



## SCENARIO PLANNING REPORT



# Plan BayArea 2040

FINAL  
SUPPLEMENTAL  
REPORT



Metropolitan  
Transportation  
Commission



Association  
of Bay Area  
Governments

JULY 2017

## Metropolitan Transportation Commission

**Jake Mackenzie, Chair**  
Sonoma County and Cities

**Scott Haggerty, Vice Chair**  
Alameda County

**Alicia C. Aguirre**  
Cities of San Mateo County

**Tom Azumbrado**  
U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development

**Jeannie Bruins**  
Cities of Santa Clara County

**Damon Connolly**  
Marin County and Cities

**Dave Cortese**  
Santa Clara County

**Carol Dutra-Vernaci**  
Cities of Alameda County

**Dorene M. Giacomini**  
U.S. Department of Transportation

**Federal D. Glover**  
Contra Costa County

**Anne W. Halsted**  
San Francisco Bay Conservation  
and Development Commission

**Nick Josefowitz**  
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

**Jane Kim**  
City and County of San Francisco

**Sam Liccardo**  
San Jose Mayor's Appointee

**Alfredo Pedroza**  
Napa County and Cities

**Julie Pierce**  
Association of Bay Area  
Governments

**Bijan Sartipi**  
California State  
Transportation Agency

**Libby Schaaf**  
Oakland Mayor's Appointee

**Warren Slocum**  
San Mateo County

**James P. Spering**  
Solano County and Cities

**Amy R. Worth**  
Cities of Contra Costa County

## Association of Bay Area Governments

**Councilmember Julie Pierce**  
**ABAG President**  
City of Clayton

**Supervisor David Rabbitt**  
**ABAG Vice President**  
County of Sonoma

### Representatives From Each County

**Supervisor Scott Haggerty**  
Alameda

**Supervisor Nathan Miley**  
Alameda

**Supervisor Candace Andersen**  
Contra Costa

**Supervisor Karen Mitchoff**  
Contra Costa

**Supervisor Dennis Rodoni**  
Marin

**Supervisor Belia Ramos**  
Napa

**Supervisor Norman Yee**  
San Francisco

**Supervisor David Canepa**  
San Mateo

**Supervisor Dave Pine**  
San Mateo

**Supervisor Cindy Chavez**  
Santa Clara

**Supervisor David Cortese**  
Santa Clara

**Supervisor Erin Hannigan**  
Solano

### Representatives From Cities in Each County

**Mayor Trish Spencer**  
City of Alameda / Alameda

**Mayor Barbara Halliday**  
City of Hayward / Alameda

**Vice Mayor Dave Hudson**  
City of San Ramon / Contra Costa

**Councilmember Pat Eklund**  
City of Novato / Marin

**Mayor Leon Garcia**  
City of American Canyon / Napa

**Mayor Edwin Lee**  
City and County of San Francisco

**John Rahaim, Planning Director**  
City and County of San Francisco

**Todd Rufo, Director, Economic  
and Workforce Development,  
Office of the Mayor**  
City and County of San Francisco

**Mayor Wayne Lee**  
City of Millbrae / San Mateo

**Mayor Pradeep Gupta**  
City of South San Francisco /  
San Mateo

**Mayor Liz Gibbons**  
City of Campbell / Santa Clara

**Mayor Greg Scharff**  
City of Palo Alto / Santa Clara

**Mayor Len Augustine**  
City of Vacaville / Solano

**Mayor Jake Mackenzie**  
City of Rohnert Park / Sonoma

**Councilmember**  
**Annie Campbell Washington**  
City of Oakland / Alameda

**Councilmember**  
**Lynette Gibson McElhaney**  
City of Oakland / Alameda

**Councilmember Abel Guillen**  
City of Oakland / Alameda

**Councilmember Raul Peralez**  
City of San Jose / Santa Clara

**Councilmember Sergio Jimenez**  
City of San Jose / Santa Clara

**Councilmember Lan Diep**  
City of San Jose / Santa Clara

### Advisory Members

**William Kissinger**  
Regional Water Quality  
Control Board



**Plan Bay Area 2040:**

# Final Scenario Planning Report

July 2017



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION



Association of  
Bay Area Governments

Bay Area Metro Center 375 Beale Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

(415) 778-6700  
[info@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
[www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

*phone*  
*e-mail*  
*web*

(415) 820-7900  
[info@abag.ca.gov](mailto:info@abag.ca.gov)  
[www.abag.ca.gov](http://www.abag.ca.gov)

## Project Staff

**Ken Kirkey**

Director, Planning

**Matt Maloney**

Assistant Director, Planning

**Adam Noelting**

Principal Planner

**David Vautin**

Principal Planner

**Mike Reilly**

Principal Planner

**Kristen Villanueva**

Associate Planner

## Table of Contents

<b>Plan Bay Area 2040:</b> .....	<b>1</b>
List of Figures.....	3
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>Scenario Planning</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Approach .....	2
Process.....	2
Land Use Strategies .....	3
Transportation Strategies.....	4
<b>Scenarios for the Planning Process</b> .....	<b>4</b>
No Project Scenario .....	5
Scenario 1 – Main Streets.....	5
Scenario 2 – Connected Neighborhoods .....	5
Scenario 3 – Big Cities.....	5
<b>Land Use and Transportation Assumptions across Scenarios</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Scenario 4 – Environment, Equity and Jobs .....	11

