



Joint Policy Committee

May 19, 2006
10:00 a.m. to 12:00 Noon
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 Eighth Street, Oakland

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of March 17, 2006 (attached) Action
3. Focusing Our Vision Progress Report (attached) Discussion

The staff memo reports progress on the Focusing Our Vision program since the last JPC meeting. Of particular concern is the tendency of some of our local-government partners to negatively pre-judge the process. JPC members, particularly those who have attended some of the meetings around the region, are requested to reflect and comment on causes and cures for the cynicism directed at regional agencies and regional processes. Members of the Bay Area team which attended the statewide Regional Blueprint Learning Network meeting in Sacramento on May 12th will also report on that session.
4. Smart Growth and Goods Movement (attached) Discussion

Last year, the Committee received a report on potential land-use conflicts between regional smart-growth housing objectives and regional goods-movement objectives. Staff will provide a progress report on efforts to understand and begin resolving these conflicts. A few case studies are highlighted. This item is deferred from the March 17th JPC meeting.
5. Corridor Planning Program—Opinion-Leader Attitudes Toward Development and Change (attached) Discussion

Staff has completed a series of interviews with leaders of community-based organizations in three key corridors which the regional vision targets to take a large portion of future growth. These interviews provide some important insights into the opportunities for and obstacles to region-serving development in these corridors.
6. Legislative Update Discussion

As the Committee is aware, the Legislature has approved four bond measures to put before the voters in November. Included in the bond package are incentives for infill development and transit-

oriented development. Staff will provide an oral report on late-breaking news related to the bonds, relevant trailer bills, and other legislation of interest to the JPC's program.

7. Other Business
8. Public Comment
9. Adjournment

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING:

10:00 a.m. to Noon
Friday, July 21, 2006
MetroCenter Auditorium
101 Eighth Street, Oakland

This meeting is scheduled to end promptly at 12:00 Noon. Agenda items not considered by that time may be deferred.

The public is encouraged to comment on agenda items by completing a request-to-speak card and giving it to JPC staff or the chairperson.

Although a quorum of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission may be in attendance at this meeting, the Joint Policy Committee may take action only on those matters delegated to it. The Joint Policy Committee may not take any action as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission unless this meeting has been previously noticed as a Metropolitan Transportation Commission meeting.



Joint Policy Committee

Minutes of the Meeting of March 17, 2006 Held at 10:00 AM in the MetroCenter Auditorium, Oakland

Attendance:

ABAG Members:

Jane Brunner
Mark Green
Scott Haggerty
Steve Rabinowitsh

BAAQMD Members:

Chris Daly
Jerry Hill
Pamela Torliatt
Gayle Uilkema

MTC Members:

Bill Dodd
Steve Kimsey
Sue Lempert
John McLemore
Jon Rubin, Ch.
Shelia Young

BTH Member:

Sunne Wright McPeak

ABAG Staff:

Gillian Adams
Randy DeShazo
Paul Fassinger
Henry Gardner
Pat Jones
Janet McBride
Christy Rivierre

BAAQMD Staff:

Jack Broadbent
Henry Hilken
Jean Roggenkamp

MTC Staff:

John Albrecht
James Corless
Steve Heminger
Valerie Knepper

Other:

Moira Birss, Housing Leadership Council
Duane DeWitt
Jean Finney, Caltrans, District 4
Frank Gallo, MCAC
Jerry Grace
Ann Hancock, Climate Protection Campaign
Seth Kaplan, Supervisor Nate Miley
Sherman Lewis
Steve Lowe, WOCA Peter Lydon, SPUR
Peter Lydon, SPUR
Bob Planthold
Allison Quaid, Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable
Communities
Bill Sandbrick, Fremont Chamber of Commerce
Mike Sandler, Community Clean Water Initiative
David Schonbrunn, TRANSDEF
Michael Sarzbiz
Leslie Stewart, Bay Area Monitor

