ADDENDUM:

ITEM 6: PLAN BAY AREA 2040 DRAFT SCENARIO CONCEPTS WORKSHOP NOTES FROM SMALL GROUP SESSIONS ON WEDNESDAY OCTOBER 7, 2015

Question 1: What do you want your community to look like in 2040? What characteristics will make it a great place to live for all – including children, older adults, low-income residents and others?

Great parks, schools, lots of services.

A range of housing. Range of cost, size, affordability.

How does our plan change (ideally improve) public health. How will Plan Bay Area address public health problems like food deserts, air quality, etc. Our land use plan should directly take into account public health – no more "death by zip codes."

Better bike and pedestrian network > big improvements to these systems.

Need to tame the noise and congestion on freeways. Electrical vehicles will do a lot to reduce noise issue. Congestion is a difficult challenge to address – transit is one of the solutions.

I'd like multi-modal networks that link housing and jobs. On that note I'd like to see a closer proximity between housing and jobs. It'd be great to have opportunity for people to work and live in the same community, where they can stop in the office in between seeing kids and eating lunch at home.

We should be thinking about how employers can leverage telecommuting and build that technology into our land use planning decisions.

I'd like a region with full employment.

Conflict between what "my" community looks like vs. what the region should look like

Uniqueness to different parts of the Bay Area – maintain the unique character – both macro (region) /micro (communities)

Development in unincorporated areas, youth programs engage youth with community (vs. the "streets")

Walkability, bike-ability

Major cities to be bike/transit accessible, convenient, less driving.

Concentrated growth in big cities

Homelessness issue – would like to see 4-5% vacancy rates (vs. less), living wages, light industry, but need to support ag and urban growth boundaries

Improve on in-commuting in Sonoma County – keep or improve, need affordable housing. (but don't want to be feeder or bedroom communities)

Need access to open space, a lot of more housing, mass transit, balanced mix of housing, walkability, choice where to live- how to live, affordable housing, urban parks, less congestion.

Small town suburban feel, people can gravitate to where they want to live amidst variety of choices.

Infill development before going to outside limits, incorporate UBER, LYFT, Bike trails, In Solano County in particular, access to food stores- alleviate these issues.

Build on what we have (existing Plan Bay Area), sustain what we have for everybody.

Decentralize healthcare, food, schools.

Change focus from automobile to transit.

A region where we can accommodate the growth; where the private sector is capable of accommodating growth, public side needs to be able to keep up with permitting process in order to accommodate the growth that needs to take place

Need to be able to accommodate economic growth while protecting open space and quality of life. This can be accomplished by improving interconnectivity.

Key infrastructure investments in order to reduce congestion and commute times; locating housing near jobs, those go together, we cannot leave one behind

Housing production needs to increase to meet population growth, this will allow us to house all income levels

We need to be a world class region; the Bay Area should be the best place in the world that other places look to as a leader; look at international examples, Copenhagen, Amsterdam. Silicon Valley could be the bike capital of the world; Bike/ped infrastructure is cheaper than auto infrastructure; Why can't we do this in the Bay Area; we need the political institutions to accommodate this type of world-class region

Jobs-housing balance

Pretty much the same, not much growth in our community, preserved wetland, diverse communities, and community separators, such as green spaces that separate different communities.

More trees.

Safe streets, mix income communities, places that are well connected, walkable places, full of life, welcoming workforce, trails that connected to open spaces.

More people live close to where they work, a big middle class

Recreational areas

Job options, and living options for all population

Clean water, cheap power, 3D conference call

Responsible education system, public and private, integrated health care

Scenario #1:

We think our plans will become what we plan, but we live in a free market world with private property owners. We need to be pragmatic in our scenarios recognizing this.

There has been a significant disinvestment in North Bay infrastructure. We need to add capacity to limit congestion (which is a constraint on the north bay economy) and change the function of the highways to not be fast highways but instead slower local roads that incorporate

bike and ped infrastructure…it should be a hybrid investment in increase traffic flow, but allow for complete streets.

Agree be pragmatic – find ways to encourage the policies we want like zero net energy. If private property owners are going to build in a greenfield then have strategies to be sure it is done in a reasonable way, with stringent water and energy conservation requirements.

I'd like to see an investment in public squares of the smaller cities in order to bring in more amenities that make cities more internally livable. Sacramento and Davis are some good examples of this, especially with their implementation of bike and ped improvements.

Need economic investment distributed just as housing is done. Dublin has housing, but needs more job choices so people have commute alternatives that are nearer housing. Also need to consider the folks who commute from San Joaquin valley.

