

A G E N D A

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
METROCENTER Auditorium
1:00-3:00 P.M. WEDNESDAY, October 7, 2009

Please Note: Carl Anthony and Paloma Pavel of Earth House will present their recently published book **Breakthrough Communities** at a pre-meeting informal luncheon discussion from 11:45 to 1:00PM in ABAG MetroCenter Conference Room 171.

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 5, 2009**
4. **Oral Reports/Comments**
 - a. Committee Members
 - b. Staff
5. **SB 375 – Building Blocks for the Sustainable Communities Strategy Work Program**
INFORMATION - Miriam Chion, Principal Planner will provide the Committee with an overview of some of the preliminary tasks for the Sustainable Communities Strategy, under SB 375.
6. **Development without Displacement TOD Program and Final Report**
INFORMATION – Marisa Cravens, Regional Planner will present an overview of the *Development Without Displacement* program, including recommendations from consultant organization PolicyLink for strengthening the equity components of regional agency policies.
7. **Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area - Status Report**
INFORMATION – Jeanne Perkins, Earthquake Hazards Program Consultant and Danielle Hutchings, Earthquake Hazards Specialist will seek feedback relative to gaining participation from additional jurisdictions and expanding publicity for the planning process.

ADJOURN

Next meeting: Wednesday, December 2, 2009



A G E N D A

MEMO

Submitted to: Regional Planning Committee
Submitted by: Ken Kirkey, Planning Director
Subject: Building Blocks for the Sustainable Communities Strategy
Date: September 30, 2009

Executive Summary

The Building Blocks are the first set of products that will identify key issues and policies and set the course for the Sustainable Communities Strategy. They are developed by the regional agencies, ABAG, MTC, BAAQMD, and BCDC in collaboration with the local jurisdictions. At the October 7 meeting, staff will provide an overview of the current work program for the Building Blocks.

Recommended Action

No action is required.

Next Steps

ABAG and MTC staff will be working on the Building Blocks and will provide regular updates on progress and completed tasks.

MEMO

To: Regional Planning Committee
From: Marisa Cravens, Regional Planner
Date: September 30, 2009
Subject: Development without Displacement TOD Program and Final Report

Executive Summary

Staff will present an overview and findings from the 18-month *Development Without Displacement* program, which has produced planning strategies, case studies, and recommendations for improving the social equity benefits of transit-oriented development. Included in the packet are a set of recommendations from consultant organization PolicyLink for strengthening the equity components of regional policies. Staff is seeking input from the Regional Planning Committee on these recommendations relative to their potential incorporation into the Sustainable Communities Strategy

Background

The purpose of *Development Without Displacement* was to identify ways to implement the FOCUS goal of “Support existing communities” by investigating the link between urban infill, changing real estate markets, and the indirect displacement of low-income residents due to rising rents, redevelopment, or loss of employment areas. Funded through a \$200,000 Caltrans Environmental Justice grant, *Development Without Displacement* also provided three grants to community-government partnerships in Priority Development Areas in Richmond, Oakland, and San Francisco. These grants supported engagement efforts around strategies to limit displacement in areas where significant new housing is planned.

This project has explored the following elements as a framework for equitable TOD planning and development:

1. Understand neighborhood change and displacement potential.
2. Engage residents in creating a vision for the future.
3. Preserve existing unsubsidized affordable units and secure land for development of new affordable housing.
4. Limit or manage upzoning in areas sensitive to displacement.
5. Retain and grow jobs for local workers.
6. Plan for neighborhood activity centers (“social seams”) to support integration
7. Secure community benefits for current residents.

The final report has been written by ABAG Planning and Research staff with assistance from consultants at the UC-Berkeley Center for Community Innovation and Policy Link, a national research and action institute advancing economic and social equity. The report includes an analysis of changing regional demographics and migration patterns, a summary of equity-building policies, and reports from the three PDA community engagement programs. An introduction and a set of recommendations for regional agencies by the consultants are attached. A full report will be available on October 7th.

Recommended Action

Staff request Regional Planning Committee input on PolicyLink’s recommendations for regional actions relative to thier potential incorporation into the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Next Steps

Based on the Regional Planning Committee’s comments, staff will explore the feasibility of incorporating recommendations into the Sustainable Communities Strategy and will return to the Committee in the future with any proposed policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction.....	2
II. Displacement and TOD Dynamics in the Bay Area.....	6
Demographic Shifts during the Boom years, 1990-2000.....	
Rising Incomes and Property Values of TOD Areas.....	
Complete Communities Strategies.....	
III. Equitable Transit Oriented Development Strategies.....	38
Housing Strategies.....	
Jobs Strategies.....	
Complete Communities Strategies.....	
Community Engagement Strategies.....	
IV. Case Studies of Community Partnerships.....	47
Community Engagement: City of Oakland and Asian Health Services.....	47
Affordable Housing: City of Richmond and Richmond Equitable Development Initiative.....	49
Small Business Stabilization: City and County of San Francisco and the Mission Economic Development Agency.....	51
V. Regional Toolbox: Transit Oriented Development Components of Existing ABAG and MTC Programs.....	60
VI. Recommended Future Regional Actions.....	60

List of Figures

I. Introduction

Over the last decade, Bay Area communities—from dense cities like San Francisco and Oakland to suburbs like Antioch and Pittsburg—have come to recognize the benefits of transit-oriented development (TOD): compact, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented communities located within a half-mile of transit stations. Transit-oriented development can bring multiple, synergistic benefits, including revitalized neighborhoods, greater public transit use, reduced traffic congestion and carbon emissions, and preserved open space. TOD also provides an opportunity for equitable development. Building affordable homes in new transit-oriented developments can enable low-income working families (predominantly people of color) to lower their transportation costs, live in healthy and walkable neighborhoods with shops and services, and access jobs and economic opportunities throughout the region.

But the benefits of TOD do not automatically flow to the low-income communities and communities of color residing around the new or renewed transit stop. Intentional planning and policymaking, and meaningful community engagement, are needed to ensure that new transit investments increase equity and opportunity for existing residents and contribute to a more equitable, sustainable region.