JPC Staff:

Ted Droettboom

1. Call to Order

Chair Rubin called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of Joint Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of January 20, 2006

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

3. Focusing Our Vision (nee' Regional Blueprint Planning Program)

ABAG Planning Director, Janet McBride, described the basics of the program's approach and summarized progress over the first two months. As the program seeks to negotiate priority development areas and priority conservation areas with local governments, outreach has concentrated on local-government officials. Meetings with elected officials have been held in nearly all the nine Bay Area Counties and are beginning with appointed officials. Other meetings with elected officials are planned, as is a stakeholder conference in early May. Technical work is proceeding with the assembly and mapping of data which will assist in the identification of priority areas.

The JPC sought clarification on the role of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). It is to provide advice to the regional agencies on analysis and process. It is not a decision-making body and is not intended as a substitute for direct collaboration with local governments throughout the region. The size of the TAC has been limited so as to permit full discussion of issues among members and with regional staff.

The JPC also discussed the difficulty of reconciling local and regional objectives. The effect on the region is but one of many concerns that local decision makers need to consider when making land-use decisions and planning public investments, and it is usually not near the top of list. We need to do more work to bring the efficiency and livability of the region to the forefront of local policy and development discussions, and regional efforts need to be communicated more clearly and consistently to local-government colleagues. The region is an agglomeration of local governments, but many local governments feel separated from regional affairs and regard regional agencies as adversaries, rather than as jointly owned agents of the common good. Getting out and engaging local-government officials throughout the region is essential to regional success.

The desirability of complementary development and conservation areas was highlighted. The connection between open-space conservation and development intensity may be key to many local-government collaborations.

Secretary Sunne Wright McPeak joined the meeting during this discussion. She presented a mock check symbolizing the State Government's financial contribution to the *Focusing Our Vision* program and then described the State's objectives for regional planning. These included ensuring a twenty-year housing supply, with each region accommodating its own indigenous demand (i.e., not exporting housing units and commutes to adjacent regions), reducing the number of daily trips, reducing congestion to improve mobility, and conserving environmental and agricultural land. She also acknowledged the uniqueness of each California region and noted that different solutions may be required for different places; the state is built from distinct regions. The Secretary cited economy, environment and equity as touchstones for effective regional planning and emphasized the importance of tangible outcomes and performance measures.

4. Legislative Update

Discussion with the Secretary continued with an emphasis on the infrastructure bond measures which had failed in the legislature a few days earlier. Ms. McPeak emphasized the Administration's continued commitment to strategic investment and noted the links to other initiatives, including public-private partnerships, design-build contracts, and land-use reforms. Again, she highlighted a focus on performance and outcomes. The Administration intended to relate investment to tangible improvements in mobility and reduction in congestion, not to purely political priorities. There was also an intent to incentivize infill and refill development in the right places.

Committee and public comment identified a number of issues for the State's consideration including: the mix between highway and transit funding, the support of goods-movement investments to relieve trucking bottlenecks and reduce localized particulate matter pollution, the need to incentivize (not penalize local self-help transportation investment programs), the possibility and desirability of using gas taxes and other targeted revenues as an alternative to general revenue to retire the infrastructure bonds, the relationship between land-use intensity and the return on transit investment, the need for financial and regulatory help to get housing happening near existing transit stations (e.g., BART replacement parking), and the difficulties cities and counties have in upgrading and replacing their own infrastructure under a broken system of local-government finance. The relationship between transportation/land-use decisions and environmental outcomes, including global warming, was repeatedly mentioned.

Ms. McPeak also noted an effort underway to provide local-governments with relief to environmental challenges through references to regional plans.

5. Climate Protection (local efforts to combat global warming)

Jack Broadbent, Executive Officer of BAAQMD, introduced the Air District's climate protection program, highlighting its relationship to other air quality concerns. Ann Hancock and Mike Sandler described the pilot program in Sonoma County and noted the manner in which the principles could be extended to the region and state. Henry Hilken provided details on nascent Air District program, including the relationship to land-use and transportation planning. The presentation slides are available on the JPC website: www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy.

