funds. Local government leaders could also facilitate the stacking of funds from a variety of investors, such as traditional lenders, government, foundations, pension funds and others (all with different levels of risk).

**SPECIFIC SOLUTIONS:**

City and county leaders could study and act upon lessons learned in the near term from proposed infill projects currently seeking permits from the city. As an example, a developer proposed construction of a 135-apartment infill building at 404 Mendocino Avenue in Santa Rosa. To expedite the permitting for this project, the city shortened the design review board process from 10 months to 3 and implemented or is considering a raft of other incentives for developers of similar projects. The city and other interested parties could learn important lessons
from this developer’s experiences securing financing, marketing to potential tenants, and observing operation of the project over time. This and other similar projects present opportunities to study the influence of expedited processing and other city efforts on the ultimate success of an infill project.

**City and county leaders could launch and support pilot infill projects that meet certain criteria with expedited processing and other incentives.** Once a project has met the criteria, the city or county could waive or reduce fees and provide other incentives, such as donated land, expedited processing for entitlements, reduction in parking requirements, and waivers or reductions of affordability requirements in the longer term. The goal would be to demonstrate the viability of meritorious infill projects and stimulate revitalization of prime infill, transit-rich neighborhoods. Participants identified potential areas for pilot projects, such as the Press Democrat site, Railroad Square, the Cannery, Roseland Village and Coddingtontown. In conjunction with the pilot projects, city and county leaders could leverage the benefits associated with the status of downtown Santa Rosa as an enterprise district and Roseland as a federal opportunity zone.

**Local officials, infill advocates, and developers should research and contact institutional investors to support infill pilot projects.** Infill advocates can confer with local and other institutional investors and determine those interested and willing to invest in Sonoma County infill and actively work with them on pilot projects. Financial models used by banks and other lenders can act as a barrier to
securing capital investment, and infill development in cities and older suburbs that have experienced neglect and disinvestment can be more difficult to finance. Such areas are also more likely to have contaminated sites, which can present additional financing challenges. For these sites, lenders can have high underwriting costs associated with evaluating site conditions, require higher rates of return, request developers to contribute more equity, and be reluctant to accept the underlying real estate as collateral for a loan. At the same time, these sites are eligible for a host of local, state, and federal assistance programs, which can close the financing gap and make infill a financially viable proposition.

Despite the challenges, many developers have successfully financed infill projects in these types of areas. Although investors might perceive the risk of infill development to be high, developers with experience working on infill projects related that no real risk premium exists relative to comparable mixed-use projects in undeveloped areas. As more developers and lenders become involved with infill projects, perceptions may start to better match reality. To that end, some specialized firms have opened to serve developers that need help with financing for mixed-use developments. Certain real estate investment funds and trusts are also focusing on infill markets for investment of their large pools of capital. Sonoma County infill advocates, developers and officials could therefore work to attract these investors to the region.

**Local leaders and infill developers could seek to harness financing for projects from various public and private sources, such as pension funds, employers and crowd sourcing.** Pension funds invest in real estate and infrastructure projects. Civic leaders can therefore highlight the benefits of investing in Sonoma County projects and work with a targeted group of pensions funds on investing in infill and infrastructure in the County. Employer support for infill could also help. Kaiser Permanente, for example, pledged $200 million to invest in homelessness and affordable housing in 10 states, including California and the District of Columbia. Sonoma County and Santa Rosa leaders could work closely with Kaiser Permanente and other employers to providing financing for infill. Employers could also guarantee employee rents, which could reduce perceived risk for some lenders (discussed in more detail).

“Pilot projects are really key. You can justify a lot when it’s a pilot.”

- Meea Kang, Related California
detail below). Finally, more unusual methods of financing, such as crowdsourcing, could be an option. Though a relatively new and successful method for financing housing, it has been used successfully in Los Angeles and Washington D.C. Local officials and other infill advocates could contact these crowdsourcing funds and encourage them to become active in infill projects within Sonoma County.19

**City and county leaders could establish a housing bond fund for infill areas.** Santa Rosa has placed Measure N, the $124 million Housing Recovery Bond Measure, on the November 2018 ballot. If passed, the measure will establish a housing bond fund to help with rebuilding efforts from the 2017 wildfires, build affordable housing for low- and moderate-income persons, and support infill development. The amount of the bond is estimated to be $80 to $180 million. The bond would be paid for by Santa Rosa property taxes over 30 years and would cost $29 per $100,000 in assessed value, which would be about $110 per year for the typical Santa Rosa home. When leveraged with other state and federal funds, the City anticipates that Measure N would allow the City and its partners to build about 1,200 affordable units. Santa Rosa lost over 3,000 homes in the fire, so Measure N would have a significant impact on the amount of affordable units and housing overall.20 These funds could be used to fill gaps in other funding for infill projects and to stack with financing (with different levels of risk) from institutional investors, pension funds, and other lenders.

