Attachment E
MTC-ABAG Merger Study
Elected Official Survey Results

Introduction

As a part of the MTC and ABAG Merger Study stakeholder engagement process, Management Partners sent an electronic survey to elected officials in the cities, towns, and counties of the Bay Area region as well as BART and AC Transit. The survey opened February 23, 2016 and closed on March 11, 2016. The survey asked for the respondent's thoughts regarding regional planning and options for integrating land use and transportation planning.

Of the 111 local jurisdictions[1] surveyed (101 cities, nine counties and two transit agencies), 95 or 85% participated in the survey. This included 86 cities, eight counties and three responses from transit agency board members. (Respondents were not asked to identify their transit agency.) Management Partners received surveys from 180 (about 30%) of the 610 elected officials engaged in the process.

The following sections summarize the results of the survey by each question. For reference purposes, we have designated the following as definitions of jurisdiction size.

1. ***Cities***
    a. Small: less than 50,000 in population
    b. Medium to Large: over 50,000 in population
2. ***Counties***
    a. Small: less than 500,000 in population
    b. Large: over 500,000 in population

For a detailed list of the different sized jurisdictions, please refer to section, "List of All Bay Area Jurisdictions by Size."

[1]*The City and County of San Francisco counts as a single local jurisdiction in the overall count, even though it is included in both the total City count and the total County count.*

Background Information:

1. Please indicate your elective office:

	Number of Total Respondents	Number of Jurisdictions Represented
Overall	**180**	**>95**
Councilmember/Mayor	**161***	**86**
Medium to Large City**	60	35
Small City	100	51
Supervisor	**15**	**8**
Large County	7	3
Small County	8	5
Transit Agency Board Member	**3**	**>1*****

** The subsections (small, and medium to large cities) do not equal 161 because one council member did not indicate the city of his/her residence.*
*** There were 3 responses from cities over 250,000 in population. The City and County of San Francisco did not participate in the survey.*
**** It is not possible to determine participating transit agencies specifically based on the responses collected. There is at least one agency represented in the survey.*

2. Are you currently appointed to a transportation or transit agency governing board?

	Yes	No
Overall	**87 (48%)***	**91 (51%)***
Councilmember/Mayor*	**72 (45%)***	**87 (54%)***
Medium to Large City	32 (53%)*	28 (47%)*
Small City	40 (40%)*	58 (58%)*
Supervisor	**11 (73%)**	**4 (27%)**
Large County	5 (71%)	2 (29%)
Small County	6 (75%)	2 (25%)
Transit Agency Board Member	**3 (100%)**	**0 (0%)**

**Totals may not add up due to blank responses.*

Main Survey Results:

3. My community was actively involved in the development of Plan Bay Area.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall	14.1%	39.3%	**39.9%**	6.7%
Councilmember/Mayor	14.6%	**41.0%**	39.6%	4.9%
Medium to Large City	5.7%	**45.3%**	**45.3%**	3.8%
Small City	20.0%	**38.9%**	35.6%	5.6%
Supervisor	13.3%	26.7%	**46.7%**	13.3%
Large County	**28.6%**	**28.6%**	**28.6%**	14.3%
Small County	0.0%	25.0%	**62.5%**	12.5%
Transit Agency Board Member	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	**66.6%**

4. Regional planning has generally been effective in the Bay Area.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall	12.6%	**47.7%**	38.5%	1.1%
Councilmember/Mayor	12.9%	**46.5%**	39.4%	1.3%
Medium to Large City	13.8%	**44.8%**	39.7%	1.7%
Small City	12.5%	**46.9%**	39.6%	1.0%
Supervisor	6.7%	**60.0%**	33.3%	0.0%
Large County	14.3%	**57.1%**	28.6%	0.0%
Small County	0.0%	**62.5%**	37.5%	0.0%
Transit Agency Board Member	0.0%	**66.6%**	33.3%	0.0%