In discussion, the JPC was asked to consider the possibility of establishing greenhouse reduction targets for the region and to include a broader consideration of energy use and pricing (including the concept of peak oil) in a future agenda.

6. Smart Growth and Goods Movement

Due to the shortage of time, this item was deferred to a future agenda.

7. Other Business

There was no other business.

8. Public Comment

The JPC was commended for the quality of the items on its agenda and the importance of its mandate.

9. Adjournment



Joint Policy Committee / Regional Planning Program

Date: May 11, 2006
To: Joint Policy Committee
From: Regional Planning Program Director
Subject: *Focusing Our Vision* Progress Report

This memo provides a brief report on progress on the *Focusing Our Vision* program since the JPC last met in March.

Meetings with Local Governments and Others

Meetings were held with local-government staff in all nine Bay Area counties. In addition we were invited to present the *Focusing Our Vision* program to additional groups of elected officials and to some voluntary-sector organizations.

On May 8th we hosted a forum for stakeholder groups at the Palace Hotel in San Francisco. The forum, attended by over a hundred stakeholder representatives, received a presentation on the program and then divided into breakout groups to identify priorities and issues and to nominate stakeholder members to the program's Technical Advisory Committee.

A list of meetings, divided by type, is attached as Appendix A.

Technical Advisory Committee

One of the purposes of the meetings with local-government staff and of the stakeholder forum was to solicit members for a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to work with us as the program proceeds. In each case, those present at the meeting chose their own representatives (occasionally after a post-meeting caucus). The first meeting of the TAC will be on Thursday, May 25th. A list of TAC members and alternatives (noting a few positions yet to be resolved) is attached as Appendix B.

Data Collection and Analysis

A substantial set of data to assist in the identification of Priority Development Areas and Priority Conservation Areas has been assembled. The Technical Advisory Committee will assist us in the analysis of this data. Geographical Information System (GIS) maps illustrating some of the data will be on display at the JPC meeting.

“We Have Met The Enemy...and He Is Us”— Pogo

In our meetings with local elected and appointed officials, a pervasive theme has been an attitude of hostility and distrust toward regional agencies and regional processes. This presents a significant barrier to overcome in establishing the collaboration required to move *Focusing Our Vision* forward. Among the comments we repeatedly heard are:

- ABAG keeps trying to IMPOSE housing and population on us;
- MTC is biased toward the big cities in the central Bay Area;
- MTC is biased toward the suburbs;
- MTC is trying to kill our transit project by demanding uneconomic, unrealistic and undesirable densities;
- ABAG’s projections of population, jobs and housing growth are totally unrealistic;
- You guys in Oakland are out of touch;
- You keep trying to make one size fit all;
- You are all about top down;
- Based on past experience, we have no reason to trust your promise of collaboration.

Most of the members of the JPC are both local-government elected officials and directors of regional agencies, and these comments should be of concern. While by no means universal (A few folks actually appear to like us and agree with what we are doing.), the negative attitude toward the region is sufficiently widespread to create an impediment to productive dialogue. Clearly ABAG, BAAQMD, and MTC have important regional objectives to pursue which may be at odds with local objectives, and some cynicism and resentment is always to be expected; but the apparent inability to acknowledge legitimate differences without attributing ulterior motives is worrisome.

Ultimately trust can only be built by demonstrating behavior consistent with our promises (i.e., walking the talk). However, even then there may be residual prejudice. Our purpose will benefit from discussion of what we all (elected and appointed) can do to build bridges between the regional agencies and their constituent local governments.

