

# ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area

## A G E N D A

**REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE  
METROCENTER Auditorium  
1:00-3:00 P.M. WEDNESDAY, October 1, 2008**

**Please Note: There will not be a pre-meeting workshop for the October Meeting. The Recovery Planning Workshop series will resume in December.**

*Committee may take action on any item on agenda*

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Public Comment**
3. **Approval of Regional Planning Committee Meeting Minutes – August 6, 2008**
4. **Oral Reports/Comments**
  - a. Committee Members
  - b. Staff
5. **LONG-TERM DISASTER RECOVERY PLANNING – Discussion of Findings of Survey of Existing Long-Term Recovery Planning Efforts – Information**

Linda Min, Recovery Planning Intern, will discuss the final results of a survey of Bay Area cities and counties planning efforts related to long-term disaster recovery planning. ABAG plans to use the data to provide local governments with a template of best practices that will mitigate impacts of a major disaster and ease the post-disaster recovery process.
6. **FOCUS – Priority Development Area Nominations – Action**

Ken Kirkey, Planning Director, will provide an overview of Priority Development Areas nominated by local jurisdictions for inclusion in FOCUS, the Bay Area's regional blueprint plan. The nominations are in response to the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for nominations by the regional agencies.
7. ***Projections 2009 Performance Targets: System – Action***

Ken Kirkey, Planning Director, will present a proposal to discuss alternative performance-based land-use scenarios with local governments and others.

### **ADJOURN**

**Next meeting: Wednesday, December 3, 2008**

**ABAG Long-term Disaster Recovery Survey Respondents by County  
August 2008**

**Alameda County**

Alameda (city)  
Alameda (county)  
Berkeley  
Dublin  
Fremont  
Hayward  
Newark  
Oakland  
San Leandro  
Union City

**Contra Costa County**

Brentwood  
Clayton  
Concord  
Contra Costa (county)  
Danville  
El Cerrito  
Hercules  
Martinez  
Oakley  
Orinda  
Pinole  
Pittsburg  
Richmond  
San Pablo  
San Ramon  
Walnut Creek

**Marin County**

Fairfax  
Marin (county)  
Mill Valley  
Ross  
San Anselmo  
San Rafael  
Tiburon

**Napa County**

American Canyon  
Calistoga  
Napa (city)  
Napa (county)  
Yountville

**San Francisco County**

San Francisco County

**San Mateo County**

Belmont  
Brisbane  
Burlingame  
Colma  
Daly City  
Foster City  
Half Moon Bay  
Hillsborough  
Menlo Park  
Millbrae  
Pacifica  
Redwood City  
San Bruno  
San Carlos  
San Mateo (city)  
San Mateo (county)  
South San Francisco  
Woodside

**Santa Clara County**

Campbell  
Cupertino  
Los Altos  
Los Gatos  
Monte Sereno  
Morgan Hill  
Mountain View  
Palo Alto  
San Jose  
Santa Clara (city)  
Santa Clara (county)  
Saratoga  
Sunnyvale

**Solano County**

Benicia  
Dixon  
Fairfield  
Rio Vista  
Solano (county)  
Suisun  
Vacaville

**Sonoma County**

Cloverdale  
Cotati  
Healdsburg  
Rohnert Park  
Santa Rosa  
Sebastopol  
Sonoma (city)  
Sonoma (county)

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter – Auditorium

101 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Oakland, California

August 6, 2008

### **Members Present:**

Susan Adams, Supervisor County of Marin  
Diane Dillon, Supervisor, Napa County  
Pat Eklund, Mayor, City of Novato  
Dan Furtado. Councilmember, City of Campbell  
Rose Jacobs Gibson. Supervisor, County of San Mateo/ABAG President  
Mark Green, Mayor, City of Union City/Chair of RPC/ABAG Vice President  
Scott Haggerty, Supervisor, County of Alameda  
Kasie Hildenbrand, Councilmember, City of Dublin  
John Holtzclaw, Sierra Club  
Federal Glover, Supervisor, Contra Costa County  
Janet Kennedy, Councilmember, City of Martinez  
Jim Leddy, Bay Area CMA  
Jake Mackenzie, Mayor, City of Rohnert Park  
Lesla McIntosh, Board Member, EBMUD  
Nate Miley. Supervisory, County of Alameda  
Mike Moore. BAPDA  
Julie Pierce, Vice Mayor, City of Clayton  
A. Sepi Richardson, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Brisbane  
Jim Spering, Supervisory, Solano County  
Mark Ross, Councilmember, City of Martinez  
Carol Severin, EBRPD Board of Directors