List of Tables

Table 1. Land use assumptions across scenarios .....6

Table 2. Relative levels of transportation investments across scenarios .....7

## List of Figures

Figure 1. Scenarios evaluated in the planning process.....	8
Figure 2. Household growth pattern for Main Streets scenario .....	11
Figure 3. Household growth pattern for Connected Neighborhoods scenario .....	12
Figure 4. Household growth pattern for Big Cities scenario .....	13

## Executive Summary

Staff developed and evaluated four alternative land use and transportation scenarios illustrating the effects that different housing, land use and transportation strategies would have on adopted Plan Bay Area 2040 goals and performance targets. Each scenario displayed a different combination of housing development, commercial growth, and transportation investments. Scenario development was a key input for constructing the Preferred Scenario, which is now the Draft Plan.



## Introduction

In order to understand what the Bay Area may look like in 2040, MTC and ABAG generated regional projections of households and jobs, as well as transportation system needs and a forecast of revenues to fund improvements. To understand how these projections might play out over time — and to ensure the region is able to meet the goals and targets for Plan Bay Area 2040 — staff developed and evaluated different scenarios for future growth. Each scenario presented a different combination of residential and commercial growth, and transportation investments to support the growth. Based on public input, coordination with transportation agencies throughout the region, and scenario evaluation, staff created and the MTC Commission/ABAG Executive Board adopted the Preferred Scenario — a forecasted development pattern of household and job growth and corresponding transportation investment strategy for the region — which is now the Draft Plan.

This report describes the scenario planning approach, describes the scenario development and refinement process, describes the scenarios considered, and provides a comparison of land use and transportation strategies across these scenarios. A full description of the Draft Plan is included in the main document. More technical information on the land use and transportation inputs to the scenarios are in the *Land Use Modeling Report* and the *Travel Modeling Report*. Evaluations of the scenarios against the Plan’s adopted targets is in the in the Performance Assessment Report. These supplemental reports can be found here: <http://2040.planbayarea.org/reports>

## Scenario Planning

### Approach

In November 2015, MTC and ABAG staff shared the Scenario Planning Approach. The approach focused on the mandates of Senate Bill (SB) 375, reiterating the goals of reducing per capita greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions while housing the region’s forecasted population, and discussed the importance of scenario planning in the Plan development process. The recommended approach for the Plan focused on:

- A single round of scenario analysis and evaluation, and a maximum of three scenarios;
- Constructing scenarios in an effort to achieve the Plan’s adopted goals and performance targets;
- Ensuring the process would inform the creation of a preferred scenario; and,
- Carrying over the scenarios into the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) alternatives assessment process.

The recommended approach also identified anticipated milestones, development tools (e.g. Bay Area UrbanSim and Travel Model One), common growth projection assumptions, and potential land use and transportation strategies. This approach memo was the foundation for the Plan’s initial scenario concepts and the public process described in the following sections.

### Process

MTC and ABAG staff developed three scenario concepts designed to integrate the three E’s — environment, equity and economy — across each of them, while achieving the mandates of SB 375. All three scenario concepts used the region’s established framework of Priority Development Areas (PDA) and Priority Conservation Areas (PCA); however, each of the scenario concepts incorporated a forecasted development pattern that contemplated different intensities of household and job growth

in the PDAs across the region. Each scenario concept was paired with a transportation investment strategy needed to support the forecasted development pattern. The result was three conceptual scenarios with distinct forecasted development patterns of household and job growth and corresponding transportation investments.

In October 2015, MTC and ABAG began the public process of refining the scenario concepts into official scenarios for analysis and evaluation by holding two scenario workshops at the Regional Advisory Working Group (RAWG) and ABAG's Regional Planning Committee to present and discuss three scenario concepts. The purpose of the workshops was to receive feedback on the initial scenario concepts, as well as specific strategies for how to maximize their effectiveness. Some 80 participants attended the RAWG workshop, representing a mix of staff from local planning agencies, transit operators, congestion management agency (CMA) staff, as well as leaders from business, building, environmental, public health and social justice organizations. A number of members of MTC's Policy Advisory Council also joined the dialogue. Another 50 participants attended the ABAG's Regional Planning Committee, which included a range of public sector, nonprofit and community representatives as well as local elected officials.

After a short overview of scenario planning approach, participants at the workshops had the opportunity to engage in small-group discussions around the initial scenario concepts. Participants were asked for their feedback on the scenario concepts, and their suggested housing, jobs and transportation policy strategies that would allow each scenario concept to be successful in achieving the Plan's goals. Workshop participants were also asked what they found most promising and most challenging and any other important issues for consideration in developing scenarios. A complete summary of the workshop comments organized by overall goals for scenario planning; general comments on the process; and specific comments on each of the three draft scenario concepts were presented at the MTC Planning Committee/ABAG Administrative Committee's November 2015 meeting.