One issue is ensuring there are adequate opportunities for lower income households to live in transit communities. Recent reports by Bay Area and national research and advocacy groups have described the need to put in place mechanisms to build mixed-income TODs.¹ Experience has shown that the market on its own does not adequately produce this type of housing. Although many of the initial successful TODs were created by nonprofit community development organizations like the Unity Council in Fruitvale, most new TOD projects serve upper-income households who can pay a premium to live in them.²

Despite increasing demand for housing near transit, TOD is still more complex and expensive than conventional developments, making it less likely that affordable homes will be included unless there are government incentives for developers.³

Another challenge is maintaining affordability and preventing displacement of lower-income residents in revitalized TOD neighborhoods. New TODs – and sometimes even plans for new transit stops or lines – can spark rapid appreciation in the costs of land and

Equitable development is an approach to ensure that low-income residents and communities of color participate in and benefit from regional growth and development

housing in the community. Homes within a five- to ten-minute walk of a transit station typically sell for more than comparable properties further away. The Center for Transit Oriented Development (CTOD) recently reviewed the research on TOD impacts on property values and found that premiums for single-family homes near transit were 2 to 30 percent, and rents for apartments near transit were 1 to 45 percent higher.⁴ In some parts of the Bay Area, increased migration into existing transit-oriented neighborhoods (such as San Francisco’s Mission District and West Oakland) is associated with rent increases, evictions, loss of affordable housing units, and disrupted social networks.⁵ In these neighborhoods community organizations and activists have worked hard to prevent new developments that would further jeopardize their homes or jobs, and development has been extremely contentious.

The fear of displacement is potent for residents living in lower-income neighborhoods where TOD is planned—often the same communities that were the targets of Urban Renewal or other redevelopment projects that were not intended to bring benefits to current residents and led to their displacement. This can create tensions and mistrust between current residents, incoming residents and government agencies.

All signs suggest that the demand for TOD in the Bay Area will grow in the coming years. CTOD estimates that by 2030 the number of households seeking housing near transit will more than double (from 410,000 to 830,000).⁶ Household preferences for walkable neighborhoods and transit are coinciding with planning and policy prerogatives to encourage compact development and transit use in order to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming. In the past year, the California legislature passed two landmark bills to address climate change, one of which, Senate Bill 375, deals specifically with promoting climate-friendly regional development patterns.

To fully realize the benefits of TOD, it is essential that Bay Area communities take action to ensure that the opportunities created through TOD are available to all, including low-income residents who are most in need of the cost savings and potential health benefits of living near transit.⁷ Local planners, policymakers, and advocates all have enormous roles to play in moving forward equitable TOD.

There are already many examples of equitable TOD in the region. Several city planning and redevelopment departments, including those in areas with a history of urban renewal, have made marked efforts to build trust through inclusive planning processes. San Francisco, San Jose, Oakland, Berkeley, Marin, East Palo Alto, and Dublin all have excellent examples of equitable development, where development and redevelopment programs with extensive community involvement are investing substantial resources into improved amenities, transit services, and job opportunities for local residents. Local governments have responded to concerns about gentrification and displacement through land use policies and legislation.

As a public agency that guides regional growth and development, the Association of Bay Area Governments has sought to promote inclusive, equitable development that provides

a variety of housing choices for households at all income levels and the creation and maintenance of diverse neighborhoods. There are regional benefits to creating socially and economically diverse neighborhoods – for the economy and environment as well as for social equity. The lack of affordable housing near transit leads families to look for housing they can afford that is further away, or to trade their housing and transportation costs, contributing to sprawl and congestion.⁸ Bay Area households have both driven ‘til they qualified’ for lower-cost homes in the outer suburbs and moved out of the region in search of affordable housing.

The disconnection between housing, transit, and employment facilitates racial and economic segregation and sprawling, unsustainable regional development patterns. At the same time, a lack of development in other urban areas fosters blight, concentrated poverty, and unemployment. Inclusive, equitable development, including a variety of housing choices for workers at all income levels, is essential if the region is going to shift its land use patterns to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.⁹ There is evidence that regions that are more equitable perform better economically as well.¹⁰

This report looks beyond efforts to limit displacement to look at positive steps to build regional social equity, moving from development without displacement to development with diversity. This is to emphasize that livable neighborhoods are those that sustain their social, cultural, and racial/ethnic diversity—and do not lead to displacement as a byproduct of neighborhood improvement—and that this is a critical goal of regional planning. This goal will serve as an even more important guidepost as we seek to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through more compact development that clusters jobs, transit, and housing around existing infrastructure.

With the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, we are implementing FOCUS, a development and conservation strategy that promotes a more compact land use pattern for the Bay Area including transit-oriented development.¹¹ FOCUS encourages the development of complete, livable communities in areas served by transit by providing incentives for local governments who steer growth to designated “Priority Development Areas” (PDAs). Other regional efforts, such as MTC’s Station Area Planning and Transportation for Livable Communities grants, also provide funding for community engagement processes around TOD.

To better understand how to implement equitable TOD and prevent displacement, FOCUS applied for and received an Environmental Justice Grant from the California State Department of Transportation to conduct an 18-month *Development Without Displacement* program. Between Spring 2008 and Fall 2009, ABAG worked with the Center for Community Innovation at the University of California, Berkeley, PolicyLink, and three city-community partnerships to better understand the drivers of displacement in the region and develop local strategies to ensure equitable TOD. The program included three primary components:

1. Research to develop indicators of gentrification and displacement in Bay Area neighborhoods
2. Documentation of equitable TOD strategies and resources to provide to cities and community groups
3. Pilot anti-displacement projects in three Bay Area cities: Oakland, San Francisco, and Richmond

This report shares our findings from this project. It is intended to provide useful information for cities and community groups who want to implement equitable TOD and spark discussion and debate about how best to do that now and into the future. It is organized as follows:

- **Section II** describes development, gentrification, and displacement trends in the Bay Area, their relationship to transit and challenges to addressing displacement
- **Section III** presents strategies for ensuring equitable TOD, including community engagement, affordable housing development and preservation, land use (complete communities), and economic development.
- **Section IV** reports on the pilot projects in Oakland, Richmond, and San Francisco
- **Section V** examines regional TOD policies and their equity implications
- **Section VI** concludes with recommendations on how regional agencies can promote equitable transit oriented development

VI. Recommended Future Regional Actions

We are at a critical moment when it comes to planning for equitable development. Growing recognition about climate change – and the role of land use and transportation patterns in reducing greenhouse gas emissions – has refocused attention on the need for coordinated regional planning. SB 375 has the potential to dramatically redirect growth toward existing urban centers and transit lines, creating the opportunity to expand TOD throughout the region. At the federal level, there is renewed interest in coordinated housing, transportation, environmental, and economic development planning and policymaking through the recently-launched Sustainable Communities Initiative.