### **Members Absent:**

Andy Barnes, Policy Chair, Urban Land Institute  
Shiloh Ballard, Silicon Valley Leadership Group  
Patty Boyle, Bay Area League of Women Voters  
Valerie Brown, Supervisor, County of Sonoma  
Jose Cisneros. Treasurer, City and County of San Francisco  
Dave Cortese. Vice Mayor, City of San Jose, ABAG Immediate Past President  
Juliet Ellis, Urban Habitat Program  
Federal Glover, Supervisor, County of Contra Costa  
Jennifer Hosterman, Mayor, City of Pleasanton  
Andrew Michael. Bay Area Council  
Nancy Nadel, Councilmember, City of Oakland  
Joseph Perkins, HBANC  
Harry Price, Mayor, City of Fairfield  
Pixie Hayward Schickele, California Teachers Association  
Dianne Spaulding, Nonprofit Housing of Northern California

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

### **ABAG Staff Present:**

Kenneth Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director  
Linda Min, Management Intern  
Jeanne Perkins, Hazards Consultant  
Kathleen van Velsor, Senior Environmental Planner  
Dayle Farina, Administrative Assistant

### **1. Call to Order/Introductions**

- Chairperson Green called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM.
- Member Jake Mackenzie announced his resignation. This will be his final meeting.
- Chairperson Green introduced new member Federal Glover, Contra Costa County Supervisor, and provided his background.

### **2. Public Comment**

### **3. Approval of Minutes for June 4, 2008 Meeting.**

It was Moved by Committee Member Mackenzie and Seconded that the minutes be approved.

#### **Corrections:**

Janet Kennedy is Councilmember for City of Martinez.

Minutes were approved as corrected.

### **4. Oral Reports/Comments**

#### **A. Committee Members**

1. Committee Member Severin announced 500 million dollar bond issue in the November election for East Bay Regional Parks District. She explained what the bond would support.
2. Committee Member Richardson announced that former School Board Member and former Mayor of South San Francisco, Joe Fernekes passed away suddenly this morning. Ms. Richardson asked if the meeting could be closed in his honor.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

3. Chair Green thanked the ABAG President for delegating him to appear, at 7:30 this coming Sunday, at KPIX on a television show related to water issues in the bay area.

### B. Staff

1. Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director, announced the Second Call for Priority Development Areas. PDA Workshops planned; information available online.
2. Mr. Kirkey also announced that the first round of Priority Development Areas was awarded 7.6 Million Dollars in Planning Grant funding.
3. Mr. Kirkey announced that ABAG awarded \$100,000 in grant funds to the Development Without Displacement program to planning efforts in Oakland, Richmond and San Francisco.
4. August 15 ABAG is having a roundtable discussion for Priority Development Area jurisdictions around the issue of HCD funding.

*Committee Member Adams requested a quick synopsis about this and asked if ABAG would be doing formally to show the region's dissatisfaction.*

*Chair Green noted that Sacramento was looped in with the Bay Area became a drain on our region. Also, this needs to be a better process in round two.*

*Committee Member Jacobs Gibson (ABAG President) has had some discussions that she intends to establish a committee of ABAG representatives to discuss with our HCD Director the issues with the RHNA process and this process as well.*

5. ABAG/MTC/ULI event on September 26, TOD Marketplace which presents the opportunity to look at the TOD areas.
6. Mr. Kirkey requested that committee members check the Committee contact list for inaccurate information there have been a few problems with people not receiving their packets.

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

*Committee Member Adams asked if the packets could be delivered electronically.*

### **5. Long Term Disaster Recovery Planning: Government Facilities and Services Information**

Mr. Kirkey introduced Jeanne Perkins, ABAG Hazards Consultant and explained that this is the fourth in a series of Disaster Recovery workshops.

Jeanne Perkins presented information on and sought RPC input on the Long Term Disaster Recover Planning as it relates to Government Facilities and Services Information. Ms Perkins referred Committee Members and attendees to the Disaster Recovery website: [quake.abag.ca.gov/recovery](http://quake.abag.ca.gov/recovery). Materials from today's discussions & presentations will also be posted at that website.