**City and county leaders could establish a joint powers agreement (JPA)/Renewal Enterprise District (RED) to coordinate and promote financing for infill housing.** Sonoma County and Santa Rosa officials are considering developing a Renewal Enterprise District (RED) that could bring together a panoply of other private, public and non-profit financing solutions. Advocates for the proposed RED envision it as a City/County Joint Powers Agency (JPA) that would regionalize housing production and pool and leverage financing from sources such as banks, pension funds and other lenders and funding from sources such as government, employers, foundations and non-profit organizations. It would also prepare county-owned land for development, facilitate sharing of risks and benefits of development in new ways, streamline environmental review and put equity, affordability and climate solutions at the center of the local economic strategy.21 The RED could provide multiple benefits for infill development, such as coordinating a real estate insurance pool, identifying investment of housing bond funds, identifying prime infill sites, and organizing private and public funding for infill projects and associated infrastructure (particularly since public entities can often take more risks than market actors are willing to
take). Local officials will have to develop criteria for membership, determine representation by non-elected versus elected officials, and delineate the extent of the JPA's land use authority, if any, before establishing the RED.

**City and county leaders could create a regional fund or pool of capital similar to the Bay Area Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) fund.** Launched in 2011, the TOAH fund was made possible through a $10 million initial investment from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The Low Income Investment Fund served as the fund manager and an originating lender, along with five other leading community development financial institutions (Corporation for Supportive Housing, Enterprise Community Loan Fund, LISC, Northern California Community Loan Fund, and Opportunity Fund). Additional capital for the fund was provided by Citi Community Capital, Morgan Stanley, the Ford Foundation, Living Cities, and the San Francisco Foundation. The resulting $50 million TOAH fund provides financing for the development of affordable housing and other vital community services near transit lines throughout the Bay Area. Through a similar fund in Sonoma County (or expansion of the existing Bay Area TOAH fund to the region), developers could access flexible, affordable capital to purchase or improve available property near transit lines for the development of affordable housing, retail space and other critical services, such as child care centers, fresh food outlets, and health clinics. The fund could also participate in stacked multi-layered financing pack-
State and local leaders could develop and use taxing and bond authority to generate funds for infill and infrastructure. In addition to proposing Measure N, which is a property tax for affordable housing (discussed above), the City of Santa Rosa placed Measure O, the Vital City Services Measure, on the November 2018 ballot. Measure O is a temporary one-quarter cent sales tax measure that would provide $9 million annually to help Santa Rosa recover from the fires, rebuild infrastructure, preserve emergency services and address other critical City needs. The tax would expire after six years. Other taxes could be increased to generate financial incentives for housing, such as the sales tax and the transient occupancy (hotel) tax. Participants also suggested that cities like Santa Rosa consider property tax breaks for infill projects and simultaneously tax vacant land to encourage owners to transition them into productive uses. Bond programs the city could use for housing include Statewide Community Infrastructure Project (SCIP) bonds and Mello Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) bonds. In the long term, participants suggested that state leaders create a new version of block grants for infill housing.

Employers could develop housing assistance programs to boost demand for infill. Participants recommended that employers guarantee employee rents as a method to incentivize financing and create more demand for infill housing in Sonoma County. Rent guarantees are a form of employer-assisted housing (EAH), which is a term used to describe a variety of housing benefits employers can offer to help their workforce afford homes. An EAH program can be a cost-effective way to help improve employee recruitment, retention, productivity, and morale, thereby improving the employer’s bottom line. Originally conceived as a tool for recruiting senior executives, many companies and other types of employers now offer some type of housing assistance across their pool of employees. This trend is driven by factors affecting employees such as the persistent disparity between home costs and wages, long and costly commutes, employee preference to live near their workplace, and general employer and employee desire to achieve an improved work-life balance. For employers, ongoing and anticipated challenges in hiring and retaining workers and the desire to increase employee productivity and morale make EAH programs attractive. These programs can create broader benefits such as safer neighborhoods, increased investment in the local area, and community stabilization. In many cases, employers partner with third-party organizations to help design and manage EAH programs. These outsourced arrangements help ensure that EAH programs are easy to administer and cost-effective for employers.
“You need strong leadership and relationships. We lost past infill opportunities due to wavering and lack of focus.”
- Kirstie Franceschi, Codding Enterprise

Barrier # 3: Lack of Policy and Process Commitment to Support Infill Development

Uncertain or deficient commitments and directives from civic leaders on infill in their communities can be detrimental to the deployment of these often-challenging pioneering projects. Local politics and policies that can discourage infill development include political hostility toward infill for a variety of reasons, land use and fee policies that adversely affect infill, and excessive parking requirements that place high costs on infill developers.