The Bay Area is full of innovative examples of equitable development, and should continue to develop new policy and programmatic efforts to build “communities of opportunity” throughout the region. Local leaders and the regional agencies should seek to exhibit and continue to build their leadership in these areas and position themselves for federal funding streams related to climate change emissions reductions (for example, EPA’s “Climate Showcase Communities” grants), green jobs development, and other national goals.

As a part of the *Development Without Displacement* project, PolicyLink developed the following recommendations regarding what regional agencies (particularly ABAG and MTC) can do over the next several years to prevent displacement and to build inclusive, transit-oriented neighborhoods in the Bay Area.

- 1) Develop an online *Equitable Development Indicators System* to track, monitor and evaluate equity outcomes in PDAs and other geographies in the region over time.
- 2) Establish *specific equity-focused performance measures for Priority Development Areas* and include these measures as criteria for the receipt of capital infrastructure investments and station area planning grants.
- 3) *Allocate more funding for station area planning and require strong community engagement* as a condition for receiving funds.
- 4) Create a *regional affordable housing strategy* that emphasizes the retention and expansion of affordable housing and the prevention of displacement near transit.
- 5) Include an *Equity Innovations Forum* where practitioners can exchange best practices and resources as a part of its new web platform.
- 6) Convene an *Equity Caucus* to engage elected officials representing the PDAs to discuss how to meet equitable development goals.

- 7) *Evaluate current regional investment policies and make recommendations* for how to ensure equitable development and prevent displacement.
- 8) *Modify parking policies and fee structures* to benefit existing communities.
- 9) *Incorporate displacement prevention* in regional sustainable communities planning.

Recommendation 1: Develop an online regional Equitable Development Indicators System to track, monitor and evaluate equity outcomes in PDAs and other geographies in the region over time.

ABAG could leverage its role as the regional Census Data Center and its research and data expertise to develop and maintain an Equitable Development Indicators System: a comprehensive, regionwide online GIS database. This database could both make available a wide array of data already collected and maintained by the agency and serve as a repository for data collected by local governments or community groups. The system could incorporate Web 2.0 functionalities to enable users to provide feedback, verify data and contribute their own data. It could be used for multiple purposes, including but not limited to:

- tracking and monitoring a set of equity indicators in PDAs and other geographies;
- measuring the agency’s own progress on equity performance goals;
- providing data to support local governments and advocacy groups in developing and implementing housing, TOD and other strategies; and
- fostering regional collaboration and data-sharing.

A longer-term goal should be to develop a parcel-level regional data system. Parcel-level indicators – land value, ownership, zoning, tax liens, vacancy status, etc. – are essential for understanding neighborhood change. Such a system could distribute agency data and gather an array of local datasets including property files generally maintained by local assessors and make this data available to the public, local governments and other regional agencies. Local governments are increasingly making their property data available online and several regional systems have been developed. Efficiency is a prime reason for developing larger-scale data systems. The city of Portland decided to develop an institution-wide GIS system (www.PortlandMaps.com) after a business analysis documented the inefficiencies of running multiple GIS systems. The city’s initial \$7 million investment now saves \$1 million per year. Several regions have already developed such systems and are using them to effectively guide their planning and community development efforts:

- In Minneapolis-St. Paul, the MetroGIS (www.metrogis.org/) regional data-sharing platform has served as a one-stop shop for information in the Twin Cities since 1995 and has supported a wide variety of community development efforts. MetroGIS secured data-sharing agreements with each of the region's seven counties to create a regional parcel layer with a set of common attributes.
- Chicago's regional planning agency (Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning) manages a regional parcel data system and engages communities in regional planning through its Full Circle Community Mapping Project. Full Circle provides wireless data capture devices to communities to undertake their own data collection and mapping. There have been dozens of application, but the system has been particularly useful for groups working to improve commercial corridors.¹²

One of the signature products and uses of the regional data system could be an Equitable Development Indicators project that would monitor equitable development goals in the PDAs and other geographies in the region. Community indicators are a widely used tool for tracking positive and negative community trends and assessing how well a place is doing. Successful indicators projects lead to community action, policy change and progress toward goals. Coalition for a Livable Future's *Regional Equity Atlas Project* (www.equityatlas.org/), for example, developed a set of equity indicators, shared them with community members and engaged them in the search for solutions, and developed an Equity Action Agenda. One of the actions to come out of the process was the development of the Affordable Housing NOW! Collaborative, which led a campaign that established a 30 % set aside for the development, preservation, and rehabilitation of affordable housing in the city's urban renewal zones – the equivalent of \$125.5 million over five years.

A regional Equitable Development Indicators project, undertaken by the regional agencies in collaboration with other stakeholders and residents, could provide an ongoing analysis of the state of the region and serve as a roadmap for directing energy and investments in a way that creates more equitable and sustainable communities. A set of equitable development indicators would need to be developed and vetted in partnership with communities and other regional advocacy groups. The equity indicators would cover critical areas such as affordable housing, transit service, public investment, access to jobs, gentrification/displacement, healthy communities measures (access to healthy food and safe streets), etc. Given the unique concerns and conditions across the PDAs, there might be PDA/community-specific indicators in addition to a common set of indicators. Indicators such as those developed by CCI could potentially be incorporated into this data system, providing users with easy access to the information and the ability to analyze



gentrification in relation to other data such as public investment. Adding public investments into the system (not only regional agency investments but federal, state and local investments as well) would allow communities to track their equity impacts.