Ms. Perkins introduced Monique Zmuda, Deputy Controller of City and County of San Francisco, who has finance and administration control of the City and Counties emergency plan. Ms. Zmuda presented information on Disaster Recovery Planning from a financial and administrative point of view.

*Committee Member Richardson asked if there were step-by-step instructions for each employee and are these instructions also posted on their website?*

Ms. Zmuda responded by saying that most of their employees will continue to do their regular jobs. Where the problems will come in is if the computer systems are down and they have to resort their normal operations to manual processes. Those employees who will be performing duties other than their regular jobs have been attending special training sessions several times a year.

*Committee Member Kennedy asked if accounts have been established with suppliers for emergency supplies.*

Ms. Zmuda replied that suppliers have been established and orders have been pre-bid.

*Committee Member Adams commented that the situation may arise that San Francisco will be dependant on another jurisdiction and that ABAG should consider facilitating discussions around how this would be handled in the case of a big regional event.*

Ms. Perkins introduced Ezra Rapport.

Mr. Rapport briefly discussed the recovery experience and process of recovery following the Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989. He also presented information on the

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

recovery experience after Hurricane Katrina, after which he spent a year working in New Orleans City Hall. He discussed the importance of Recovery Planning.

*Committee Member Furtado asked Mr. Rapport to comment on the level of flexibility of The Stafford Act.*

Mr. Rapport commented the complexity of The Stafford Act.

### **6. LONG-TERM DISASTER RECOVERY PLANNING – Discussion of Preliminary Findings of Survey of Existing Long-Term Recovery Planning Efforts – Information.**

Linda Min, ABAG Tranter/Leong Management Intern, discussed the preliminary results of the survey of Bay Area cities and counties planning efforts related to longer-term disaster recovery planning.

*Committee Member Adams requested that a direct link be added to the ABAG Homepage which would take people to the quakes sites and templates built so that it can be found easily.*

*Committee Member Miley asked if the survey information has been sent to special agencies and districts, including school districts.*

Ms. Perkins responded on the status of including these agencies in the surveys.

*Committee Member Pierce commented that the smaller city staffs would benefit, time wise, from sample ordinances being made available.*

*Committee Member McIntosh commented that essential services, such as water, the need to eliminate or minimize disruption should have its own focus.*

Ms. Perkins responded that she agrees that essential services, particularly infrastructure, are critical. ABAG has received a grant from FEMA to examine the range of natural hazards that could lead to water system disruption. Other infrastructure systems, such as sewer, power, transportation and communications are also critical. In addition, a workshop for RPC members specifically related to recovery of lifeline systems is planned for sometime during the next year.

*Committee Member Richardson commented that she has spoken with a Chancellor and President of all of their colleges in her area and the colleges are interested in getting involved. They feel they are not in the loop even though they have their own campus Recovery Plans.*

### **7. DELTA VISION STRATEGIC PLAN; System – Action**

## Regional Planning Committee Summary Minutes

Kathleen Van Velsor, ABAG Senior Planner introduced key issues presented by the DRAFT DELTA VISION Strategic Plan.

Jeanne Perkins continued with more information on the Plan.

*Committee Member Furtado asked how BCDC fits into this plan.*

Mr. Kirkey will look into the involvement of BCDC in the Delta Vision Strategic Plan.

According to Arne Simonsen, there are no Delta Interests participating in the BDCP process. As a result of that the supervisors from 5 delta counties and others have set-up meetings with the Resource Secretary every month.

Arne Simonsen, Chair of the Delta Protection Commission, presented more information on the protection of the Delta.

*Committee Member Eklund asked how they will fund the maintenance of the levees.*

Prop 180 and 84 provide money for this effort. Depending on the type of levy, the exporter could pay for the operation and maintenance since they are the beneficiaries.

It was moved by Committee Member Mackenzie and seconded by Committee Member Jacobs Gibson that the recommendations presented by the staff be adopted.

The motion carried.

### **ADJOURN:**

Chair Green adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m. The next meeting is on October 1, 2008.