5. **The current allocation of roles and responsibilities between ABAG and MTC support an effective approach to regional transportation and land use planning in the Bay Area.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall	12.0%	**43.1%**	38.9%	6.0%
Councilmember/Mayor	12.8%	**42.6%**	39.2%	5.4%
Medium to Large City	7.5%	**45.3%**	43.4%	3.8%
Small City	16.0%	**40.4%**	37.2%	6.4%
Supervisor	0.0%	**60.0%**	26.7%	13.3%
Large County	0.0%	**85.7%**	14.3%	0.0%
Small County	0.0%	**37.5%**	**37.5%**	25.0%
Transit Agency Board Member	33.3%	0.0%	**66.6%**	0.0%

6. **Transportation and land use planning should be performed by separate agencies in the Bay Area.**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall	15.4%	**45.0%**	24.3%	15.4%
Councilmember/Mayor	16.0%	**44.0%**	24.0%	16.0%
Medium to Large City	14.5%	**47.3%**	30.9%	7.3%
Small City	17.0%	**41.5%**	20.2%	21.3%
Supervisor	6.7%	**60.0%**	26.7%	6.7%
Large County	14.3%	**85.7%**	0.0%	0.0%
Small County	0.0%	37.5%	**50.0%**	12.5%
Transit Agency Board Member	**33.3%**	**33.3%**	**33.3%**	0.0%

7. **Transportation and land use planning should be performed by a single agency in the Bay Area, as it is in other large metropolitan areas in California**

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Overall	17.5%	24.0%	**41.5%**	17.0%
Councilmember/Mayor	18.4%	23.7%	**42.1%**	15.8%
Medium to Large City	16.4%	25.5%	**45.5%**	12.7%
Small City	19.8%	22.9%	**39.6%**	17.7%
Supervisor	13.3%	20.0%	**40.0%**	26.7%
Large County	0.0%	0.0%	**71.4%**	28.6%
Small County	25.0%	**37.5%**	12.5%	25.0%
Transit Agency Board Member	0.0%	**33.3%**	**33.3%**	**33.3%**

8. **Rank the options below in order of their effectiveness in supporting regional transportation and land use planning in the Bay Area. (Rank the options with 1 least effective, 2, 3, 4 most effective)**

	Most Effective	Second Most Effective	Third Most Effective	Least Effective
Option A. Keep the current division of roles and responsibilities between ABAG and MTC the same.	35.4%	16.7%	15.3%	32.6%
Option B. Strengthen the regional transportation and land use planning collaboration between ABAG and MTC.	9.1%	37.8%	44.1%	9.1%
Option C. Look for opportunities to functionally integrate the regional planning operations of ABAG and MTC, but retain each entity separately	14.4%	34.0%	32.0%	19.6%
Option D. Create a new governance model for the Bay Area's land use and transportation planning, and transportation coordination and financing roles and responsibilities.	41.1%	7.4%	7.4%	44.2%

9. **What concerns would you have if a new governance model for land use and transportation planning, and transportation coordination and financing was created? (Indicate your top three concerns in order)**

	Highest Concern	Second Highest Concern	Third Highest Concern
Overall	Local Control	Governance	Accountability
Councilmember/Mayor	Local Control	Governance	Accountability / Efficiency and Effectiveness
Supervisor	Local Control	Governance	Accountability
Transit Agency Board Member	Accountability	Governance	Transparency / Local Control

List of other concerns indicated by the comment box (verbatim):

- Adequate representation of mid and small cities in the governance board
- Appropriate resource allocation to small rural areas
- Availability of funding for implementing planning goals
- Believe focus should be on regional transportation and local land use
- Bias toward high density development
- Concentration of power; common ground becomes lowest common denominator
- Direct communication and actually considering local issues
- Equity- making sure resources get to the North Bay Area
- Excessive control by large cities
- Expanded power of the Executive Director to manipulate results
- Governance should be COG with cities represented in number and geographically
- If they become one agency, I am most concerned about representation/voting for the smaller counties
- I'm more concerned with the status quo than I am with a new governance model
- Increased cost
- MTC has failed with the Eastern span, the overruns on HQ, and efforts to reduce congestion
- Not enough room for comment
- Participatory planning - not just tolling the stakeholders
- Political power and pressure on poorer communities
- Responsiveness to the broad population rather than just interest groups
- The way that MTC tried to take over is very telling. As it is they will complete this in June.
- Transit Board representation
- We are not on El Camino and have been left out of lots of planning

10. What should MTC and ABAG do to improve regional transportation and land use planning in the Bay Area? (Maximum 500 characters, verbatim):

Note: Specific comments regarding agency staff have been excluded.