To share the indicators with the public and support decision making and policy debate, regional agencies could regularly produce Scorecards or Progress Reports on the region as a whole, on particular PDAs, or on particular topics of relevance. The system could track development in air quality districts, for example, or evaluate the creation of quality jobs associated with development projects.

This system could be incorporated into the Sustainable Communities planning connected with SB 375 that the regional agencies will undertake over the next several years. A sustainability indicators system for the PDAs that prioritizes equity indicators could serve the same purposes as an equitable indicators system.

Community Indicators Project in Jacksonville, Florida

Since 1985, the *Jacksonville Community Council, Inc (JCCI)*, commonly described as a citizen think tank, has tracked quality of life indicators in the five-county Northeast Florida region. JCCI has been a pioneer in developing and using indicators to measure community progress and is recognized around the world for its work. A community progress report is produced annually with data and technical assistance from the region's MPO. The report includes over 100 indicators that reflect trends in nine areas: education; economy; environment; social wellbeing; arts, culture, and recreation; health; government; transportation; and safety. JCCI is widely recognized for moving the needle on key issues in the region including racial income disparities, pollution, and workforce training. Numerous public-private partnerships have developed out of its activities. Blueprint for Prosperity¹³, for example, was created after JCCI released its annual community progress report which described persistent racial income disparities in the region. The Chamber of Commerce, the local workforce agency, and the City of Jacksonville joined to advance a 15-year effort with the goal of increasing per capita income for all residents.

Recommendation 2: Establish specific social equity performance goals for Priority Development Areas and incorporate these goals into criteria for the receipt of capital infrastructure investments and station area planning grants.

In concert with the equity indicators project, ABAG and the other regional agencies (in collaboration with local agencies and organizations working within the PDAs) should define a set of social equity “performance goals” for the PDAs. The establishment of performance goals for the allocation of capital infrastructure funds is already being discussed by the agency, and the Sustainable Communities planning process will also require establishing emissions reductions and additional equity goals. Given the overlap

between PDAs and “communities of concern” identified by MTC (thresholds of more than 70 % non-white and at least 30% of households living below 200% of federal poverty level), it is critical that social equity considerations are not only included as performance measures but that these measures are prioritized as plans for infill development and investment move forward.

Equity goals would need to be determined through a community process but might include measures such as improvements in bus service, change in housing and transportation burden, affordable housing development and preservation targets, community engagement, anti-displacement strategies, and commercial revitalization or stabilization. ABAG’s existing knowledge of the PDA communities could be used to create an initial list of equity goals. Using measures of housing market demand, the displacement indicators and transportation/land use characteristics (e.g. the TOD place types in MTC’s station area planning manual) it might be possible to create a typology that divides the PDAs into 4-6 community types and indicates the equity issues they are likely to face. This would provide a useful tool for further discussions about equity indicators. A complementary tool would clearly highlight the policy mechanisms or strategies that enable progress on particular equity indicator. This information could be taken from the PolicyLink Equitable Development Toolkit, the Great Communities Collaborative TOD Toolkit, HousingPolicy.org and other existing resources.

Equity goals for PDAs should be developed as a part of the SCS process and should include, when possible, “climate equity” and “green jobs” measures in order to position localities and the agency for federal funding streams related to climate change emissions reductions (for example, EPA’s "Climate Showcase Communities" grants) and green jobs development.

Once these equity goals are established, ABAG and MTC would encourage innovative efforts to meet these equity goals through:

- Allocating planning funds, technical assistance and capital infrastructure funds based on the ability of a project or a community to make progress on these equity issues.
- Including these equity goals in its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
- Encouraging local governments to insert these goals in their general plans, zoning ordinances, and design guidelines, and to adopt, strengthen, or retain policies that promote these equity goals.

experience rising property values and influx of wealthier residents. This situation requires a strong regional strategy to promote affordable housing near transit.

This strategy should include not only affordable housing development targets, already established through RHNA, but also targets to preserve existing affordable units near transit. Research by Reconnecting American and the National Housing Trust shows there is a strong connection between the location of many subsidized and unsubsidized affordable units and the proximity to public transportation options. There is an urgent need to preserve existing affordability, as a majority of these units that have government contracts will be expiring over the next five years. In addition, it should seek to ensure permanent affordability through nonprofit rental housing and shared equity homeownership (deed restrictions, community land trusts, or limited equity housing cooperatives).

The strategy could include several components:

- Provide capital funds for transit infrastructure based on the construction or preservation of affordable housing near transit.
- Develop agency capacity (through partnerships with housing groups) to acquire and transfer land for the purposes of affordable housing development or to develop a regional community land trust.
- Provide localities with information and technical assistance about affordable housing and anti-displacement strategies (including sharing the lessons learned from the Development Without Displacement partnerships)

TOD “Value Capture” in Hot Markets

TOD adds value to a place by increasing the value of nearby land and properties, generating additional tax revenues. Localities can implement strategies such as tax-increment financing (TIF), business improvement districts and developer agreements to capture this value and use it to finance additional features that make TOD projects successful, such as streetscape improvements, parks, and historic preservation. In hot housing markets like the Bay Area, the higher home values spurred by TOD can counter community goals for housing affordability and lead to gentrification and displacement. In such markets, TOD value capture strategies can fund efforts to preserve housing affordability or build new permanently affordable housing. Maine, Massachusetts, Portland and San Antonio use TIF to support affordable housing.

Austin, Texas, for example, passed legislation in 2007 to enable the creation of Homestead Preservation Districts in TODs that use tax increment financing, land trusts, and land banks to provide affordable housing opportunities to residents. The first tax increment district was approved by the city council in December 2008 and is currently being debated by the county, which is required as an equal funding partner.