Submitted by:

Dayle Farina

Administrative Assistant

# ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area

## A G E N D A

**REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE  
METROCENTER Auditorium  
1:00-3:00 P.M. WEDNESDAY, October 1, 2008**

**Please Note: There will not be a pre-meeting workshop for the October Meeting. The Recovery Planning Workshop series will resume in December.**

*Committee may take action on any item on agenda*

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Public Comment**
3. **Approval of Regional Planning Committee Meeting Minutes – August 6, 2008**
4. **Oral Reports/Comments**
  - a. Committee Members
  - b. Staff
5. **LONG-TERM DISASTER RECOVERY PLANNING – Discussion of Findings of Survey of Existing Long-Term Recovery Planning Efforts – Information**

Linda Min, Recovery Planning Intern, will discuss the final results of a survey of Bay Area cities and counties planning efforts related to long-term disaster recovery planning. ABAG plans to use the data to provide local governments with a template of best practices that will mitigate impacts of a major disaster and ease the post-disaster recovery process.
6. **FOCUS – Priority Development Area Nominations – Action**

Ken Kirkey, Planning Director, will provide an overview of Priority Development Areas nominated by local jurisdictions for inclusion in FOCUS, the Bay Area's regional blueprint plan. The nominations are in response to the 2<sup>nd</sup> call for nominations by the regional agencies.
7. **Projections 2009 Performance Targets: System – Action**

Ken Kirkey, Planning Director, will present a proposal to discuss alternative performance-based land-use scenarios with local governments and others.

### **ADJOURN**

**Next meeting: Wednesday, December 3, 2008**

DATE: October 1, 2008

TO: ABAG Regional Planning Committee

FROM: Linda Min, Tranter-Leong Management Intern

RE: Progress Report on Existing Long-Term Disaster Recovery Planning Efforts by Local Governments

## **Background**

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) conducted a survey to assess the state of readiness by local governments for long-term recovery after an earthquake or other catastrophic disaster. Long-term recovery refers to the repair and rebuilding process that will need to be undertaken by government departments such as Planning, Finance, Housing, Public Works/Building, Redevelopment and Emergency Management to start restoring their community. The results of the survey provide an assessment of what disaster recovery plans are and are not in place in Bay Area jurisdictions.

While hazard mitigation is essential to minimize the damage of disasters to communities, having a comprehensive plan for the long process of recovery is often overlooked. Hurricane Katrina's aftermath clearly shows the consequences of not preparing for recovery. New Orleans is still struggling to rebuild its communities.

With the upcoming 140<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the last major earthquake on the Hayward Fault on October 21, 2008, now is an opportune time for Bay Area governments to re-examine how they are laying the groundwork for a multi-faceted recovery process. This report provides the first review of the survey's findings on the status of recovery efforts. The final results will be released on October 24, 2008 at ABAG's Fall General Assembly and at the Earthquake Hazards in the Eastern San Francisco Bay Area Conference, October 22-24, 2008.

## **Methodology and Response Rates**

The survey was sent out to city managers and county administrators of all 109 ABAG jurisdictions on July 3, 2008. The original deadline of July 22, 2008 was extended to August 29, 2008 to increase the response rate. In the interim, a preliminary staff report, list of respondents (by county), and Power Point slides were presented to ABAG's Regional Planning Committee on August 6, 2008 based on the 54 responses received by that date.

The survey closed on August 29, 2008 with 85 jurisdictions responding out of a total of 109. The response rate at 78% was excellent. Of the 85 respondents, 2 submitted answers for less than half of the survey questions. In addition, a small number of respondents skipped questions. Staff had mixed success with follow-up calls, which accounts for the varying response rates for individual questions.

