
From: Pilar Lorenzana-Campo [mailto:pilar@siliconvalleyathome.org]

Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 9:38 PM

To: dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; Julie Pierce <jpierce@ci.clayton.ca.us>

Cc: Steve Heminger <SHeminger@mtc.ca.gov>; Ken Kirkey <KKirkey@mtc.ca.gov>; BradP@abag.ca.gov; Miriam Chion <miriamc@abag.ca.gov>; fredc@abag.ca.gov; Rosy Leyva <rleyva@mtc.ca.gov>

Subject: Re: (November 17, 2016, Item 4.a) Special Joint Metropolitan Transportation Commission together with the Association of Bay Area Governments Executive Board Meeting

Importance: High

Honorable MTC Chair Cortese, ABAG President Pierce, and members of the MTC Commission and ABAG Executive Board,

On behalf of our members, SV@Home thanks both agencies for their efforts to create a regional framework for coordinated land use and transportation planning.

We acknowledge and appreciate staff's tremendous effort to arrive at a meaningful and achievable Final Preferred Scenario and their efforts to respond to our feedback. We are heartened to see that adjustments were made in response to concerns we raised in our October 13th comment letter.

However, we still remain concerned about the following:

Exacerbation of the Jobs Housing Imbalance-- The assumptions contained in the Final Scenario are a vast improvement over the jobs and housing assumptions in the Draft Preferred Scenario.

However, despite these adjustments, we remain concerned that the Final Scenario continues to exacerbate Santa Clara County's already significant jobs and housing imbalance. For example, the revised projections show Cupertino with 5.46 jobs per households in 2040 – significantly reduced from the 7.41 jobs per households stemming from the Draft Preferred Scenario – but still much greater than the City's existing 1.29 jobs per household (2010). (See Attached analysis of job and housing growth in Santa Clara County cities.)

Disconnect with Current Housing Goals-- In some cases, housing projections are lower than housing plans currently approved or being considered by local jurisdictions. For a vast number of cities, the Final Scenario's household projections fall below household projections established by local general plans. For example, the Final Scenario projects 30,400 households in Milpitas by 2040, when the City's General Plan plans for 31,680 households during the same period. The City of Palo Alto is now considering a plan that would create more new housing units than the number required under the Final Scenario.

As you move forward in approving the Final Preferred Scenario and taking the next steps that will lead to adopting an Action Plan concurrently with Plan Bay Area adoption in 2017, we encourage the MTC Commissioners and the ABAG Executive Board to:

- **Take additional steps to ensure that the next iteration of Plan does not inadvertently endanger local efforts to strike a more equitable balance between jobs and housing across Santa Clara County communities and the greater Bay Area;**
- **Include short- and long-term strategies to achieve a better fit and balance between jobs and housing in the County and its respective jurisdictions; and**
- **Include a roadmap of specific short- and long-term housing policy actions to address the affordable housing goals of the Plan.**

Addressing the housing crisis falls squarely on the shoulders of our local, county, and regional bodies. We thank you for your leadership and urge you to continue to take bold and aggressive action to address our regional planning needs.

Sincerely,

Pilar Lorenzana-Campo
Policy Director
SV@Home
M (510) 255-1253
pilar@siliconvalleyathome.org



350 W Julian #5, San Jose, CA 95110



Table 1: Plan Bay Area 2040 Final Preferred Scenario (October 28, 2016)

Jurisdiction	Households		jobs per household		new households per year	
	2040 PBA projections	2040 General Plan projections	2010 actual	2040 final scenario	2040 PBA projections	2015-2022 RHNA
Campbell *	18,750	19,260	1.61	3.41	73	117
Cupertino *	22,950	24,040	1.29	5.46	68	133
Gilroy	19,600		1.25	0.79	187	136
Los Altos	11,720	11,268	1.37	2.62	41	60
Los Altos Hills *	3,020	3,300	0.73	0.71	6	15
Los Gatos *	13,040	13,785	1.91	1.40	38	77
Milpitas *	30,400	31,680	2.36	1.40	380	411
Monte Sereno *	1,320	1,498	1.21	0.14	2	8
Morgan Hill *	15,800	16,135	1.43	0.11	108	116
Mountain View	53,800	41,790	1.50	1.13	733	366
Palo Alto *	32,900	31,916	3.39	3.86	212	249
San Jose *	448,300	487,000	1.25	1.11	5,020	4,385
Santa Clara *	57,000	57,260	2.62	4.54	497	512
Saratoga *	10,960	*11,678	0.92	1.10	10	55
Sunnyvale	84,200	*66,934	1.40	1.35	1,053	682
Unincorporated Area	32,450	*26,952		1.06	212	35
TOTAL	856,210			1.46	8,640	

Legend

- Projected ratio that will likely exacerbate current jobs and housing imbalance (underhoused)
- Projected ratio that will likely exacerbate current jobs and housing imbalance (under employed)
- PBA per year housing projections that are less than yearly RHNA requirement
- * Communities with local plans that exceed housing projections