- Encourage and reward localities for adopting measures to increase affordable housing near transit and prevent displacement such as adopting “no net loss” policies, inclusionary requirements, and putting in place value capture mechanisms to link TOD value increases with permanent affordability strategies such as Austin’s Homestead Preservation District (see text box, right)
- Develop a housing preservation inventory to guide and track preservation efforts as a part of the Equity Indicators Project described above
- Promote regional employer engagement in workforce housing strategies

Preservation Inventories

Databases that include characteristics about an areas housing stock, including subsidized and unsubsidized units allow communities to take stock of their preservation challenges and prioritize where action is needed, both at the project level —“What properties need to be contacted and offered incentives to remain affordable?” — and at the community level — “In what neighborhoods do we need to target efforts to preserve affordable rental housing?” Once information has been collected and assembled, agencies can choose to focus attention on a subset of properties that appear to be at elevated risk of loss from the affordable housing stock. A nonprofit organization, the California Housing Partnership Corporation, already maintains a database of at-risk affordable properties using HUD data, and is a likely partner on preservation issues.

The early identification of at risk communities can help prevent the loss of subsidized and unsubsidized affordable rental housing unit by giving city officials, nonprofits, and others the opportunity to act quickly and offer incentives to private owners who agree to maintain the building habitable and keep all or a portion of units affordable to low- and moderate-income households. Data on high-risk properties can be linked to mapping technology, allowing identification of areas where the risk of loss is the greatest. Preservation Inventories can be utilized in the selection process and in the financial backing and incentives given to PDAs.

- In Washington DC, local agencies, nonprofit housing groups, and community developers partnered to track expiring Section 8 units and develop targeted preservation strategies. Regional agencies could develop similar working relationships with local groups and agencies.
- In Florida, administrators of the Florida Housing Data Clearinghouse regularly prepare reports on the characteristics of the state’s assisted rental stock and households in need of affordable housing for the Florida Housing Finance Corporation. The 2007 report included for the first time a risk assessment based on data from the preservation inventory.
- Both Mayor Bloomberg in New York City and Governor Corzine in New Jersey have implemented broad affordable housing plans that include goals related to housing preservation. Preservation inventories provided data explaining why rental housing preservation may be needed to achieve city- and state-wide housing goals.

Recommendation 5: Include an Equity Innovations Forum where practitioners can exchange best practices and resources as a part of its new web platform.

The Bay Area includes some of the highest-capacity equity advocates in the country who have decades of experience working to implement equitable development strategies. At the same time, there are other jurisdictions that have few organizations and little capacity. A web-based platform for sharing best practices, resources and other information would enable them to exchange information with each other and would also provide ABAG and other regional agencies with a space for gathering feedback and ideas from the field. This forum should have a user-friendly design and sort conversations by equitable development strategy areas (e.g. protecting renters, inclusionary zoning, equitable infrastructure investment, etc.).

Recommendation 6: Convene an Equity Caucus to engage elected officials representing PDAs to discuss how to meet equitable development goals.

Regional agencies could improve relationships with local elected officials and discuss equitable development strategies and challenges to their implementation by regularly convening an Equity Caucus with these officials. The Equity Caucus could serve to inform the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy with social as well as environmental goals.

Recommendation 7: Evaluate current regional investment policies and make recommendations for how to ensure equitable development and prevent displacement.

Regional agencies should examine existing investment programs to see how they can explicitly incorporate goals or protections related to the displacement of residents. For example, Resolution No. 3434 (described above) showcases MTCs commitment to a regional vision for an expanded transit network as well as the goal of developing affordable housing near transit. This policy should be evaluated for its contributions to equitable TOD and modifications that could increase affordability and prevent displacement. Potential relevant policies include: using the PDA equity performance standards as suggested above; providing incentives for cities modifying existing land use zoning to zone for housing; setting minimum housing requirements for receipt of funds; and requiring an explanation displacement issues and how they will be addressed in funding proposals. In addition to conducting this self-assessment, regional agencies can help standardize local actions to stabilize businesses and address displacement.

Recommendation 8: Modify parking policies and fee structures to benefit existing communities.

As part of its Transportation for Livable Communities initiative, MTC published a *Parking Policies to Support Smart Growth Toolbox/Handbook* for local jurisdictions in 2007. The FOCUS program provides technical assistance to cities to help them get parking policies right. Through this program, MTC and ABAG can play a critical role in helping cities shape parking policies and fees, where appropriate, to benefit existing residents and merchants. Much like a linkage fee fund, parking fees can recirculate in the neighborhood to improve existing businesses or maintain and increase the affordable housing stock. In exchange for technical assistance, regional agencies could require cities to abide by the priority to have a portion of parking fees be invested in the surrounding area.

Recommendation 9: Incorporate displacement prevention in regional sustainable communities planning.

Sustainability too often gets narrowly defined as an environmental goal rather than a comprehensive goal that emphasizes equity, economics, and the environment (the “three E’s.” As planning for SB 375 gets underway, regional agencies should take explicit steps to address displacement prevention while planning for more compact development. The lessons learned from the Development Without Displacement Program, the local policies presented in this report, and the strategies employed by the community partnerships, provide a starting point for discussions about which strategies will be effective in which community. Because communities care about this issue, broad and meaningful community participation in developing sustainable communities plans is one mechanism to ensure it is addressed.

¹ Chapple, Karen, et al. Transit-Oriented for All: The Case for Mixed Income Transit-Oriented Communities in the Bay Area, http://communityinnovation.berkeley.edu/publications/GCC_ExecSummary.pdf.

² The Center for Transit Oriented Development, Fostering Equitable and Sustainable Transit-Oriented Development: Briefing Papers for a Convening on Transit-Oriented Development, available at http://reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ra_ford_brief_final

³ The higher costs for TOD result from a confluence of factors:

- Expenses associated with changing zoning and building codes to allow higher density, mixed-use buildings.
- Insufficient funds for community engagement, particularly in regions where moderate and high density product did not exist prior to the proposed TOD.
- Increased land price expectations by property owners who see long-term value of TOD.
- Brownfield remediation expenses.
- Coordination with the transit agency to site and construct transit facilities, such as stations, parking or bus transfers.
- Provision of new streets, parks and other place-making amenities that create identity.
- Higher construction costs for dense building types.
- Provision of excess parking spaces in high cost structures in areas where households may not need more than one car.
- Local requirements for community benefits with limited cost offsets for developers.
- General imbalance between the supply of and demand for attractive, walkable neighborhoods.