Solutions for Barrier #3: Reform Local Land Use Policies to Encourage Infill

Successful downtowns often benefit from strong political will and a commitment to stay with a strategy to revitalize the area. Participants called for political and management actions to reform the land use permitting process, fee structures, and parking policies. Additional solutions recommended that civic leaders identify available infill sites, launch pilot projects and make downtown housing and elimination of homelessness top priorities (also discussed above).

SPECIFIC SOLUTIONS:

City and county leaders could reform land use policies that discourage infill development. These policies include (but are not necessarily limited to):

(a) unreasonable zoning limitations on density;
(b) overly restrictive zoning overlays that discourage redevelopment of underutilized infill properties;
(c) inclusionary housing requirements without financial support from the city or county;
(d) restrictive zoning that does not support or promote mixing of land uses;
(e) overly cumbersome entitlement processes that provide advantages to sprawl projects while burdening infill; and
(f) inflexible staff members that do not embrace change.
The City of Santa Rosa and other jurisdictions within the county are currently working on solutions to some of these challenges – specifically an expedited permit process for quality projects where the developer and the city both agree to move forward on a specific timeline.24

**City and county leaders could reform fee policies that discourage infill development.** These policies include fees that are overly burdensome for infill projects and/or provide advantages to sprawl projects. For example, the city could cap certain development fees for five years to encourage taller buildings. Many development fees are paid on a per-unit basis, which otherwise creates a disincentive for developers to build more units. According to David Guhin, Santa Rosa’s director of Economic Development and Housing and a participant at the convening, “Our current fee structure doesn’t encourage people to build more floors.” In a recent article, he said that one idea the city was exploring was to charge fees up to a certain number of stories and then waive them for anything higher.25

**City and county leaders could reform excessive parking requirements that discourage infill development.** Examples of burdensome local parking policies and practices include:

(a) requiring too much parking (over-parking) and lack of political understanding that the high cost of free and too much parking is a significant barrier to infill housing;
(b) requiring expensive replacement parking when a developer builds on a city-owned parking lot; and
(c) parking minimums and a rigid parking ordinance in Santa Rosa that currently do not allow for flexibility or creativity regarding provision of parking.

City and county leaders could address some of these challenges by reducing or eliminating minimum parking requirements, unbundling parking from housing (charging the cost of a parking space separately from the cost of renting or purchasing a home) and allowing developers to use more shared parking. They could also reform the rules governing the downtown-parking district in Santa Rosa. Currently, elimination of parking spaces or facilities to accommodate

“**City- and County-owned land helps. A patient landowner also helps. Otherwise, developers can burn through all their money just paying for land while waiting for entitlements.**”

- Ali Gaylord, MidPen Housing Corporation
development may conflict with district requirements, which require the district to be made whole if there is a reduction in parking. In other words, the developer must provide replacement parking, which can be expensive. Parking spaces add a disproportionate cost to developing infill housing; the average cost of a parking space in a parking structure ranges from $15,000 to $30,000. For example, parking costs per unit in San Francisco can range from $17,500 to $35,000 per unit. Not only are parking construction costs high, but ongoing operation and maintenance of parking structures can be costly for rental properties. As a result, restructuring the City's parking district and alleviating the high-cost requirements of replacing parking spaces could be part of the solution.

**City and county leaders could continue to make development of more downtown housing and alleviation of homelessness top priorities.** Promotion of downtown and reducing homelessness are two of the top five 2018 priorities for the Santa Rosa City Council. To expedite the permitting process for infill, local governments could dedicate staff to shepherd projects through the process so that projects do not fall off track. Politicians and high-level government officials can help by involving themselves to move catalytic projects forward. Additionally, participants suggested that local leaders support initially proposed densities for new projects and not allow projects to get “watered down” during the approval process. City and county leaders could also work with downtown commercial property owners to assess their willingness to redevelop and connect them with infill builders that have the financial resources and expertise to complete infill development on these sites.

**City and county leaders could identify publicly owned properties that can be developed for infill housing.** As discussed above, they could launch pilot projects on these properties where more flexible fees and land use regulations are applied in order to test the effectiveness of various approaches and to jump-start development of more infill projects. Santa Rosa could also consider reducing fees in all infill areas and/or downtown for a certain period of time.
“A big barrier is finding the sites. Owners often have a high expectation for land value, and it’s depressing for them when they find out the costs of construction and how that lowers the value of their land.”