## Key Findings

1. **Reasons for Delays in Recovery Planning**-Most jurisdictions (84%) cited mitigation efforts as the prime reason for not doing more to prepare for long-term recovery efforts. Lack of funds (72%), time (46%) and staff\* (41%) were cited as the next most common obstacles.
2. **Financial Recovery**-The vast majority of jurisdictions (92%) have designated a department to oversee the FEMA reimbursement claims process and half (50%) of the Bay Area's local governments have adopted a Local Hazard Mitigation Plan as part of their General Plan. Areas for improvement include: adoption of repair and reconstruction ordinances, documenting of pre-existing conditions, and establishment of a fund for emergency repairs. Only 18%, 37%, and 57% of jurisdictions, respectively, have these measures in place.
3. **Emergency Purchases**-More than half (53%) of local governments' codes or regulations allow the city manager or county administrator to make emergency purchases over \$100,000, which is a minimal amount. Of the 37 comments received, 54% stated there was **no limit** specified in the Municipal Code or other governing document; this is the most flexible and appropriate approach.
4. **Resumption of Government Operations**-Many jurisdictions have made considerable progress ensuring that government operations and services can resume. They still have not fully completed preparations for their resumption, however. For example, 39% currently do not have back-up procedures or plans for making payments if normal finance operations are interrupted. Of this number, 25% plan to do so by December 2009, leaving only 14% with no plans to do so. A total of 54% currently do not have a list of alternate locations for offices and community centers, though 26% plan to by December 2009 (leaving only 28% with no plans to make a list.) In addition, 25% currently do not have back-ups of key records that can be accessed from alternate work sites, though 15% plan to by December 2009 (leaving only 10% with no back-up plans.)
5. **Promoting Mitigation: Residential Buildings**-More extensive retrofitting of residential buildings is needed to preserve our housing stocks, particularly of older single-family homes with "cripple walls" and multifamily housing with "soft stories." Cripple walls are the weak outside wall of the crawl space below the floor one walks on and the perimeter foundation. Soft story buildings (typically built prior to 1980) have an open first floor to allow for parking or retail. Only 16% of jurisdictions currently provide incentives for strengthening cripple walls of single-family residences. A clear majority (84%) of jurisdictions currently has no incentives for seismic retrofitting of single-family residences with cripple walls. Of this number, 8% plan to provide incentives by December 2009, leaving 76% with no plans to provide incentives.

Over one-third of jurisdictions (33%) indicated they do not have multifamily housing with soft stories. Thus, the following percentages only apply to those local governments with soft story multifamily buildings. Of the remaining jurisdictions with soft story buildings, only 10% of jurisdictions have mandated strengthening rules or provide incentives, while 21% plan to do so by December 2009. The majority of jurisdictions (69%) do not mandate strengthening or provide incentives.

6. **Promoting Mitigation: Commercial Buildings**-Relative to mitigation programs for residential buildings, more local governments have actively promoted mitigation of unreinforced masonry buildings in their commercial areas by requiring that these buildings be retrofitted or vacated (44%.) However, 17% of cities and counties cited they currently have no plans to require mitigation of these commercial buildings. *Local governments can facilitate retrofitting by providing incentives. This mitigation measure will drastically reduce property damage after a major earthquake and, more importantly, preserve the historic character and mix of small businesses in older downtowns during recovery. Currently, only a small number of the Bay Area's 109 jurisdictions offer such incentives.*
7. **Expedited Processes**-Building departments need to prepare for the high volume of work they will be required to do after a disaster. Having expedited processes for reviewing plans, granting permits and scheduling inspections for both residential and commercial properties will help ease the recovery effort. While 48% of jurisdictions have expedited processes in place, 24% plan to do so by 2009 and 30% currently have no plans to establish them.
8. **Assisting in Business Recovery**-More planning departments need to be aware of the implications for small business recovery after a major earthquake. It is recommended that they identify key businesses and districts most in need of immediate resumption and include specific area plans in the General Plan. More than half (61%) of jurisdictions currently have no plans to establish specific area plans and only 33% of jurisdictions have identified key businesses and districts.

## Next Steps

As part of ABAG's Disaster Recovery Initiative, four issue papers addressing financing disaster recovery, housing recovery, recovery of business and the economy, and recovery of government facilities and services have been presented at earlier RPC meetings. These issue papers and other related resources are available online at <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/recovery/>. Forthcoming issue papers will address recovery issues related to infrastructure, schools, health facilities and land-use. This project is funded by ABAG and the City of Oakland.

A summary report of the survey's findings will be available at the ABAG General Assembly and a full report will be available online at <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/recovery/>

Based on the survey's results, ABAG will create a template of best practices as part of the larger toolkit that provides technical assistance to local governments for recovery planning.

\* Note: Lack of staff was not included in the original list of obstacle options. It was cited in 41% of the responses for "J-Other."

# ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

---

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area

## MEMO

September 24, 2008

**TO:** ABAG Regional Planning Committee

**FR:** Ken Kirkey, ABAG Planning Director

**RE:** Priority Development Area Applications Received and Recommended Designations

---

At the October 1<sup>st</sup> RPC meeting, staff will seek committee approval of the recommended designations for Priority Development Areas (PDAs) proposed by local governments this year. With RPC support, these recommendations will be forwarded to ABAG's Executive Board at its November 20, 2008 meeting for adoption of these areas as part of FOCUS, the San Francisco Bay Area's Regional Blueprint Plan.