⁴ The Center for Transit Oriented Development, *Capturing the Value of Transit*, November 2008. Available at http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/ctodvalcapture110508v2. The authors note that one study of light rail stations in Santa Clara County in 1995 found that values for adjacent single family homes actually decreased 11 percent, but this was not the norm and might be explained by the economic recession.

⁵ Chapple, Karen, et al. *Mapping Susceptibility to Gentrification*. Center for Community Innovation, UC-Berkeley. 2009.

⁶ Center for Transit Oriented Development, “2007 Demand Estimate,” http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/display_asset/demestctod.

⁷ San Mateo County Public Health Department, “Health Benefits of TOD,” available at:

http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/vgn/images/portal/cit_609/30/18/1250073112tod_and_health.pdf.

⁸ J. Andrew Hoerner and Nia Robinson. 2008. “A Climate of Change African Americans, Global Warming, and a Just Climate Policy in the U.S.” Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative and Redefining Progress. (www.ejcc.org)

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Manuel Pastor, Jr. et al., *Regions that Work: How Cities and Suburbs Can Grow Together* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2000).

¹¹ For more details on the FOCUS program, visit www.bayareaivision.org

¹² See case studies of Chicago and the Twin Cities in *Transforming Community Development with Land Information Systems*, available at http://www.policylink.org/atf/cf/%7B97c6d565-bb43-406d-a6d5-eca3bbf35af0%7D/TRANSFORMINGCOMMDEVELOPMENT_FINAL.PDF

¹³ <http://www.coj.net/Mayor/Blueprint+for+Prosperity/default.htm>

DATE: September 30, 2009

TO: Regional Planning Committee

FROM: Jeanne Perkins, Earthquake Hazards Program Consultant
Danielle Hutchings, Earthquake and Hazards Specialist

SUBJECT: Status Report – Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP)

Recommended Action

Following a staff presentation and questions, ABAG staff request feedback on the following specific items:

- (1) Ideas for gaining participation from additional jurisdictions not covered by other plans
- (2) Ideas for getting increased publicity for this process

Background

ABAG is continuing with the process of updating the 2005 multi-jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area. This MJ-LHMP is related to, but not the same as, the regional disaster recovery planning initiative of ABAG. Approval of a MJ-LHMP by FEMA makes jurisdictions eligible for various mitigation grants through FEMA and results in the waiver of a 6.25% local match for Public Assistance dollars.

As discussed at the August 2009 RPC meeting, for the update, the list of mitigation strategies has been increased to 361 to specifically deal with climate change and recovery planning issues as they relate to mitigation. In addition, the update includes regional priorities for mitigation which were developed by consensus at a series of sub-regional workshops attended by staff from cities, counties and special districts. All of the strategies and plan documents can be found online at <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation>.

The final list of 361 mitigation strategies has been endorsed by ABAG's Executive Board. .

Multi-Jurisdictional LHMP Summary

GOAL: To maintain and enhance a disaster-resistant region by reducing the potential loss of life, property damage, and environmental degradation from natural disasters, while accelerating economic recovery from those disasters.

COMMITMENTS: *Together, the cities, counties and special districts of the San Francisco Bay Area are committed to increasing the disaster resistance of the infrastructure, health, housing, economy, government services, education, environment, and land use systems in the Bay Area.*

- 1. Infrastructure:** Bay Area transportation and utility facilities and networks are vital lifelines during and following disasters, as well as in the functioning of our region and its economy.
- 2. Health:** Bay Area facilities, networks, and systems providing care of sick and those with special needs need to be resilient after disasters for these systems will need to care for additional injured at the same time as those currently cared for are stressed.
- 3. Housing:** Bay Area residents need to have safe and disaster-resistant housing that is architecturally diverse and serves a variety of household sizes and incomes.
- 4. Economy:** Safe, disaster-resilient, and architecturally diverse downtown commercial areas, business and industrial complexes, and office buildings are essential to the overall economy of the Bay Area.
- 5. Government Services:** Bay Area city and county governments, as well as community services agencies, provide essential services during and immediately following disasters, as well as critical functions during recovery, that need to be resistant to disasters.
- 6. Education:** Safe and disaster-resistant school, education, and childcare-related facilities are critical to the safety of our children, as well as to the quality of life of Bay Area families.
- 7. Environment:** Disaster resistance needs to further environmental sustainability, reduce pollution, strengthen agriculture resiliency, and avoid hazardous material releases in the Bay Area.
- 8. Land Use:** Land use change needs to be accompanied by a respect for hazardous areas and facilities, as well as recognize the interconnected nature of the Bay Area.

This document, the multi-jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJ-LHMP) for the San Francisco Bay Area, should serve as a catalyst for a dialog on public policies needed to mitigate the natural hazards that affect the San Francisco Bay Area.

This multi-jurisdictional effort should not only maintain and enhance the disaster resistance of our region, but also fulfill the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 for all local governments to develop and adopt this type of plan.

For purposes of this plan, local governments include not only the cities and counties of our region, but also special districts and other government agencies.

The chapters which follow describe the mitigation actions that can be taken to mitigate hazards and ensure these eight commitments, together with the regional priorities on taking those actions agreed upon by those local governments.

For additional information used to develop this MJ-LHMP by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), including interactive hazard mapping and risk assessment, see quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation.

Actively Participating Jurisdictions

The following is a list of jurisdictions that have participated in the development of this plan and have submitted a letter of commitment indicating that they are full participants in the plan. Each jurisdiction's involvement is being documented.