- Keith McCoy, Urban Mix Development

Barrier #4: High Costs and Fees to Build Infill

Numerous factors increase the cost of all types of housing, such as the cost of labor, materials, local fees, and permitting requirements. But infill development is by its nature more expensive to build, given the regulatory process, construction materials, and high-wage labor required for multistory building, as well as the challenge of building in developed neighborhoods and the attendant cost of upgrading older infrastructure. Permitting for infill projects can also be complicated, time consuming, and expensive. For example, the costs of compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) can add to the expense of processing permits and entitlements for infill projects. The high price of infill sites presents another barrier. Other factors such as onerous parking requirements and land use restrictions also contribute to high costs (as discussed above). In Sonoma County, the post-wildfire period has seen particularly high construction costs and labor shortages, exacerbating already existing high costs. These costs present a barrier to development unless consumers are willing to pay a higher price per square foot than they would for a competing low-rise, suburban-type product.

Solutions for Barrier #4: Improve and Streamline Local Permitting Processes for Infill

To reduce the high costs of building sustainable infill development, most solutions involve local reforms to fee structures, permit processing times, and environmental review.

SPECIFIC SOLUTIONS:

Local leaders could reform fee structures to recognize the benefits of infill. City and county leaders could apply a fee schedule with one fee schedule for infill projects and higher fees for projects outside infill areas, in order to incorporate the benefits of infill and externalities of sprawl. Along these lines, the price of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) could be factored into the various tiers of fees, and local leaders could codify these differentiated fees. Local leaders could also defer, waive, or reduce fees for infill projects. Cities could also consider creating a “Downtown Fee District,” in which all fees would be
Reducing Costs Per Door Through Building Electrification and Reduced Parking

Local governments can save infill units significant “costs per door” by offering developers the flexibility to avoid building expensive on-site parking and eliminate natural gas connections in favor of all-electrical appliances.

Natural gas connection costs: $18,000 per unit

Parking stall requirement costs: $30,000 (estimated)

In general, one parking space per unit increases costs by approximately 12.5%, while two parking spaces can increase costs by up to 25%.

Total Savings “Per Door” From Eliminating Natural Gas and Parking: $48,000

“Local governments should consider a two-tier fee system and look at real externalities based on data, including the cost of VMT. The key is having higher fees outside a certain infill line, compared to inside the line.”

- David Mogavero, Mogavero Architects

State and local leaders could expedite the environmental review time for meritorious infill projects. They could accomplish streamlining through assignment of specific staff persons to “shepherd” projects through the process and by reducing the levels of review required for certain projects. The City of Santa Rosa recently took a major step to expedite review of infill projects with the adoption of the Resilient City Development Measures, which was added to the City’s Zoning Code, effective May 11, 2018. Its effectiveness will depend on the implementation effort by city staff. The city also supported passage of reforms and/or exemptions in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for projects in Santa Rosa. Specifically, the proposed Assembly Bill 2267 (Wood) would exempt residential projects consistent with Santa Rosa’s downtown specific plan from CEQA review. The city has already expedited the review time for the proposed infill apartment project in downtown at 404 Mendocino Avenue (discussed above).

Industry leaders and other interested parties could host a “Lower Cost Building Technology Summit” to explore ways to reduce the cost of construction. Information at the summit could be exchanged about how to lower the cost of construction and materials. Additionally, civic leaders could confer with local trade unions about labor rates and explore revisions to Santa Rosa’s charter to relax prevailing wage and/or open shop requirements for infill projects. Some participants mentioned that lowering seismic insurance costs would reduce the overall cost of building and operating infill projects.

“In San Francisco and Sacramento, we had persons from the city who were really dedicated to shepherding the projects through the city process. To the extent Santa Rosa can think about shepherds, that’s really helpful.”

- Galen Wilson, Goldman Sachs
CONCLUSION & NEXT STEPS: THE FUTURE OF INFILL IN SONOMA COUNTY

With the rebuild from 2017’s devastating wildfires in Sonoma County underway, state and local decision-makers face urgent decisions about the character of the new Sonoma County and its major cities like Santa Rosa. Economic, environmental, and quality-of-life concerns require this development to be sustainable and infill-focused. Unless policy makers act quickly to promote this development and take advantage of underutilized space and transit infrastructure, the opportunity may quickly fade. Given the urgent pressures to address the extreme housing shortage and need for more broad-based and equitable economic development, state and local leaders should consider acting on solutions such as those identified in this report by expert land use participants. Infill advocates should harness the experience, data, and supportive partnerships in the region to help rebuild Sonoma County into a more convenient, thriving, and environmentally sustainable place for residents of the county and beyond.

“Due to the fires, there has been a real loss of the bonds and sense of community. We should not lose sight of those who lost their homes.”

- Caroline Judy, Sonoma County
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