### **Background**

Last year, the ABAG Executive Board adopted the first set of PDAs. Jurisdictions with adopted PDAs have since been eligible to apply for station area planning grants for the planning of Priority Development Areas as complete communities and have been more competitive in applications for funding from regional and state grant programs. Programs for planning and capital funding and technical assistance are being developed to continue supporting the development of Priority Development Areas as viable, transit-served neighborhoods that can accommodate much of the Bay Area's future growth and development. A second call for PDA applications was held this year to allow local governments to submit new areas for consideration as part of FOCUS.

### **Priority Development Area Applications Received**

The application deadline for submitting a PDA application this year was September 12<sup>th</sup>, and applicants have until the end of October to submit a supporting local government resolution. Twenty PDA applications were received. Almost half of the applications were from jurisdictions in the North Bay. Staff have reviewed the applications received and have made recommendations for designation of PDAs as Planned or Potential areas. The primary difference between these two designations is that a Planned PDA has both an adopted land use plan and a resolution of support from the city council or county board. In general, these categories relate to readiness for funding: Planned PDAs are eligible for capital infrastructure funds, planning grants, and technical assistance, while Potential PDAs are eligible for planning grants and technical assistance, but not capital infrastructure funds. Staff will continue to move a PDA from the Potential to Planned category upon completion of the applicable plan and resolution.

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the RPC endorse the list of Planned and Potential PDAs for adoption by the ABAG Executive Board on November 20<sup>th</sup>.

### Recommendations for PDA Designation

Area	Recommended Designation	Notes
Alameda, Naval Air Station	Potential	Planning in process; resolution pending
Emeryville, Mixed Use Core	Potential	General Plan in process; resolution pending
San Rafael, Downtown	Planned	Pending resolution
Benicia, Downtown	Planned	Pending Resolution
Suisun City, Downtown Waterfront District	Planned	Pending Resolution
Vacaville, Downtown	Planned	Pending Resolution
Vacaville, Allison Policy Plan Area	Planned	Pending Resolution
Cotati, Downtown and Depot	Planned/Potential	Depot area is Planned. Downtown is Potential given Specific Plan in process. Resolution pending
Santa Rosa, Mendocino/Santa Rosa Corridor	Potential	Planning in process; resolution pending
Santa Rosa, Sebastopol Road Corridor	Planned/Potential	Planned for area subject to Corridor Plan; resolution pending
Windsor, Redevelopment Project Area	Planned	Pending Resolution
Gilroy, Downtown Specific Plan	Planned	Pending Resolution
Morgan Hill, Downtown	Potential	Specific Plan in process; resolution pending
Sunnyvale, Lawrence Station Transit Village	Potential	SAP or Precise Plan has been proposed in a current study of the station area
Sunnyvale, Downtown	Planned	Majority of area in Downtown Specific Plan. Remainder considered in General Plan.
Sunnyvale, El Camino Real Corridor	Planned	
San Francisco, 19th Avenue Corridor: County Line to Eucalyptus Drive	Potential	No specific land use plan; resolution pending
Orinda, Downtown	Potential	Specific Plan in process; resolution pending
Pinole, Old Town	Potential	Specific Plan in process
San Ramon, North Camino Ramon Plan Area	Potential	Planning in process

# ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

---

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area

## MEMO

**To:** Regional Planning Committee  
**From:** Paul Fassinger, ABAG Research Director  
Christy Riviere, Senior Planner  
**Date:** September 23, 2008  
**Subject:** What if? Performance of Land Use Alternatives, Projections 2009

---

### Summary

This fall, ABAG staff will be conducting outreach on *Projections 2009*, the bi-annual update to the region's forecast of population, jobs and housing. In our outreach, we will be discussing with local governments how future land use alternatives perform against the ABAG Board adopted set of regional "performance targets." Regional targets are: to reduce driving, congestion, transportation-related carbon emissions and particulate matter in the air. The region has also aimed to increase region-wide transit access and to reduce land consumption. (Note: See Attachment 1 for performance targets.)

A key message during the *Projections* outreach will be about the degree to which we may need to consider land use changes if we realistically expect to reduce driving, carbon emissions or to make any measurable difference on the other adopted targets. The magnitude of change required will be conveyed through two alternative development scenarios. The first, **Scattered Success**, will showcase what can likely be achieved through new development projects in places where people can drive shorter distances, take transit and/or walk. This scenario assumes that in addition to this limited success scattered about the region, we will also continue to build and support our many traditional, auto-oriented developments. The second scenario, **Focused Future**, takes a more intensive approach toward planning and developing complete communities and therefore a more sustainable region.