There are many cities that could become a "hub" like Santa Rosa…would like to see more jobs in "hubs" that act as a sub-regional location for employment and increase the number of amenities throughout the region (shopping, health care, etc.). This can be done while maintaining community character, can integrate bike and ped infrastructure. I'd like to see complete communities – made complete in large part by the addition of jobs.

Technology is making distributed employment easier – jobs will have less reliance on the physical geography and resource geography.

Foreshadowing to the other scenarios, I don't want to see investment in only a few places and let other communities wither.

Conflict between what "my" community looks like vs. what the region should look like

Uniqueness to different parts of the Bay Area – maintain the unique character – both macro (region) /micro (communities)

Development in unincorporated areas, youth programs engage youth with community (vs. the "streets")

Walkability, bike-ability

Major cities to be bike/transit accessible, convenient, less driving.

Concentrated growth in big cities

Homelessness issue – would like to see 4-5% vacancy rates (vs. less), living wages, light industry, but need to support ag and urban growth boundaries

Improve on in-commuting in Sonoma County – keep or improve, need affordable housing. (but don't want to be feeder or bedroom communities)

In Danville we can use a carrot/stick method. Need policies that can result in more housing near downtown.

Infill, walkable, bikeable will be important.

Concentrations will be different. A concern that it is an auto-oriented scenario, is counter to the SCS goal. Scenario should be modified, distributed for growth but less auto oriented.

Green emissions need to be zero, not VMT. We can have zero emission vehicles etc. It is good we are studying this alternative.

Don’t think we have the capacity to support an auto oriented scenario. Good to test this earlier and throw it out.

It’s usually a hard time to get people out of their car.

Just being auto oriented limits choices besides issues of capacity and greenhouse gases. Also there are natural resources/agriculture implications.

We are actually displacing sprawl to the Central Valley if we don’t go with Scenario #1.

It is business as usual. We need to look at that, many want to live in city, while others in suburbs. This addresses that. We do have to work at the last mile mode.

There’s very minimal planners can do to affect the outcome, how growth happens will be driven by market forces; if this scenario is chosen then you need to put teeth in RHNA, put carrots and sticks, make RHNA meaningful

No one should be off the hook for helping solve challenges; make sure you got a supply of land available, specifically where you want to see the housing happen

More affluent communities may opt-out if we allow each locality to decide

Focus on express corridors, where people can move quickly from one place to the next; need to force the growth where it needs to be; focus on express corridors

Make sure the transit options are viable, well maintained transit is necessary to make this scenario work, if you want to incentivize less auto use then transit needs to work; needs to connect; transit needs to be prepared to handle this type of growth

Not inspired by this scenario; this is more of the status quo; fix RHNA

Allow different housing types in all localities; this will increase densities but make housing affordable

How do you get the jobs where they need to be?

What is the most logical place to put jobs and each land use? We need to remove the local boundaries and look regionally and identify the places that can accommodate each type of land use regionally, i.e. light, industrial, housing, etc.

This scenario describes the pattern that lots of places growth a little bit, larger places growth less than what plan bay area 2013 allocated

It depends on a lot technology innovation

Is there a number that is associated with the scenarios?

How much of the growth can small town areas handle with all the general plans that have been approved?

Policies may be changed, such as revising the urban growth boundary

It doesn’t give the community the choice in this dispersed scenario, jobs and housing numbers will go to all the cities, however if the city that cannot handle that allocated growth

The policies could be in conflict with the general plan in the local communities

The biggest problem in this scenario is that it creates longer commute as people are living in outer area of the region

In scenario one, development may be distributed to a lot more places, but the development in a specific place can still be dense.

The plan does not talk about economic vitality, jobs created there and population living there may not match exactly.

Our demographics are saying we want more urban settings.

By expanding express lanes, we are compromising our natural land.

The PDA assessment that we could not accommodate that level of growth in outer areas

Even if you have incentives for PDAs in outer areas, that still doesn't solve the transportation problem. It is only a partial mitigation (to reduce GHGs).

How do get companies to come out to the outer parts of the region?

More concentrated employment instead the offices along the highway.

More continued infrastructure pressure

This requires expand the roadways system, which would reduce funding for transit development

Scenario #2:

This is my favorite scenario. It feels like a hybrid of scenarios 1 and 3 which are status quo and extreme respectively.

If this was adopted ABAG would need to alter its projections for housing and population to reflect the plan.

This scenario feels like it fits best. There are lots of communities that could benefit along corridors. My unincorporated community between San Leandro and Hayward has huge potential. It has a PDA, below median hard working residents, and a willingness to attract business and density – it just needs the investment. We need to invest resources along corridors like ours that are underserved.

Want to be sure there is a culture change toward biking integrated into all plans for the future. Millennials want cycling – cities need to change their culture to meet this desire. These changes improve community health, and increase the number of eyes on the street.