Appendix A

Focusing Our Vision Building the Network of Neighborhoods

Introductory Meetings with Local Elected Officials

Group	Date	Location
Santa Clara County Cities Association	January 12 th , 2006	Sunnyvale
Napa County League of Governments	January 19 th , 2006	Napa
West Contra Costa County Mayors' Conference	February 1 st , 2006	El Cerrito
Alameda County Mayors' Conference	February 8 th , 2006	Berkeley
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)	February 9 th , 2006	San Carlos
Solano County Coordinating Council	February 9 th , 2006	Vacaville
East Bay Division of the League of California Cities	February 16 th , 2006	Orinda
Walnut Creek City Council	March 21 st , 2006	Walnut Creek
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee	March 31 st , 2006	San Pablo
East Contra Costa County Mayors' Conference (Delta Six)	April 20 th , 2006	Brentwood
Marin City-County Planning Committee	April 27 th , 2006	San Rafael
Oakland City Council	May 2 nd , 2006	Oakland
Contra Costa County Mayors' Conference	May 4 th , 2006	Concord

Introductory Meetings with Local Appointed Officials

Jurisdictions	Date	Location
City and County of San Francisco	March 24 th , 2006	San Francisco
Napa Cities and County	March 30 th , 2006	Napa
Sonoma Cities and County	March 30 th , 2006	Santa Rosa
Contra Costa Cities and County	March 30 th , 2006	Pleasant Hill
Solano Cities and County	March 31 st , 2006	Fairfield

Jurisdictions	Date	Location
Alameda Cities and County	March 31 st , 2006	Oakland
Marin Cities and County	April 7 th , 2006	San Rafael
San Mateo Cities and County	April 13 th , 2006	San Carlos
Santa Clara Cities and County	April 21 st , 2006	San Jose

Introductory Meetings with Stakeholder Groups

Group	Date	Location
Housing Leadership Council, San Mateo County	February 21 st , 2006	San Carlos
Leadership Institute for Ecology and the Economy	March 1 st , 2006	Cotati
Transportation and Land Use Coalition (TALC)	April 1 st , 2006	Oakland
San Francisco Planning and Urban Research (SPUR)	April 13 th , 2006	San Francisco
Stakeholder Forum	May 8 th , 2006	San Francisco

Other Staff-Level Meetings to Introduce the Focus Program and Explore Joint Program Opportunities

(may include multiple meetings on various dates and other continuing information exchanges)

Alameda County Planning Directors
Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Communities
Bay Area Council
Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART)
California Center for Regional Leadership (CCRL)
Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG)
Contra Costa County Planning Directors
East Bay Community Foundation
El Camino Real Grand Boulevard Project
Greenbelt Alliance
Non-profit Housing Association of Northern California (NPH)
Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC)
SamTrans
San Francisco Foundation
San Francisco Planning Department
Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG)
Solano County Planning Directors
Sonoma County Planning Directors

Transit and Land Use Coalition (TALC)
Urban Ecology
Valley Transportation Authority
West Contra Costa County Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC)

Appendix B

Focusing Our Vision Building the Network of Neighborhoods

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Members

Jurisdiction/Interest	Members	Alternates
Alameda County	Larry Cheeves City Manager, Union City Jeri Ram Community Development Director, Dublin	Hanson Hom Community Development Director, San Leandro Phil Kamlarz City Manager, Berkeley
Contra Costa County	Victor Carniglia Deputy Director, Com- munity Development, Antioch Steve Falk City Manager, Lafayette	Janet Keefer City Manager, Orinda
Marin County	Bob Brown Community Development Director, San Rafael Dave Wallace Community Development Director, Novato	Nancy Kaufman Planning Director, Lark- spur Paul Kermoyan Community Develop- ment Director, Sausalito
Napa County	Hilary Gitelman Planning Director, Napa County Howard Siegel Community Partnership Manager, Napa County	
San Francisco	Tilly Chang Deputy Director, San Francisco County Trans- portation Authority Amit Ghosh Chief of Comprehensive Planning, San Francisco Planning Department	Sara Dennis Senior Planner, San Francisco Planning De- partment
San Mateo County	Duane Bay Director of Housing, San Mateo County C/CAG Staff Person	
Santa Clara County	Sharon Fierro Community Development Director, Campbell Laurel Prevetti Deputy Community De-	Robert Paternoster Community Develop- ment Director, Sunny- vale Pamela Vasudevai