In this staff report, we summarize the core message we will deliver to local governments, as conveyed through our land use performance analysis. We ask that you endorse this message before we commence with our outreach.

### The Land Use Story: What if?

The production and accumulation of green house gases, including carbon dioxide, are changing the Earth's climate. In the Bay Area, 50 percent of carbon emissions come from the transportation sector. The vast majority of these emissions come from cars and trucks. Most of us live in communities where driving is the only viable transportation option for most trips. What if things were different? What if we could re-envision our communities so that they are more resilient against the major changes expected from a growing and aging population, continued high energy prices and, most significantly, global warming?

By 2035, over nine million people will live in the San Francisco Bay Area – two million more than today. Over one-quarter of us will be 65 years old or older. The era of cheap oil will have more than likely come to an end.

How we plan and develop our communities - where and how we house our population and develop our jobs – can either exacerbate or alleviate the impacts anticipated from these pending structural changes.

Many communities in the Bay Area are feeling the impacts of these changes now. Areas that boomed over the last couple of decades with low-density, auto-dependent residential and commercial development, mostly in response to unavailable housing near job centers, are experiencing plummeting housing values. In some places, values have dropped by as much as 45 percent over the last two years. Residents in these same communities have few travel options, and are experiencing soaring commute costs, with little relief in sight. Older residents, those now unable to drive must rely on family and friends to shuttle them to and from doctor's appointments and their daily errands.

Communities with viable transit, those that are walkable and have plentiful jobs, or easy access to them, are seemingly more resilient. Housing values in these areas have declined nominally, or have remained fairly steady. When gas prices doubled, many residents simply opted to take transit, dragged their bikes out of their garage or bought a new pair of walking shoes. Older persons walk or take transit to run their errands and visit friends. Resilience comes principally from the development pattern, the relative location of housing and jobs, access to transit, and the walkability of the community.

Development patterns and access to transportation alternatives greatly affect the amount of driving we do, and therefore our transportation-related carbon dioxide emissions. In communities with some density, transit and jobs, household greenhouse-gas emissions from transportation activities can be as low as 17 pounds on an average weekday. In outer, more remote parts of the Bay Area, where travel options are limited, emissions can be as high as 53 pounds per day.

This fall, we will focus on telling the story of our region's future development pattern. We will demonstrate, through the targets, how the location of homes and jobs can reduce driving and our transportation-related emissions. We will discuss the challenges we face in planning and developing our communities in the coming decades - challenges that are essentially about untangling ourselves from our dependent relationship to the automobile, a relationship fueled by unknown environmental consequences, historically cheap land and even cheaper oil.

The story will be told through two alternative development scenarios. The first, **Scattered Success**, demonstrates some success scattered about the region, in addition to continued auto-oriented development. The second, **Focused Future**, takes a more thorough approach toward planning and developing a sustainable region.

For each scenario, we describe the future as we see it. How much driving will we do? What will our region-wide carbon emissions be? What will air quality be like? How many people will be able to get to work or services on foot or by public transit? Under each scenario, what will it take or will it even be possible to reduce driving and therefore the Bay Area's transportation-related emissions?

#### Scattered Success

**Scattered Success** reflects some degree of success in responding to a growing and aging population, and to the need for more transportation efficient communities. San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, Walnut Creek, San Leandro, San Mateo, Redwood City, Mountain View, Vallejo and several other cities around the region have built relatively higher density residential and mixed use projects near their transit stations. As a result, there has been a modest increase in the number of people living in the Bay Area's urban core. Jobs are also somewhat more concentrated in urban areas, although more people drive into the region for work than ever before. People living in areas with transit use it frequently to get to and from work. On the weekends, however, they still mostly drive to visit friends or to do their shopping, for most everything else is miles away and auto-oriented.

Our **Scattered Success** has moved us farther away from our regional objectives: to reduce driving, clean our air, to reduce greenfield development and to improve access to transit and jobs. More people are

driving than ever before. Our carbon emissions have gone up by several thousand tons per day, to over 92 thousand tons. Particulate matter in the air, both coarse and fine dust, has also risen. We have barely increased people's direct access to transit and jobs. We have converted tens of thousands of acres of our open lands into single family homes, shopping centers and office parks. We had hoped to limit our appetite for land to a mere 900 acres per year, or a total of 22,500 acres.