1. Put money into local implementation of housing and planning.
2. Dissolve both agencies and return the responsibilities to the local level. Too much money is being spent on administrative costs in relation to results from these lettered agencies.
3. ABAG appears to be more responsive to local governments than MTC, which is why I don't support MTC taking over ABAG. The ABAG governance model should be followed in any functional merger.
4. Planning should be consolidated under one management, even if serving two agencies. Transportation financing should be protected from additional governance burdens. Prioritized policies of both MTC and ABAG should be tied to financial incentives for local governments that cooperate. More public forums should be held on key issues, so that a broader, more inclusive stakeholder input and policy understanding is achieved.
5. Integrate transportation planning and land use planning, and hold communities accountable for doing their part.
6. Maintain separate entities and provide ABAG with its own funding so that it does not rely on MTC.
7. Concentrate housing and transportation activities and funding in urban not rural areas.
8. Have a committee made up of people from both entities. Transportation only. MTC should stay out of land use planning.
9. MTC should alter its governing structure to include smaller city representation (currently representation dominated by large cities/counties). Also, MTC needs to get its finances in order (interest rate swap debacle) and figure out how to manage projects (Bay Bridge debacle). ABAG needs to continue to improve its cooperation with smaller cities/counties (improvement already happening).
10. Provide means for differentiation of planning and programs for communities with different needs. One size fits all approach has excluded smaller communities from realistic programs suitable to their needs.
11. Need one voice and need to be bottom up, not top down; in addition, the only participants in land use planning decisions seem to be special interest groups.
12. Allow local jurisdictions more flexibility in determining RHNA numbers: one size does not fit all. Also, priority for transportation projects should focus on infrastructure projects, not quasi-social issues.
13. Drill down on the concept of collaboration between counties in the allocation of growth in housing, services, and attention to environmental concerns.
14. Understand that not every community can build large amounts of housing. Focus on getting people from where housing exists to job centers, rather than trying to get housing closer to jobs.
15. Merge or highly collaborate
16. Land use planning and transportation planning should be subordinate to one locally controlled/elected entity
17. Reward Transit Oriented Smart Growth Communities with grants

18. Not impose RHNA numbers that fail to accurately reflect what they represent. Give Marin credit for Bay Area wide recreation capacity.
19. Take into consideration the general plans of each of the jurisdictions and work with them vs run over them.
20. Better public involvement process.
21. Incentivize adherence to state and regional policies and goals to/for the local jurisdictions.
22. Be fiscally responsible.
23. Form a joint body to perform the work and assure equal representation. Leadership roles should change.
24. Merge the two together and have one executive director and quit fighting with each other.
25. Form new joint agency.
26. Actually work with cities to develop regional transportation and housing corridors.
27. ABAG should be the MPO since governance structure and culture is collaborative. ABAG involves local governments & public whereas MTC is autocratic/top down. MTC should conduct public workshops. There might be more collaboration with new MTC/ABAG staff leadership. To have true land use & transportation planning needs to start at the local level and work up. There is creative tension between these disciples which strengthens the ultimate decision.
28. Better growth models. Send informed planners to local meetings.
29. Allow more local control.
30. MTC should work more with local governments. The fear is if MTC is top heavy in this merger the local cities will be ignored.
31. Listen and keep in mind the local governments' wants and needs. Each city has unique planning issues and challenges that need to be evaluated with specific solutions. These can be made in conjunction with regional collaboration, but not compelled.
32. Improve access to quality transit and provide other car alternative ways to get around. Make the case for increased density.
33. MTC does not have representation from all cities or even all cities over 60,000 population.
34. A new model should be created, but only if both entities are eliminated.
35. Plan and implement transit oriented developments, better coordinate funding and planning.
36. Work more directly with local cities/towns.
37. I do think the planning should be done together as each has a significant effect on each other but I am concerned about the current proposal which would overly represent the counties & substantially take away cities influence.
38. Improve the sensitivity and appropriateness of local housing requirements by increasing the funding for planning staff under the control of the current ABAG. Set aside more MTC funding for local transportation improvement projects planned and implemented by local staff. Provide MTC funding as a subsidy for affordable housing development near BART stations.
39. If we're to foster and retain a growing local economy, we have to find a way to counter NIMBYism. We are all worse off when individual communities build moats around themselves, but you can't block that political pressure at the local level. Look at what Washington State has done in this regard.
40. It is time for cities which have built large office complexes to devote equal attention to fulfilling housing needs in their cities. Industry should continue to pay for commuter buses to