Jurisdiction/Interest	Members	Alternates
	velopment Director, San Jose	Planner, Valley Transportation Authority
Solano County	Eve Somjen Assistant Director, Planning and Development, Fairfield Matt Walsh Principal Planner, Solano County	
Sonoma County	Mike Moore Community Development Director, Petaluma Pete Parkinson Permit and Resource Management Director, Sonoma County	Nancy Adams Transportation Planner, Santa Rosa Janet Spillman Deputy Director, Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Affordable Housing	Geeta Rao Policy Director, Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California	
Economic Development	Eliot Hurwitz Program Manager, Napa County League of Governments	Jim Wunderman Executive Director, Bay Area Council
Environment	Bettina Ring Executive Director, Bay Area Open Space Council	
Environmental Justice	Margaret Gordon Executive Director, West Oakland Environmental Indicators	
Social Equity	TBD	TBD
Transportation	TBD	TBD

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 20, 2006
To: Joint Policy Committee
From: Randy Deshazo, Senior Regional Planner
Subject: Potential conflicts between industrial and residential uses under Smart Growth

Summary

While Smart Growth principles promote a more compact land-use pattern in the Bay Area, competition for the limited amount of available land brings freight related land-uses and increasing Bayside residential development into potential conflict. Aside from direct competition for land, normal industrial activities generate off-site impacts on nearby residential uses through freight movement and site related nuisances.

Consequently, new residential developments may experience difficulties in attracting permanent residents. Industrial enterprises may also find that ongoing conflict with new residents may limit their future operations. Given these compatibility concerns, ABAG may need to reconsider the distribution of jobs and residents in certain areas in the next forecast. Also, these concerns may also influence the identification of Priority Development Areas as part of the Focusing Our Vision process.

Included in this staff report are a few case studies to illustrate how staff will approach compatibility concerns with respect to development potential. Even though this staff report concerns only three sites, the Jack London Square area, the Port of Oakland and the NUMMI plant area, several other sites can be included in further analysis. Results from this study will be communicated to affected local governments in the context of ABAG's forecast and in the identification of Priority Development Areas.

Compatibility at the Crossroads of Goods Movement and Residential Development

Most industrial areas are located along the I-80/880 corridor in the Inner East Bay, around the southern parts of the Bay in Santa Clara, in northern San Mateo and in San Francisco. Newer industrial and warehouse space appears in more outlying parts of the region such as the I-80 corridor in Solano, near Highway 101 in Sonoma and in the Livermore/Tri-Valley area along I-580. Much of the new residential development in the Bay Area is occurring inside and along the I-80/880 corridor.

Because physical site characteristics such as relatively flat and large parcels of land with proximity to major arterials and employment centers are appealing as locations for both residential and industrial uses, these uses compete for the limited available land in the Bay area. When residential and industrial uses are located near to each other, there may be compatibility issues that emerge from sharing the same road network, along with noises, odors, hazardous materials and high-intensity lighting. Moreover, since many of the available parcels are redevelopment properties, many sites considered for reuse as residential development are located in the midst of existing industrial and warehouse uses. The potential of infill redevelopment projects may be limited if they are developed adjacent to incompatible uses.

Given these factors, industrial operations may adversely impact the current trend toward higher residential densities within the I-80/880 corridor. Even with the implementation of site design standards affecting truck routes, parking and other site development techniques to mitigate industrial nuisances, permanent residents may be reluctant to locate along the industrial-residential seam line.

