

1.

Proposal to Modify OneBayArea Grant Proposal

This motion is supported by the 6 Wins Network and Greenbelt Alliance

Proposed Motion Language: MTC directs staff to establish now some core requirements for the next cycle of OBAG funding, FY 2015-16. This will set clear expectations for CMAs and jurisdictions so that they can tailor PDA Growth Strategies and other planning and legislative activities toward meeting these requirements. These include:

1. Distributing funding to reward *local* affordable housing production,
2. Requiring local adoption of policies from a flexible, but clearly articulated, menu of housing and community stabilization policies that correspond to those to be studied and considered in the PDA Growth Strategies

Note: On two occasions, most recently 4/11/12, MTC/ABAG's own advisory groups (Policy Advisory Council, Equity Working Group) passed a motion supporting changes to OBAG. The 4/11/12 motion was as follows:

MTC should adopt guidelines for the CMAs and cities for the next OBAG funding cycle (FY 2015-16) that require:

- *OBAG funding be allocated to the city/jurisdiction level based upon their affordable housing production; and*
- *Cities/jurisdictions have affordable housing and/or anti-displacement policies in place to receive funding. (MTC and ABAG should provide a menu of options and best practice policies for local jurisdictions to choose from.)*

2.

Proposal to Modify the Draft RHNA Methodology

This motion is supported by the 6 Wins Network and Greenbelt Alliance.

Proposed Motion Language: Every jurisdiction with a median income above the Bay Area average should take-on at least as much of the region's lower-income housing need as it did in the 2007-2014 Planning Period. This would mean shifting some lower-income units from lower-income cities to more affluent cities in exchange for higher-income units. The total RHNA number for each jurisdiction would remain the same.

Explanation: The draft RHNA methodology concentrates more housing growth in lower-income cities in the urban core in order to reduce GHG emissions. As a result, some affluent cities that desperately need more affordable housing are seeing sharp declines in their share of the RHNA for low and very-low income units.

With this simple fix, we can achieve both the environmental benefits of focused growth and the equity and economic benefits of planning for enough affordable housing in affluent cities that might not otherwise build it. We can keep the overall focused-growth pattern of the draft RHNA methodology, but also maintain the current, more equitable, distribution of affordable housing in the region.

3.

Proposal to Study Equity Environment and Jobs (EEJ) Scenario

Proposed Motion Language: Study the Equity, Environment, and Jobs (EEJ) Scenario as an alternative in the upcoming environmental impact review (EIR) process. If the EEJ Scenario proves to be the environmentally superior alternative, it should be incorporated into the final RTP/SCS.

Background: ABAG and MTC members supported inclusion of the Equity Environment and Jobs (EEJ) Scenario in the set of SCS alternatives that were evaluated last summer. While the EEJ Scenario did not end up being included in those alternatives, it can and should be added to the set of alternatives to be studied in the Environmental Impact Review process.

4.

Proposal to Study of an Adequate Baseline of Transit Service

Motion: As part of the Preferred Scenario, MTC should study what an adequate baseline of transit service looks like in the Bay Area.

Background: This study would analyze what level of service is needed to connect housing, jobs and other essential destinations to achieve Plan Bay Area's Greenhouse Gas emission and driving reduction goals as well as to ensure basic mobility for all Bay Area residents. This study would build off the research in the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) and provide needed information to complete Plan Bay Area, such that it plans for the optimal level of transit service and addresses issues of overcrowding, and spatial and temporal service gaps.

Currently, no such study has been done and so we have no sense of: 1) what level of transit service we should be planning for and seeking funding for; and 2) how the recent dramatic cuts to transit service have impacted peoples' mobility, the economy, public health or the amount of VMT or Greenhouse Gas emissions. Our research shows that since 2006 more than 600,000 hours (8%) of bus service have been cut resulting in 20 million fewer transit trips per year. (A Title VI analysis of these cuts does not provide us with information about the bigger picture impact we're proposing be studied.)