alleviate congestion on our existing freeways. Regional sharing of housing numbers is essential. New transportation connections between the East Bay/Milpitas and Mountain View must be designed.

41. Keep things the way they are.
42. I have two suggestions. First, ABAG become its own autonomous directly funded organization. Second, form an organization that supports local control with a regional overview, not the other way round.
43. Support private enterprise -- let them figure it out.
44. Mandate infill with incentives. Setting standards for local government gives cover for elected officials to do the right thing. Providing meaningful affordable housing criteria. Establish performance standards for regions protecting historic neighborhoods, reducing GHG, reducing VMT, funding more frequent local transit, establish government funded low affordable housing, and pay for environmental services of farmland and private open space.
45. They should be consolidated and new staff leadership should be put in place.
46. Take into consideration each local community. It's not one size fits all. There needs to be better communication between agencies and increased communication between agencies and local communities.
47. Cooperate. Listen to each other.
48. Work cohesively together and forget their individual silos. Work to create a new culture of collaboration where staff from one agency isn't "better" than the other. Once fully merged, create new administrative structure with one NEW Exec Director and Deputy for Land Use and Deputy for Transportation. While these are admin in nature, I believe they will create an environment that leads to better transportation and land use planning in the Bay Area.
49. Ensure that transportation decisions are tightly tied to affordable housing and sustainable/smart development.
50. Consolidate to one new agency, with adequate representation from cities and counties.
51. Local control over land use, regional transportation planning.
52. MTC should become more open and transparent, focus on regional transportation issues and combining of regional transportation agencies. ABAG should become more attuned to local differences with a bottom up approach, rather than top down.
53. Include elected regional transportation officials on their Boards.
54. Consolidate efforts. Focus on broad policy recommendations that facilitate implementation of sustainability goals. Fund research or pilot efforts as needed. Reflect local needs through local control based governance structure.
55. Improving the efficiency of the organizations will allow additional financial resources to be applied to the projects and operation of the organizations.
56. Integrate MTC into ABAG ideally. Since that will not happen because of the power imbalance between the agencies, some sort of joint governance structure of both organization could improve the situation.
57. Integrate and work out the millions of details.
58. Align the services. South Santa Clara County (Morgan Hill and Gilroy) are being pushed to provide housing but yet the Train and VTA services are limited and fares continue to rise for Trains. Only the upper middle class can afford the Trains. You need to align all the

requirements equally so there is a chance of success. Force North County to build more affordable housing since they have a multitude of available transportation.