How do we create better connection to communities outside the corridors (in region, and out of region). It doesn't have to be BART extensions, but there has to be reliable transit (24/7 shuttles) solutions that are equitable.

BART trains are already packed. That won't change in 25 years. Transit won't build way out of congestion – there isn't enough capacity. Need to have people closer to jobs and housing.

It takes infrastructure to connect jobs and housing.

If you increase housing and jobs densities, land values increase, limiting some job sectors and housing types. Need policy to create diversity of jobs and diversity/affordability of housing.

Please add SMART train into the scenario 2 description alongside BART and Caltrain

Cannot go against current general plans

Needs more transit capacity — transit and freeway

Needs to emphasize connectivity – reduce jobs/housing imbalance, but still need to connect – first/last mile and overall trip needs (not just work)

Shared rides may need to be emphasized, and TDM

TDM required for employers – for employees in same communities

Commuter benefit ordinance — working to meet our needs – good policy

Emery-go-round is a good model, free for everyone – TMA

Work at home – technology – hoteling, shared office space

Walk and roll to school week – education to youth – walk/bike is important – instill this in youth

Need region to have transit accessibility – if more people, more likely to take transit – but this may not be the case in less-dense areas – urban and suburban may be different

Still need a car in the suburbs to do other-than work trips (weekends/after work)

Can create downtown in suburbs, but you have malls

More bike routes, trails

More equity in scenario #1 and #2 (vs. in #3)

Doesn't work for Santa Rosa. We don't have access to BART, SMART not functional.

Value in working where you live

Jobs have been decentralizing for the last 30 years.

Small businesses will work for this scenario

Jobs housing fit will be desirable

Transit oriented jobs need to be emphasized and more incentives need to be developed.

Addresses jobs side of it.

We plan for people who are not there not for people who are there.

More jobs centered scenario will facilitate that. Also creating the built environment will facilitate that.

To reduce capacity on existing highway we must develop a "regional bus network" where we delegate highway lanes just for buses.

In terms of inclusionary housing, we need to create housing opportunities that are paid by everyone and not just developers.

Regional bonds, Regional Housing Trust Funds.

We cannot do it locally.

All scenarios have displacement issues.

This is Scenario #1 with an emphasis on PDAs

Emphasis on medium-sized PDAs

Should be described more like Scenario #3

Whether you characterize it as a carrot or a stick, you need the ability to actually construct the PDAs as they are offered up by the local jurisdictions; areas that are PDAs are becoming more difficult to develop in some jurisdictions; there's a perception that the development of PDAs is bad and it is not being facilitated by the local jurisdictions; we need to be able to execute the planning work that has gone into the PDAs, especially in the medium-sized cities; in the Peninsula there is a huge backlash against all housing; PDAs need to be implemented for this scenario to succeed.

May be too early to say that the PDA process has failed

Seems like the PDAs program is fairly new in the smaller cities; some cities are just getting started, allow us (American Canyon) to implement the PDA program selected by the local jurisdiction. You need to enable the vision to be realized; like the idea of all jurisdictions being complete communities; how do you create complete communities in the outer areas? Need policies to support this.

More development in PDAs, more TDM strategies, more transit; need to empower city councils to make decisions, this is assuming that councils will do the right thing; this scenario implies there is money to invest in transit expansion

Streamline development in the PDAs; give developers flexibility; need CEQA flexibility, provide streamlining to produce the needed housing; the permitting process is a hindrance

Focus on medium cities to relieve pressure on big cities

Common sense is that you have to disperse the growth; don't see a reflection of the market place choices people are making in the scenarios; a market-based view needs to be inserted into each of the scenarios; flexibility and empowerment is necessary in the process to allow the (free) market to work

Is this the same as PBA 2013?

Oakley has a lot of growth but not the transit infrastructure

Affordable housing, everybody needs to have the ability to afford housing in the core area, preventing displacement

As much as it is about policies, what we need is the investment. The need for affordable housing and transit development is in $$$

Middle class can live and work in the urban area.

Nobody wants to do their share. OBAG grant should not be distributed based on population numbers, instead it should be given to all the red dots places. Real sticks and carrots. (MONEY from MTC)

The plan right now focuses on housing development rather than the job side. There needs to be incentives to create jobs outside the biggest centers.

Oakley and Brentwood, if we could have infrastructure, jobs out there, there will be a lot reverse commuting.

Other thing is we don't have sidewalks, and this impacts the accessibility to transit

We should really looking at job housing ratios, using those for incentives, housing allocation, and job allocation

Designate priority retail areas to generate the sales tax revenues to distribute among the red dots areas across the region

In addition to policy strategies, there is the investment side

Scenario #3:

Will increase Bike, Ped, transit mode share which has huge environmental and health benefits. Need a huge increase in complete streets investments to meet this shift.