LEAD AGENCY

Association of Bay Area Governments

ALAMEDA COUNTY

Alameda County	Fremont	Piedmont
Alameda	Hayward	Pleasanton
Albany	Newark	San Leandro
Dublin	Oakland	Union City

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Brentwood	Hercules	Moraga
Clayton	Lafayette	Orinda
Concord	Martinez	San Pablo

MARIN COUNTY

Belvedere	Fairfax	Tiburon
Corte Madera	San Anselmo	

SAN MATEO COUNTY

San Mateo County	Daly City	San Bruno
Atherton	Foster City	San Carlos
Belmont	Hillsborough	San Mateo
Brisbane	Millbrae	South San Francisco
Burlingame	Pacifica	Woodside
Colma	Portola Valley	

SANTA CLARA COUNTY

Santa Clara County	Los Gatos	Palo Alto
Campbell	Monte Sereno	San Jose
Cupertino	Morgan Hill	Santa Clara
Gilroy	Mountain View	Saratoga
Los Altos		

SOLANO COUNTY

Solano County	Dixon	Rio Vista
Benicia	Fairfield	Vacaville

SONOMA COUNTY

Cloverdale	Petaluma	Sebastopol
Cotati	Rohnert Park	Sonoma
Healdsburg	Santa Rosa	Windsor

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Chabot-Las Positas Community College District	Jefferson Unified School District	Ross School District
---	-----------------------------------	----------------------

TRANSIT AGENCIES

AC Transit	Golden Gate Bridge HTD	samTrans
BART	LAVTA (Wheels)	Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority
Central Contra Costa TA	MTC	Vallejo Transportation
TriDelta (ECCTA)	SF MTA (MUNI)	Water Emergency TA

WATER/SEWER DISTRICTS

Alameda County Water District	Montara Water and Sanitary District	Solano County Water Agency
Contra Costa Water District	Purissima Hills Water District	Solano Irrigation District
EBMUD	Santa Clara Valley Water District	Vallejo Sanitation and Flood Control
Mid-Peninsula Water District	Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside	Zone 7 Water Agency

OTHER SPECIAL DISTRICTS

Bethyl Island MID	East Bay Regional Parks District	Silver Creek Valley Country Club
Dublin-San Ramon Services District	San Francisquito Creek JPA	

Partnering Jurisdictions

The following is a list of jurisdictions that have participated in the development of this plan, but have not submitted letters of commitment. Documentation of how each jurisdiction was involved can be found in Appendix H.

CITIES AND COUNTIES

Berkeley	Marin County (including using ABAG strategies)	San Francisco
El Cerrito	Milpitas	San Ramon
Livermore	Napa (city)	

FIRE DISTRICTS

Belmont-San Carlos Fire Department	Cordelia Fire Protection District	North County Fire Authority
Central County Fire	Livermore-Pleasanton Fire Dept.	Santa Clara County Department

WATER/SEWER DISTRICTS

Bolinas Community PUD	North Coast County Water District	San Francisco PUC
Marin Municipal Water District		

ADDITIONAL AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND COMPANIES

Bay Area Planning Directors Association	California Teachers Association	Silicon Valley Leadership Group
BARC-First	Earthquake Engineering Research Institute	SPUR
Bay Area CMA	Hills Emergency Forum	Structural Engineers Association of Northern California
Bay Area Council	Homebuilders Association of Northern California	Urban Habitat Program
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission	League of Women Voters Bay Area	Urban Land Institute
Cal Water	PG&E	US Coast Guard
California Geologic Survey	San Jose State University	US Geological Survey
California Preservation Foundation	San Jose Water Company	
California Seismic Safety Commission	Sierra Club	

CITIES NOT COVERED BY ANY LHMP

Emeryville	Ross	Los Altos Hills
Oakley	San Rafael	Sunnyvale
Pittsburg	Sausalito	Milpitas
Larkspur	East Palo Alto	Suisun City
Livermore	Half Moon Bay	Vallejo
Mill Valley	Menlo Park	
Novato	Redwood City	

ABAG LHMP Highlights (for the agency – not the region)

Hazard and Risk Assessment

The hazards and risks associated with the service area of ABAG (as a regional agency covering the entire 9-county Bay Area) are the same as those for the region as a whole. ABAG is a minority owner of the MetroCenter regional center. It owns no other facilities. Hazards at the MetroCenter facility are:

Earthquake: The MetroCenter is located 5 miles from the Hayward fault and 15 miles from the San Andreas fault. It is in the next to highest category on the ground shaking potential map and outside the zone of earthquake-induced landslides on flat ground. While the MetroCenter is not in the CGS Liquefaction Zone, it is shown as subject to liquefaction to the USGS Liquefaction Susceptibility Map. As of September 2009, the map of the tsunami inundation areas within San Francisco Bay had not been released. However, it is *not* anticipated that this facility is at risk.

Flooding: The MetroCenter is outside the 100-year and 500-year flood zones.

Landsliding: The MetroCenter is located on ground that is designated as flat land.

Wildfire: The wildland fire threat is moderate but the MetroCenter is located within the Wildland Urban Interface WUI-Threatened area.

Dam Inundation: The MetroCenter is not subject to dam-failure inundation.

Drought: The operations of the MetroCenter are not significantly impacted by drought conditions.

Hazards Conclusion: The most significant hazard to the MetroCenter is earthquake shaking.

Risk Assessment: The MetroCenter building, when evaluated in 2004, was determined to be a partial collapse hazard building. (GOVT-a-1)

Existing Mitigation Activities

MetroCenter Facility: MTC applied for, and received, approximately \$3 million dollars in the form of a PDM grant from FEMA for a seismic upgrade to the MetroCenter facility. The entire project cost approximately \$5 million and was completed in 2008. (GOVT a-2; INFR a-4)

Lead Agency – Local Hazard Mitigation Plan: ABAG has taken the lead the lead in developing both the 2005 multi-jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, as well as the comprehensive update of that Plan in 2009-2010. As part of that effort, ABAG continues to look for opportunities to improve the risk assessment effort, particularly related to housing, infrastructure, and the Delta.

Disaster Recovery Planning Initiative: During the past two years, ABAG has been working with its Regional Planning Committee and others to assess the needs related to a regional long-term disaster recovery plan.