59. Work together
60. Bring BART management under MTC/ABAG control. Place BART to ACE in Livermore on the highest priority.
61. Realize that one plan does not fit all.
62. Provide reliable transportation where the jobs are. Plan for public transit systems in new development areas, don't rely on current systems such as BART, SAMTRANS, VTA, etc.
63. Enhance collaboration
64. MTC and ABAG should meet regularly to communicate what each entity is working on in their cities. The representative of the city must actively address the unique characteristics of the city in assessing their land and transportation issues.
65. More emphasis should be given to the local level.
66. More local control. More support smaller cities.
67. More local government (City) control on RHNA allocations. Plan Bay Area should be abolished.
68. Work more closely with local jurisdictions to meet needs of local economies while working on overall regional solutions of connectivity and traffic/transportation improvements.
69. I recognize the need for regional planning, but I have serious concerns about a governing model that minimizes the role of local officials. Efficiency is important, but increasing it should not result in a less inclusive and democratic governing structure that fails to recognize the knowledge and concerns of local leaders.
70. Value the differences and values behind urban, suburban and rural communities as all being viable.
71. Inclusiveness at both tables
72. Work out independent funding for ABAG and functional integration.
73. Work more in partnership than in competition. Recognize differences between urban and suburban areas as funds are allocated to overcome perception that suburban areas, which provide the housing, have lower priority than urban job centers--yet continue to discourage sprawl through funding allocations.
74. Merge!
75. Do not be so "engineering" oriented and think about livable communities
76. Recognize that while densely populated areas are of major concern, tens of thousands of bay area residents live in outlying, sometimes rural areas, and they have needs for transportation, medical care, roads and other infrastructure. Right now ABAG ignores outlying areas and MTC while doing a better job still puts those areas as last on their list of priorities.
77. Work cooperatively.
78. Talk to each City, County and Board of Sup to keep them informed with a public hearing every other year.
79. Come up with plans that serve all communities not just those that fit its model.
80. Accept only reasonable growth goals from the state. 2. Use incentives to facilitate growth where it is desired. 3. Allocate most transportation funds based on population but tie allocation of some transportation funds to willingness to grow. 4. Figure out how to engage the large number of people who are not advocates for a particular position but are affected by

ABAG and MTC policies. 5. Create a merged agency in which neither the head of ABAG nor MTC plays a leading role.

81. Merge and become more efficient and cost effective.
82. More efficient, effective and innovative.
83. Go to APTA conferences and participate. Every county should be able to use mass transit to get to any airport but this option still does not exist for many people. Term out representatives. There is not enough new ideas or forward thinking for the health of the Bay Area. It appears more of a status to be on the board but if you look at our traffics problems that currently exist, it is clear more effective work needs to be done.
84. BART to Redwood City, across the bay, support density surrounding BART and rail stations.
85. Create a framework and policies which improve effectiveness by reducing the over-emphasis on retaining local control.
86. Secure long term funding for ABAG and look for ways to improve our collaboration.
87. Please do not compare counties as same, i.e. Alameda, Contra Costa/totally opposites in various issues, growth different land issues.
88. STAY OUT OF LOCAL AGENCIES BUSINESS ISSUES I.E. LAND USE AUTHORITY.
89. ABAG should be funded independently. ABAG should better engage the public. MTC should be located near transit..
90. Merge for efficacy, consolidate organizations into one leaner and more effective planning system.
91. I have sent my response into Heain Lee.
92. Merge with ABAG housed inside MTC. Planning all together.
93. Have sufficient funding to support the ABAG efforts, maintain local control especially on growth. Don't have ABAG and MTC tell cities how to grow, etc.
94. Coordinated planning and collaboration.
95. Take into account the benefit of the rural jurisdictions retaining open space and agriculture in regards to GHG reduction. And the transportation needs that still exist and remain unfunded!
96. I felt that Plan Bay Area was difficult to get behind as assumptions for our town and Marin had no basis in local reality and seemed to be a result of some formula. We have a built out town with no commercial or retail and yet we were asked to house a large number of new workers and residents projected by some formula. I also felt that FEMA flood zone mapping was ignored and that water resources were ignored.
97. MTC - Address long pre-existing transportation issues instead of allowing creep outside of the central bay area which allows residential development to continue creating gridlock even further away from the urban cores. ABAG, be realistic in their assessments and encumbrances of communities that are built out and simply cannot meet their mandates for required housing.
98. Recognize the different characteristics of each community, and give each a true voice in the decisions.
99. Respect local land use control, support regional transportation improvements.
100. Become more responsive to varying needs of various communities. No "One size fits all" programs.
101. There should be one agency with a regionally elected board.
102. Stop the political games and do their jobs.
103. Work together