Ultimately, at every site where there is competition for land between industrial and residential development, the prevailing land-use trend in the vicinity may be decisive. For example, even with property owner preferences for one use over another, market forces tend to turnover industrial and warehouse uses to higher value uses with increasing demand since industrial uses yield low rents and property values per square foot. On the other hand, the lack of amenities and services, especially in an area perceived to be normatively industrial, makes residential development riskier than in suburban areas.

Case Studies

The following three case studies are examples of the diversity of Bay Area land-use mixes and the role that contending demand for land between residential and industrial/goods movement uses plays in anticipating future development.

Jack London Square (Census Tracts 4032, 4033)

These tracts comprise 314 Acres

	2005	2015	2030
Employment	11,652	12,697	13,673
Job-land Acres	227	233	234
Households	1,223	1,886	2,694
Residential Acres	42	57	64
Residential Density	29 du/acre	33 du/acre	42 du/acre
Total Developed Acres	269	290	298
Percent Developed	86%	92%	95%

Given its highly desirable location along Oakland’s waterfront, the Jack London Square area is anticipated to see continued growth in employment and rapid growth in residential development over the next quarter century. Sustaining this growth requires continuing densification of both commercial/industrial land and residential land. Achieving the required density, however, may require consolidation of the currently highly fragmented pattern of land uses within the Jack London Square area. With small lot sizes, small city block sizes and the proximity of

incompatible land-uses, redevelopment of land with greater densities may be constrained by an inability to achieve the necessary building masses to support those higher densities.

Since office workers typically require far less space per employee than industrial workers, increased employment density will be supported by an anticipated greater share of office jobs by 2030. Even so, the share of industrial workers is anticipated to decline to 41% of the workforce in 2030 (as compared to 57% in 2000).

While Projections estimates are reasonable, the City of Oakland’s recent efforts to smooth over potential land-use conflicts must be observed over time to see to what extent redevelopment of the area around Jack London will allow for both residential and industrial uses.

Port of Oakland Area (Census Tracts 4017, 4018, 4019, 4020)

These tracts comprise 2,679 Acres

	2005	2015	2030
Employment	10,485	12,233	16,191
Job-land Acres	2,033	2,062	2,099
Households	1,497	2,366	3,508
Residential Acres	104	142	180
Residential Density	14 du/acre	17 du/acre	19 du/acre
Total Developed Acres	2,137	2,204	2,279
Percent Developed	79%	82%	85%

While the Port of Oakland comprises a very large area in west Oakland, much of the current debate about land in this area surrounds potential future uses such as office, industrial or even retail uses for the Oakland army base. The Oakland Army Base (“OARB”) Redevelopment Area comprises the 425 acre former Oakland Army Base, plus adjacent areas, totaling approximately 1,800 acres. East of the army base site, across I-880, is an area comprised largely of industrial and transportation related uses and a large tract of land that is being redeveloped for residential purposes.

This tract, the former Wood Street AMTRAK station area, will contain 1,557 housing units once construction is completed. Between 2005 and 2030, ABAG anticipates the area’s census tracts to add another 2,011 households. With the complete build-out and occupancy of the Wood street units, the study area will need to add approximately 454 units to meet Projections 2005 estimates of area population. While there are some tracts of vacant residential land in the vicinity, those tracts are squeezed between major limited access transportation facilities and adjoining industrial uses. It is possible that with increasing demand for residential uses, these tracts may be successfully developed. On the other hand, without significant retail support and substantial buffering from nuisances emanating from ongoing adjacent industrial uses, demand for those residential units may be low.

As with the Jack London area, ongoing monitoring of the successfulness of Oakland’s efforts will be instrumental in forecasting future growth.