### Focused Future

**Focused** reflects a future filled with a resounding response to our growing population and to the need for more transportation efficient communities. San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, Berkeley, Dublin, Pleasanton, Livermore, Concord, Pleasant Hill, Walnut Creek, Vallejo, San Leandro, San Mateo, Redwood City, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Daly City and many other cities around the region have created complete communities with access to transit and that are highly walkable, where grocery stores, shops, cafes, and other daily destinations are a short distance from people's homes. The number of people now living in the Bay Area's urban core has gone up to 57 percent, compared to only 35 percent 25 years ago. Jobs are also more concentrated in urban areas, and fewer people drive into the region than ever before. People living in areas with transit use it frequently to get to and from work. And even on the weekends, they can either walk or take a bus to visit friends or to do their shopping, for everything is a short trip away.

Our **Focused Future** has brought us closer to our regional objectives. Fewer people are driving on a per capita basis than 25 years ago. And even though our carbon emissions have yet to come down to below 1990 levels, they have decreased by nearly 5 thousand tons, to a total of 85 thousand tons per day. This is 5 thousand tons less per day than in 2006. Particulate matter in the air, both coarse and fine dust, has risen, though by less than they would have been otherwise. More people have access to transit and jobs. Much of the Bay Area's population lives in communities that have high quality transit within walking distance of their homes. We have also converted less land into urban development than we would have under our **Scattered Success**.

### **Land Use, Necessary, Not Sufficient**

A key challenge during this fall's outreach will be to convey the inter-relationship between land use, infrastructure, pricing, technology, and individual behavior in meeting the regional targets. While powerful, land-use changes alone will not be sufficient in reducing our transportation-related emissions. Reducing emissions from the transportation sector will require new transportation infrastructure, like rail extensions, more busses and even some freeway improvements. Reducing emissions will also require technological improvements to our cars so that they burn cleaner and use less gasoline per mile. We will also need to implement pricing measures - like parking fees, toll lane charges and bridge tolls - so that more people become inspired through their wallets to use their cars less. We will need a major shift in personal behavior, where more people simply choose, for whatever reason, to drive less, walk or take transit over driving.

If we seriously intend to reduce this region's transportation carbon emissions, each of these strategies will be necessary. There is no one solution. There will be no easy answers. And in all actuality, land use, infrastructure, technology, pricing, and behavioral changes are highly dependent on one another for any one measure to succeed. For transit to succeed, sufficient densities need to be in place. If driving becomes more expensive, then we need to have affordable options available. If we want people to choose walking or transit, we have to build our communities at a pedestrian scale and have real transit options available.

## Attachment 1

### Provisional Regional Performance Targets

Bay Area communities have made substantial progress toward moving away from a “business as usual” development pattern. We have had some success in planning and developing more transportation efficient communities near our BART stations, VTA transit areas, MUNI stops and ferry terminals. The **Scattered Success** scenario largely documents this progress. Scattered extends our current level of success twenty-five years out into the future. However, as you read how that future scenario plays out, it will quickly become clear that we need to get **Focused**, and do more.

When and how will we know when we have done enough?

We can only know we have achieved success by setting clear, measurable goals and then working toward those goals. The Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission<sup>1</sup> have set such goals. We have set provisional long-term targets to reduce region-wide driving, greenhouse gases, to improve air quality, protect our land resources and to promote equity. These targets are mostly based on existing California laws, including Assembly Bill 32, California’s Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.

Specifically, by 2035 we aim to:

- ⇒ Reduce driving per person by 10 percent below today’s levels
- ⇒ Reduce traffic congestion, measured by hours of delay, by 20 percent below today’s levels.
- ⇒ Reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 40 percent below 1990 levels.
- ⇒ Reduce PM2.5 (fine dust particles) emissions by 10 percent below today’s levels.
- ⇒ Reduce PM10 (coarser particulate mater) by 45 percent below today’s levels.
- ⇒ Limit greenfield development to 900 acres per year over the next 25 years.
- ⇒ Increase access to jobs and essential services via transit or walking by 20 percent above today’s levels.

<sup>1</sup> The performance targets listed here were adopted by ABAG’s Executive Board on May 15, 2008. They have been modified from those originally drafted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The “Limit greenfield development” target was added by ABAG’s Board. The equity target was changed from reducing transportation and housing costs to increasing non-auto dependent access to jobs and services.