104. Listen to the public.....
105. Both organizations are enthralled by rapid business growth--there is no real discussion of moderate and balanced growth. Why did ABAG abandon their respect for the State Demographers forecasts as soon as the State Demographer recognized a maturing slowdown in demographic growth in the state?
106. Manage BART
107. It works fine. MTC is captive to SF, Oakland and San Jose. They care zero about other communities. The problem is not coordination or redundancy, the problem is we don't want to solve the problems the way they do. ABAG gets that. Let ABAG plan housing/land use and MTC plan transport just lien legislature set up.
108. Foster local control wherever possible.
109. More accountability and transparency from MTC and ABAG staff.
110. They should merge land use planning at least. Preferably they should merge.
111. More engagement of the public at a very local level.
112. Allocate more funding to cities that do not have mass transportation options so that they can be developed.
113. Integrate functions where sensible and cost effective; increase coordination generally; plan from same maps and data; train local planners.
114. Merge the two agencies and retain one executive director (the ABAG ED).
115. Recognize that the characteristics are not the same in different parts of the Bay Area. It can't be a one-size-fits-all where everything is applied to all 9 counties as if they were a local implementation of the greater region; Need to eliminate the contradictions in conflicting policies; Need to recognize that not everything is treated equally.
116. Remain separate entities, but coordinate with a committee made up of members of each.
117. Move towards an elected metro board specializing in the matrix of transportation, greenhouse gas reduction and land use planning.
118. Make it affordable, time efficient for transit from point a to point b, effective for those other than commuters.
119. Look beyond area boundaries to consider impacts of other development from outside the area, and consider customer preferences, especially for single family development.
120. Make sure resources are allocated to smaller urban areas such as in Marin and Sonoma County so that we have transportation options like the rest of the Bay Area does. If this doesn't happen, sprawl will continue up here. It’s important to allocate resources equally throughout all 9 counties. No big city or county should have a choke hold on funding.
121. Identify what the overall goal is (ignore politics), determine what skills, expertise and leadership is needed to realize success, identify the strengths and weaknesses of each agency, and then work together to develop an organizational structure and a strategic plan that will lead to maximum effectiveness and efficiency.
122. Too many regulations and agencies make the process to cumbersome.
123. Replace the building/repair/widening of freeways, which encourage sprawl (especially in areas that lack BART access) with effective/accessible public transportation. Build QUALITY transit oriented housing.
124. Promote public transportation that effectively removes cars from main arterials roadways.
125. Work together

126. ABAG reverts back to its functions in the '60's: responsible for developing plans to protect the coastline and generate plans to improve transportation infrastructure; not an enforcement agency, but a resource for local, county and regional jurisdictions. MTC works w/ ABAG to develop the regional transportation. Neither agency has power to set forth housing mandates. Growth projections are historically overblown by ABAG. Land use planning should rest with local jurisdictions, not a regional agency.
127. Better representation and land use transportation decisions
128. We need to link jobs and housing better, with lower wage jobs requiring more affordable housing, and vice versa. Closely related, people should be encouraged to live where they work. This would make walking/biking/etc. a lot more practical. All of this would reduce the need to invest as much in our road network, other than ongoing maintenance & repair.
129. I would like to see both groups put their differences aside, and see the benefit of true collaboration.
130. Demonstrate that they care and are interested in the perspectives of the smaller counties in the region.
131. Land use and transportation have been planned separately and do not match. Because of that, some of our transportation systems are overcrowded, and others are underutilized. This should be addressed regionally whether there is a merger or not.
132. MTC should expand its board so that all communities in the Bay Area have a voice. MTC should focus on transportation and leave the land use planning to ABAG.
133. Stay as is but more collaborative meetings.
134. Re RHNA numbers, provide the funding for transportation needed to support additional housing. Re regional transportation, improve connectivity between and among different transit providers, and extend transit service to unserved or underserved areas.