NUMMI Plant, Fremont (Census Tracts 4415.03, 4433.02, 4431.02)

These tracts comprise 20,059 Acres

	2005	2015	2030
Employment	58,558	64,852	71,441
Job-land Acres	4,241	4,534	4,570
Households	7,498	7,968	8,940
Residential Acres	1,407	1,464	1,550
Residential Density	5 du/acre	5 du/acre	6 du/acre
Total Developed Acres	5,648	5,998	6,120
Percent Developed	28%	30%	31%

The area of Fremont contained within the above cited Census Tracts is characterized by clearly delineated separation of land uses, with residential uses ranging from four to ten units/acre east of I-680, a six-lane freeway, and mostly industrial/warehouse uses west of I-680. West of I-680 and framed by Warm Springs Court and Fremont Boulevard on the west and east respectively, and south of South Glimmer Road is the NUMMI (New United Motors Manufacturing) plant. The plant houses some 5,700 employees engaged in shifts around the clock.

Even though I-680 buffers single-family residential uses from the more intense industrial uses to the east of I-680, Fremont is preparing a Specific Plan for the proposed Warm Springs BART station to be located west of I-680, near the NUMMI plant.

NUMMI officials have expressed concerns about placing new residential development near the NUMMI plant. The City of Fremont's Warm Springs BART Area Specific Plan, however, calls for buffering residential uses from surrounding industrial uses with retail and office uses in a Transit Oriented Development (TOD). A TOD, designed to mitigate noise and other impacts from nearby industrial uses, with residential uses transitioning to office/retail uses to the west may succeed in a largely industrial area. However, the long-term success of this 320 acre site, with a potential for 1,500 units, depends on ensuring that residential uses are adequately buffered from active industrial uses.

ABAG's Projections 2005 forecasts modest growth in residential development for these Census Tracts with 1,442 new households for the entire forecast period. This figure is consistent with the build-out potential of a TOD at the Warm Springs site.

Conclusion

While both Oakland and Fremont appear to be grappling with the potential conflict between goods movement and residential uses, only ongoing monitoring will be able to provide insight into the overall success of mixing these often incompatible land uses. Staff will work with local jurisdictions in assessing the future development potential of areas with particular emphasis on

how these potential conflicts might impact the identification of Priority Development Areas under the Focusing Our Vision project.

MEMO

Date: May 9, 2006
To: Joint Policy Committee
From: Christy Riviere, Senior Planner, Association of Bay Area Governments
Re: CORRIDORS PROGRAM: Community Support Assessments

Background

The Association of Bay Area Governments has developed a “corridors program” to facilitate implementation of the Vision along three major corridors in the Bay Area: East 14th/International Boulevard, El Camino Real, and San Pablo Avenue. The Network of Neighborhoods Vision calls for the majority of new population growth to be accommodated through increased densities and infill development along the region’s major transportation corridors and at transit stations.

As acknowledged by the JPC, Vision implementation can be best achieved through local government commitment to, community support for and engagement in neighborhood planning and land use changes that are supportive of the principles underlying the Vision. The Corridors Program is focused on realizing this support.

Outcomes from the Corridors Program will include: 1) an assessment of community support for the Vision, and 2) an assessment of existing conditions and plans (as a measure of local government support) against the Vision.

These assessments will be used to inform the development of further regional Bay Area Vision implementation programs, including an outreach program, technical assistance, and measuring of regional progress.

The purpose of this staff report to the JPC, is to share what we have learned by “assessing community support” for the Vision.

Community Support Assessments

People often hold strong negative perceptions regarding change. This is especially true with regard to new development that may result in changes to the character or urban form of existing neighborhoods. Resistance to new development is often presented in the context of fears (real or perceived) about increased traffic congestion or new populations coming into an area.

To better understand the reality of and the reasons for these perceptions, a phone survey was developed and administered to “opinion leaders” in the neighborhoods along the three corridors of the corridor planning program: East 14th/International Boulevard, El Camino Real and San Pablo Avenue. For El Camino Real, only Santa Clara County was surveyed. A parallel effort for

San Mateo County is currently being completed, but lags the rest of our survey in order to coordinate with a survey being performed by San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans).

Target Audience/Respondents

Opinion leaders were selected as the target audience. Surveying opinion leaders, rather than individuals allowed us to leverage the in-depth knowledge that such individuals have of their communities. This was especially important considering our budget and time limitations.