Public Information Activities: ABAG provides materials to the public related to family and business disaster preparedness and mitigation planning, largely through its website at <http://quake.abag.ca.gov>.

Most recently, ABAG has worked with the water and wastewater agencies (through its Sewer Smart Program) to develop a program related to toilet disruption.

Efforts Related to Climate Change: Approximately half of the greenhouse gas emissions in the Bay Area are related to transportation. Thus, the largest impact that ABAG can have on weather-related hazards, such as wildfire and flooding, is indirectly through reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Smart Growth Preamble and Policies adopted by ABAG, MTC, BAAQMD and BCDC call for retrofit of infrastructure that serves urban areas over constructing new infrastructure to serve outlying areas in an effort to reduce those emissions. (LAND f-1) ABAG is also working to encourage compact urban areas which are served by transit to reduce dependence on the automobile. Finally, ABAG is the lead agency in promoting the development of the Bay Trail, a commute and recreational trail that will loop the Bay.

Priorities for Future Mitigation

MetroCenter Facility: RAFC is contracting with URS Engineers to prepare a Building Occupancy Recovery Program (BORP) plan for MetroCenter facility. BORP permits owners of buildings to hire qualified structural engineers to create facility-specific post-disaster inspection plans and allows these engineers to become automatically deputized as City/County inspectors for these buildings in the event of an earthquake or other disaster. This program allows rapid reoccupancy of critical infrastructure buildings. (INFR f-1)

ABAG is working on completing a comprehensive program to identify and mitigate problems with facility contents, architectural components, and equipment that would prevent its offices from being functional after major natural disasters (GOVT a-4).

Recovery Planning: While ABAG has established a framework and process for pre-event planning for post-event recovery that specifies roles, priorities, and responsibilities of various departments within its OWN organization, that process needs more work. ABAG is working to develop a more robust

continuity of operations plan that outlines the major issues and tasks that are likely to be the key elements of recovery, particularly related to computer operations (GOVT b-2, b-3, b-4, and b-5).

ABAG is also pushing for a more comprehensive long-term recovery plan for the entire region, encompassing both local governments, businesses, and the non-profit sectors.

Climate Change Mitigation: ABAG is working with MTC, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through developing land use policies that reduce dependence on cars for transportation.

Housing: ABAG is the principal local government agency focusing on studying disaster impacts on housing. During the last five years, ABAG has helped to coordinate efforts related to encouraging cripple-wall retrofits of single family homes, as well as the mitigation of soft-story multifamily residential buildings. More funding for this effort is urgently needed.

Infrastructure: ABAG is in a unique position to examine the interrelationships among water, wastewater, and transportation systems related to hazards and risks. While some progress has been made on this issue during the past five years, a better understanding of this issue is critical for disaster mitigation and recovery.

Water Resources: ABAG, as funding allows, is working on creating more consistent and useful watershed management analysis tools (INFR d-2). In addition, ABAG, as funding allows, is working on better understanding of Delta risks and opportunities (INFR a-22).

Next Steps

Staff will continue with this MJ-LHMP planning process. The MJ-LHMP must be submitted to FEMA this fall (probably October 22, 2009) in order to receive FEMA approval no later than April 22, 2010 when the 2005 plan expires.

This summer, local jurisdictions are focusing on determining their local mitigation priorities and holding public meetings to solicit comment relative to proposed local priorities. In addition, each participating jurisdiction will write an annex to the main plan which documents the process that they went through in the update and highlights specific mitigation actions that were taken since the adoption of the 2005 plan.

Staff will revise the ABAG existing 2005 annex that encompasses the actions and priorities within the plan for ABAG. Staff will be preparing the written text of the master plan and updating the list of critical facilities in the region exposed to hazards including facilities owned by cities, counties and special districts, as well as critical health care facilities, bridge and road structures and school campuses.

Upon FEMA approval of the entire MJ-LHMP, each jurisdiction will need to adopt the plan by council or board approval within 12 months. In addition, staff will bring the final plan to ABAG Executive Board for adoption.

As a next step in the Disaster Recovery Planning Initiative, ABAG is planning on holding a workshop-forum on **Land Use Change in the Recovery Process** at the December 2009 meeting.

MEMO

**Submitted by: Jeanne Perkins, Consultant to ABAG Earthquake and Hazards Program
Danielle Hutchings, ABAG Earthquake and Hazards Specialist**

Subject: Status Report - Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area

Date: September 30, 2009

Executive Summary

RPC will receive a status report on this planning process, including participating jurisdictions, key issues related to disaster mitigation, priorities for ABAG as an agency, and next steps. Committee members will be asked for feedback to ensuring that the plan is comprehensive, state-of-the-art, and a key component of the region's mitigation and recovery planning.

ABAG is taking the lead in updating the 2005 multi-jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJ-LHMP) for the San Francisco Bay Area, as required by FEMA, along with approximately 100 cities, counties, and special districts. *The goal of the MJ-LHMP is to maintain and enhance a disaster-resistant region by reducing the potential loss of life, property damage, and environmental degradation from natural disasters, while accelerating economic recovery from those disasters.*

ABAG has also designated its own priorities for this plan. All of the plan documents can be found online at <http://quake.abag.ca.gov/mitigation>

Recommended Action

ABAG staff is providing this information to RPC for review and comment. No formal actions are needed.

Next Steps

Staff will continue with this MJ-LHMP planning process. The MJ-LHMP must be submitted to FEMA this fall (probably by October 22, 2009) in order to allow adequate time for FEMA approval no later than April 22, 2010 when the 2005 plan expires. Staff will bring the final plan to ABAG Executive Board for adoption.

Upon FEMA approval of the entire MJ-LHMP, each participating jurisdiction will need to adopt the plan by council or board approval within 12 months.

As a next step in the Disaster Recovery Planning Initiative, ABAG is planning on holding a workshop-forum on **Land Use Change in the Recovery Process** at the December 2009 meeting.

Attachments:

Memo - Status Report - Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area with Table of Participating and Partnering Local Governments and Highlights of ABAG Mitigation Activities