Other Comments Received via Email (verbatim):

1. Need more open and transparent discussion of Regional and Local control concerns. Who is making the decisions and who is making recommendations? Less concerned about the Merger questions. More concerned with the recommendations that are coming from a Regional entity (merged or not). The residents of our Cities want more voice in deciding the Regional verses Local control question. How will we set up the Governance so that mid and small size cities are adequately represented? Why is this Merger question moving so fast? I am aware there is a $1m budget question, but there are Billions of transpiration funds at stake. Let's get the organization and governance right.
2. Your survey did not ask about the way this merger was drafted. The Alameda County Mayors voted 12-1-1 to not support MTC in this endeavor because of the one sided approach they took. As it is they will accomplish their goal of defunding ABAG if they wait until June and no merger is announced. The timeline for the merger was very unrealistic. Thank you for listening.
3. I took the survey. Frankly, I expected more in-depth questions about potential structure and composition for the newly merged agency. This survey barely scratched the surface.

List of All Bay Area Jurisdictions by Size

Source: California Department of Finance, 2015 Population Estimates.

Large and Small Counties

County	2015 Population	County	2015 Population
Large (larger than 500,000)		Small (smaller than 500,000)	
Santa Clara County	1,889,638	Sonoma County	496,253
Alameda County	1,594,569	Solano County	429,552
Contra Costa County	1,102,871	Marin County	258,972
San Francisco County	845,602	Napa County	140,362
San Mateo County	753,123		

Medium to Large Cities (over 50,000)

City	2015 Population	City	2015 Population	City	2015 Population
Alameda County		Marin County		Santa Clara County	
Oakland	410,603	San Rafael	59,214	San Jose	1,016,479
Fremont	226,551	Novato	53,575	Sunnyvale	148,028
Hayward	152,889			Santa Clara	120,973
Berkeley	118,780	Napa County		Mountain View	77,914
San Leandro	88,441	Napa	78,971	Milpitas	72,606
Livermore	85,990			Palo Alto	66,932
Alameda	76,638	San Francisco County		Cupertino	59,756
Pleasanton	74,850	San Francisco	845,602	Gilroy	53,000
Union City	72,744				
Dublin	55,844	San Mateo County		Solano County	
		Daly City	105,810	Vallejo	119,683
Contra Costa County		San Mateo	101,429	Fairfield	111,891
Concord	126,069	Redwood City	81,838	Vacaville	94,702
Antioch	108,298	South San Francisco	66,193		
Richmond	107,346			Sonoma County	
San Ramon	78,561			Santa Rosa	173,071
Pittsburg	67,628			Petaluma	59,540
Walnut Creek	66,868				
Brentwood	56,493				

Small Cities (less than 50,000)

City	2015 Population	City	2015 Population	City	2015 Population
Alameda County		**Napa County**		**Santa Clara County**	
Newark	44,204	American Canyon	20,149	Campbell	41,857
Albany	18,565	St Helena	6,065	Morgan Hill	41,779
Piedmont	11,113	Calistoga	5,261	Saratoga	30,799
Emeryville	10,570	Yountville	3,017	Los Gatos	30,505
				Los Altos	30,036
Contra Costa County		**San Mateo County**		Los Altos Hills	8,341
Danville	43,691	San Bruno	44,409	Monte Sereno	3,451
Oakley	38,789	Pacifica	38,551		
Martinez	37,384	Menlo Park	33,273	**Solano County**	
Pleasant Hill	34,162	Foster City	32,390	Suisun City	28,888
San Pablo	29,730	Burlingame	29,890	Benicia	27,689
Lafayette	25,154	San Carlos	29,449	Dixon	19,158
Hercules	24,775	East Palo Alto	29,137	Rio Vista	8,193
El Cerrito	24,288	Belmont	26,748		
Pinole	18,946	Millbrae	22,898	**Sonoma County**	
Orinda	18,612	Half Moon Bay	12,051	Rohnert Park	41,077
Moraga	16,466	Hillsborough	11,420	Windsor	27,335
Clayton	11,288	Atherton	6,935	Healdsburg	11,687
		Woodside	5,539	Sonoma	10,933
Marin County		Brisbane	4,541	Cloverdale	8,708
Mill Valley	14,439	Portola Valley	4,527	Sebastopol	7,507
San Anselmo	12,670	Colma	1,480	Cotati	7,346
Larkspur	12,347				
Corte Madera	9,491				
Tiburon	9,200				
Fairfax	7,634				
Sausalito	7,300				
Ross	2,493				
Belvedere	2,121				