Opinion leaders constituted heads of community based organizations, neighborhood associations, home owners associations, environmental advocacy organizations, and merchant or business groups. For many neighborhoods, especially those along El Camino Real, more homeowners were represented than renters. In some instances, individuals elected to not speak for the organization or its members, but rather as an individual expressing their personal opinions.

Survey Questions

The survey questions were designed to assess public opinions regarding neighborhood needs and concerns, new development, especially housing development, transportation choices and access and involvement in both the planning and development process. These topics were selected due to their direct correlation with our Vision implementation outreach goals, which include:

- To build public awareness of and support for the principles embodied in the Vision
- To build public awareness of and support for local land use planning and development projects that support the Vision.
- To encourage genuine, collaborative neighborhood planning in the region, so that local governments and residents can work together to identify neighborhood needs and to ensure those needs are then incorporated into locally adopted policies, plans and development.
- To encourage and assist local governments in developing and conducting meaningful and effective outreach strategies to genuinely engage community members in the planning and development process.

The survey questions were all open-ended questions, versus close-ended questions (check the box questions). We felt this would allow for more in-depth responses, thereby enabling us to capture deeper insights on the issues and the unique nuisances that may exist in individual communities. The open-ended questions also allowed us to learn about the variety of opinions that exist on these issues, amongst the corridors, between the neighborhoods along each corridor, and often times, within individual neighborhoods.

Findings

The results of the public opinion polling exercise revealed that overall people highly value being part of a “community.” People were very in touch with those elements that make their existing community complete or incomplete; for instance people recognized if their community lacked affordable housing, jobs, neighborhood serving retail, access to alternative transportation modes or parks and open space.

Generally, people are very aware of the region's housing affordability issue. Yet, concerns about density, building heights, crowding and other factors associated with building more housing were consistently raised. Support for more housing in existing neighborhoods was voiced if placed in the right locations and if it was integrated well into community. Often times the corridor was identified as the right place for increased housing development.

Having transportation choices was valued across the region. Driving was cited as the most common mode of transportation. However, where transportation options were available, these were often cited as neighborhood strengths. Where there was access to BART or a quality bus line, such as the 72 Rapid bus that serves San Pablo Avenue, respondents reported regular use by residents.

Walking was cited as a common transportation mode in neighborhoods that have pedestrian amenities, places to walk to, such as to transit or neighborhood retail, or in low-income communities where many people do not have cars or where there is aged population. If the walking environment was improved, respondents generally felt that more people would choose to walk more often.

In terms of development, people varied greatly in their support. Overall, lower-income communities seemed more supportive of development, as they seemed interested in neighborhood improvements and added services, especially neighborhood retail. Upper income communities also voiced support, but were more concerned that new development be well designed, that it would add to the "character" of the neighborhood and that it include neighborhood services, such as restaurants. Overall opposition was most noted if the community felt that it was not engaged in the decision making process.

The level of community engagement, or depth of engagement, was highly dependent on education and income levels, whether there was a strong community-based organization that mobilized the community, and past experience with local government. Most respondents felt that those who wanted to be engaged were, although barriers were noted, including timing, access to childcare and language or cultural barriers.

Common methods for learning about planning and development include local newspapers, city and other government newsletters, television, word of mouth (neighbors), and community-based organizations, and email listservs.

Next Steps

Over the next few weeks, ABAG staff will be finalizing the Bay Area Vision Awareness, Advocacy & Outreach Program, which includes a "public information campaign" component.

The public information campaign will be developed and administered in the Bay Area to raise general public awareness of and support for planning and development that supports the principles of the Vision. Gaining an understanding of current public opinions and perceptions pertaining to the issues underlying the Vision has been identified as the first step in the development of this campaign. What has been learned through this process will be used to develop the messages and to identify target audiences for the campaign.