TO: HONORABLE CITY COUNCIL
FROM: CITY MANAGER
DEPARTMENT: PLANNING AND COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT
DATE: JULY 18, 2011
REPORT TYPE: ACTION
SUBJECT: Item No. 16: Release of Alternative Scenarios by ABAG/MTC

The staff report for this item indicated that the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) were scheduled to release Alternative Scenarios for the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) at some point in July. Those scenarios were presented to ABAG and MTC committees on Friday, July 9th. Staff has had little time to review the report and supporting materials, but has attached and will have available at the Council meeting the presentation made to the regional agencies. Also attached are memos from the agencies outlining the scenarios and some of the criteria that were considered in their development. The full package of meeting materials and background is available online on the MTC/ABAG website at: http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/events/agendaView.akt?p=1694 (links to reports follow item #2b on the agenda).

While staff has not had extensive time to substantially digest or analyze the materials, the three (3) Alternative Scenarios include:

- **Focused Growth**: Growth in housing and jobs would occur primarily in planned development areas (PDAs) and growth opportunity areas (GOAs) along transit corridors in the “inner Bay Area, generally including San Francisco, Alameda, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties, with some exceptions. This option anticipates about 70% of new housing growth and 55% of new employment in the region occurring in those corridors.

- **Core Concentration**: This scenario would shift more growth to the regional and city centers in the Bay Area, particularly San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose. Density and intensity of development would be higher for those areas than in the Focused Growth scenario.

- **Outer Bay Area Growth**: This option would assign more growth to areas of PDAs and potential small growth centers in the “outer Bay Area,” focusing on increased employment opportunities and concentrated development to emphasize walkability and access to transit opportunities, though those are more limited than in the other scenarios.
Maps of the three scenarios are included in the presentation materials, though it is difficult to discern much difference between them, given the conceptual level at this time. Staff also notes that there are no numbers (housing or employment) associated with any of the scenarios. As previously reported, we do expect the overall housing number for the region to be reduced from the initial 900,000 households to something less than 750,000 households for the period through 2035.

The intent of the scenarios is to evaluate impacts on greenhouse gas emissions and the cost of transportation (primarily transit) improvements necessary to support each option. The agencies would also evaluate the “constraints” associated with each scenario to provide a more realistic vision of growth. Staff is quite concerned, however, about the “equity” criteria and emphasis on assigning greater numbers of housing units to cities with high “quality of life” indicators (schools being one). This is certainly an area the City will want to weigh in on regarding the alternatives.

Schedule
The proposed schedule for evaluation and review of the Alternative Scenarios is as follows:
- July-September: Evaluation of the impacts, costs, and forecasts related to each scenario
- October: Release scenario analysis for public review
- October-November: Review by local jurisdictions
- November: Propose preferred scenario
- January 2012: Review by ABAG/MTC
- February 2012: Approval of preferred scenario by ABAG/MTC

Next Steps
Staff believes that it may be more appropriate for Council to focus on the Alternative Scenarios and develop a response by early to mid September, rather than augmenting the prior response regarding the Initial Vision Scenario. Staff could work with the Council’s ABAG and Housing Methodology Committee liaisons or others to draft something for full Council (and, if desired, Planning and Transportation Commission) review before then.
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Attachments:
July 8, 2011 Presentation by ABAG/MTC
July 5, 2011 Memo from ABAG/MTC re: SCS Land Use Scenario Assumptions
July 6, 2011 Memo from ABAG/MTC re: Plan Bay Area: Alternative Scenarios