We also need to maintain our roads. There is an opportunity to improve roads and add bike, ped, transit improvements.

How have recent developments in the cities impact the communities? We should learn those lessons. Does this scenario exacerbate displacement and affordability issues? This creates a lot of stress in urban areas. Need strong policies to support equity issues.

For sustainable outcome it's great…but need to address equity.

Would be creating few Oz's but we have 101 cities…we need to make the other cities walkable, complete, equitable, and green too. This scenario doesn't address the other 98 cities.

I feel like this scenario is happening right now. Do we decide to foster this? Do we need to support this or will the market do this naturally? Without huge investments to support the scenario there may not be the resources for the three cities to thrive.

There's an example in San Francisco of a developer protecting existing residents, add affordable housing, add market housing, earn density bonuses, with every stakeholder satisfied. We need to take these methods to all cities large and small and scale appropriately.

Need to have proper transit options to connect other communities to these three cities.

Not going to stop it from happening. Could make it more successful if lots of investment was pumped into city.

How will we fund county initiatives (like BART to San Jose) if benefit is only for a single city?

More investment in transit than now

Would need to re-work RHNA process

Not pragmatic – there are reasons there are communities outside of the big three cities – i.e. wine industry is not moving outside of Napa

Seems to have "Forgotten" about other areas

Seems unrealistic

Region has a diverse economy – this scenario not realistic

This is contrary to the way things have gone (used to have a couple of downtowns)

What type of businesses locates in these areas? Industrial may be short-changed

Goods manufacturing cannot afford the higher prices

Concern about low-income residents getting displaced

Truly builds on existing transportation network

Practicality – San Jose is aggressively pursuing jobs (not housing)

Hard to achieve this scenario based on economic and political realities

Will shift power to these three centers

In PBA, the three cities will be taking on 42% of housing growth already – they are already important, so need to take steps to facilitate this. But cannot put blinders on forgetting about the rest of the region

East Contra Costa County – feel left out and unaccounted for– some people may not want to live in concentrated areas – but there may be no infrastructure in the area (East CCC) to support those people. Fears about funding eligibility

Would need a regional tax sharing model

May need to invest in economic development elsewhere

Three big cities are behind in their jobs/housing balance

Economics/economy drives realities

Housing prices will be an issue.

Industry hurts, jobs hurt.

Lose community

Equity issues/ cities funding outside that may not be serving them.

Most environmentally sustainable, pressure on infrastructure is least.

Also market is very weak in SF, Oakland, San Jose, the question is will the market align to the potential growth.

Huge pressure on Solano County residents who will need to commute.

The challenge will be to accommodate all income groups.

Focused on big cities…focused on regional transportation….three big cities and what is nearby and infrastructure that supports them.

Side effect: How would the big influx of commuters impact this scenario? We might need to mitigate this.

Would need more investment in cities – transportation – city to city or within the city to make travel easier for these places as they grow.

Improve the quality of life through parks, transit, access…more attention on the amenities

Make these cities feel like they are getting something out of taking on all the growth.

These are already the more progressive urban areas where it is easier to get things approved

Need inclusionary zoning

Land costs are a huge barrier. How do you get public land available for affordable housing? This needs to be an ongoing effort.

You need the densities to make this scenario work. Current densities are not sufficient to support it.

Pressure on infrastructure in urban areas is tremendous

Concentrate economic opportunities in those three cities that are lifting all populations. Educational systems have to be up to par. Economic, Education and Safety are key to keeping people there, making people want to live there, businesses want to invest there.

His scenario does put more emphasis on urban school systems to be successful.

Why do people move? Safety. Education. Jobs. Strategy is to figure out why people are moving. People move to Orinda for schools.

Investment in public institutions is key.

Telecommuting policies could help.

One of the challenges is to provide affordable housing for middle class

And goods movement in and out of the corridor

If jobs stay in the core, we still have majority of the people living in the suburban, we will still have unbalanced transit infrastructure

This is not feasible from a political perspective

It needs massive up zoning the west side of San Francisco

Not cost-effective, it is very expensive to build in these three biggest cities. Then we are mourning the expensive housing.

It's better to have people living in the Bay Area, maybe not in San Francisco

This scenario gives us least choice

So much of the investment in concentrated, and the infrastructure in other areas will deteriorate, so will economic vitality

Preserve open spaces yet at the cost of a lot other things

PDAs complied projects should be streamlined, as long as the bar is set high

Community after community, places that have PDAs are denying projects in the PDAs

Traffic congestion will worsen

The transit cannot handle it

Housing trust fund to allow people to live close to where they work

This will need the greatest transformation of public schools.