

A G E N D A

CORRECTED COPY

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Friday, May 13, 2011, 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Special Meeting

Location

MetroCenter, 101 – 8th Street, Auditorium, Oakland, CA

For additional information, please call:
Fred Castro, (510) 464 7913

Agenda and attachments available at:
www.abag.ca.gov

1. Call to Order


Immediately after conclusion of MTC Planning Committee Item 3.a.

2. Plan Bay Area: Joint Meeting with MTC Planning Committee [MTC Planning Committee Item 3.b.]**

Information. Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director, Doug Kimsey, MTC Planning Director, and Ashley Nguyen, MTC Planner, will summarize feedback from our ongoing public workshops and discuss initial ideas on alternative land use/transportation scenarios. Scenarios will be selected in June 2011 and then evaluated through the summer 2011.

3. Public Comment [MTC Planning Committee Item 4]

4. Adjournment



Ezra Rapport
Secretary-Treasurer

Committee may act on any item on this agenda. **Attachment included.



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: MTC Planning Committee
ABAG Administrative Committee

DATE: May 6, 2011

FR: Deputy Executive Director, Policy, MTC
Executive Director, ABAG

RE: Plan Bay Area: Defining Alternative Scenarios

Phase 2 of the Plan Bay Area process focuses largely on conducting an analysis of alternative scenarios to demonstrate how the Bay Area can achieve its 15 percent per-capita greenhouse gas emission reduction target, stipulated by CARB, and other ABAG/MTC adopted performance targets. While both the Current Regional Plans and Initial Vision Scenario get us closer to the greenhouse gas targets, they still fall short. We must now find alternative ways to achieve this target as required by SB 375. This means identifying and testing a range of alternative scenarios that feature different combinations of land use, transportation investments, and policy strategies.

MTC and ABAG staff have conducted initial brainstorming on alternative scenario concepts with the Regional Advisory Working Group and Partnership Technical Advisory Committee in April and May 2011. We are also receiving feedback through the Plan Bay Area/You Choose Bay Area workshops that are now underway. The following points have been raised thus far:

- Create distinct scenarios, including a historical land use “trend” option for comparative purposes.
- Focus more growth in the urbanized areas of the region to preserve agricultural lands and open space.
- Consider refocusing development along transportation corridors (not just transit lines).
- Increase growth in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) but realize that they have limits on their carrying capacities.
- Increase existing transit service and improve pedestrian access to transit
- Create a strategy that places importance on supporting growth in rural/suburban communities, but recognize that the growth will not be at the same density and intensity as growth in the more urbanized areas of the region.
- Emphasize the importance of the “fix-it first” policy (i.e., maintain existing system)
- Consider policy initiatives such as Transportation Demand Management and road and parking pricing

The attached PowerPoint presentation outlines initial concepts for the alternative scenario analyses. We look forward to your ideas to help us further refine these alternatives. Staff will present draft alternative scenarios for your review and approval in June. The analysis of the scenarios will begin immediately thereafter.

Ann Flemer

Ezra Rapport

SH:AN

BayArea Plan

Defining Alternative Scenarios

MTC Planning Committee and ABAG Administrative Committee
May 13, 2011

Policy Issues

1. Given what we learned from Current Regional Plans and the Initial Vision Scenario:
 - a. Have we pushed the land use far enough, and have we designed a land use pattern sufficient to reach our targets?
 - b. Can we afford the transportation improvements needed to support the land use pattern?
 - c. What difference could employment distribution make?
 - d. What more do we need in order to reach our targets?
2. Can we develop distinct alternative scenarios that help us evaluate these questions?

Input To Date

(from advisory groups and public workshops)

- Create distinct scenarios, including a historical land use “trend” option for comparative purposes.
- Focus more growth in the urbanized areas of the region to preserve agricultural lands and open space.
- Consider refocusing development along transportation corridors (not just transit lines).
- Increase growth in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) but realize that they have limits on their carrying capacities.
- Create a strategy that places importance on supporting growth in rural/suburban communities, but recognize that the growth will not be at the same density and intensity as growth in the more urbanized areas of the region.
- Emphasize the importance of the “fix-it first” policy (i.e., maintain existing system)
- Consider policy initiatives such as Transportation Demand Management and road and parking pricing

BayArea
Plan



3

Alternative Scenarios Framework

- Define and evaluate a small number of alternative scenarios that are deemed financially feasible and achievable
- Each scenario will be distinctly different in terms of growth patterns, transportation investments, or supportive policies
- Growth patterns entail distribution and intensity of jobs, population and housing in small geographic areas within jurisdictions
- Land uses will be distributed to reduce trip lengths and will be located in proximity to transit network
- Each scenario will aim to achieve adopted performance targets
- Project performance assessment will inform transportation investments for scenarios

BayArea
Plan



4

Land Use, Transportation & Policy Variables

Land Use	Transportation	Policy Initiatives
More Concentrated Growth* Shifting jobs/housing distributions in the Current Regional Plans, and choosing to distribute growth among Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in a manner that optimizes GHG reductions (this may mean that some PDAs are more appropriate growth areas than others)	Transportation 2035 Investment Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 80% of funding to "Fix-It First" Policy Maintain existing transit service levels with Resolution 3434 transit expansion Regional Express Lane Network, Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI), and various roadway improvements around region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation Demand Management (telework, commuter benefits, ridesharing services, etc.) Eco-Driving (driver education on how to drive to save fuels and reduce emissions) Electric Vehicles (beyond what's assumed by Air Resources Board) Parking Pricing (e.g., higher parking during peak hours, charge for employer parking) Other Pricing (e.g., toll lanes, vehicle fees)
Most Concentrated Growth Shifting jobs/housing around the Bay, and concentrating job/housing growth around existing centers	Intensive Transit Services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allocate more funding to places that are taking on growth, which involves redistributing maintenance funds to core areas with "Fix-It First" funding as an incentive Extensive transit funding for core capacity improvements, such as to BART, Caltrain, Muni and AC Transit bus rapid transit and local transit Smaller backbone Regional Express Lane Network, FPI, and various roadway improvements 	
Dispersed Growth Shifting more jobs towards housing growth in outer areas of the region	Transit Expansion & Roadway Improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More highway improvements and long-haul transit expansion, increased carpool/vanpools and shuttle services, and various roadway improvements 	



*This scenario is the Initial Vision Scenario with consideration for job location and intensity, financial constraints and local input

5

Example Scenarios

(by "mixing & matching" land use, transportation & policy variables)

	Land Use	Transportation	Policy Initiatives
1	Push land uses harder to achieve the 15% greenhouse gas emission reduction target	Transportation 2035 Investment Strategy	No Change to Existing Policies
2	Reduce intensity of land uses	Transportation 2035 Investment Strategy	No Change to Existing Policies
3	Optimize the Initial Vision Scenario	Intensive Transit Services	No Change to Existing Policies
4	Support jobs-housing balance & fit in outer areas	Transit Expansion & Roadway Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transportation Demand Management Eco-Driving



6

Alternative Scenario Timeline

Develop alternative scenarios through an iterative process	Now – June 2011
Present alternative scenarios for initial review in June and then approval by MTC and ABAG in June/July	June/July 2011
Start scenario analysis	July 2011
Release scenario results	October 2011
Seek public review and comment on scenario results	October 2011
Review preferred scenario with MTC and ABAG	January 2012
Approval of preferred scenario by MTC and ABAG	February 2012