Over the next several months, MTC and ABAG continued to develop and refine the suggested housing, jobs and transportation policy strategies into actions that could be modeled in MTC's integrated model framework of UrbanSim and Travel Model One. Specific land use policies (also commonly referred to as 'strategies' or 'assumptions') were identified to influence each scenario's forecasted development pattern to emulate the growth pattern envisioned in the three scenario concepts. The goal of the three scenarios were to illustrate the effects that different housing, land use and transportation strategies could have on the Plan's adopted goals and performance targets.

In May 2016, MTC and ABAG presented the evaluation of the scenarios' different housing, land use and transportation strategies had on the Plan's adopted goals and performance targets. The evaluation was described to inform the development of the region's "preferred scenario," which was anticipated to incorporate some of the best aspects of the three scenarios. The results of this evaluation are described in the *Performance Assessment Report*, found at: <http://2040.planbayarea.org/reports>.

## Land Use Strategies

By 2040, ABAG forecasts an additional 1.3 million jobs and 2.4 million people for the Bay Area and therefore the need for approximately 820,000 more housing units between 2010 and 2040. Each scenario varied combinations of land use policies that either local jurisdictions or regional and state agencies could enact in order to influence the regional growth pattern and accommodate this future growth. These strategies could influence land use patterns by adjusting a community's capacity for new development or providing financial incentives for a particular type or location of growth. Each scenario

builds on the Bay Area's existing land use pattern and transportation network, while also taking into account local plans for growth, historical trends, and the results of the most recent PDA assessment.

The different land use strategies varied intensity and location of future growth of residential and commercial buildings, highlighting growth distributions within three distinct geographic regions:

- Big 3 (the region's three largest cities – San Jose, San Francisco and Oakland)
- Bayside (generally cities directly adjacent to San Francisco Bay – e.g., Hayward, San Mateo and Richmond)
- Inland, Coastal, and Delta (generally cities just outside the Bayside region – e.g., Walnut Creek, Dublin, Santa Rosa, Antioch, Brentwood and Dixon)

The types of land use strategies and policies considered include the following:

- Changes to allowable zoning densities
- Restrictions on development of open space or beyond urban growth boundaries
- Caps on office development
- Requirements for deed-restricted units in new development
- Eased parking minimums and CEQA streamlining to stimulate development
- Fees on commercial or residential development in high-VMT areas
- Subsidies for affordable housing
- Tax policies, including adjusting the parcel tax; implementing a housing capital gains tax; and adjusting property tax assessments to be based largely on the value of the land and less so on the improvement (e.g. building portion of the property)

Additionally, focusing different levels of household growth in various *geographies* is a key differentiating land use strategy across scenarios. These geographies could be close to transit, close to good schools, and/or locally-nominated areas for growth. One way to measure the differences across scenario is to assess growth levels in PDAs and Transit Priority Areas (TPAs). PDAs are existing neighborhoods served by transit and nominated by local jurisdictions as appropriate for concentrating future growth. PDAs were developed as part of the process for the last Plan Bay Area and remain an important implementation mechanism for Plan Bay Area 2040. TPAs are half-mile buffers around high-frequency transit stops or stations.

## Transportation Strategies

Plan Bay Area 2040 forecasts \$303 billion of federal, state, regional and local transportation revenues over the next 24 years. Of this amount, approximately \$74 billion (24 percent of total Plan revenues) is assumed to be discretionary. Transportation improvements within the scenarios varied in terms of how this \$74 billion was distributed across maintenance, system enhancement and major capital projects.

Each of the scenarios assumes both different shares of funding for major projects or maintenance and different shares of funding for roads (highways and local roads) and public transit. The scenarios maintain a consistent level of investment in system enhancements, comprising several discretionary funding sources including One Bay Area Grant, Regional Transportation Improvement Program and other sources for active transportation and goods movement.

## Scenarios for the Planning Process

For comparison purposes, the scenario process included a No Project scenario and three variations of future growth and transportation investment – Main Streets, Connected Neighborhoods and Big Cities.

These are described in the following section.



*Figure 1. Scenarios evaluated in the planning process*

## No Project Scenario

Staff evaluated each scenario, including the Preferred Scenario, against a No Project. The No Project scenario assumes no new growth strategies (upzoning, office caps, CEQA streamlining, etc.) would be implemented, meaning future growth likely would follow historic trends. Urban growth boundaries would be allowed to expand at historical rates, while only committed transportation projects (e.g., those under construction) would be allowed to proceed.

## Scenario 1 – Main Streets

The Main Streets scenario forecasts the most dispersed growth pattern, meaning cities outside of the region's largest — Oakland, San Jose and San Francisco — are likely to see higher levels of growth than in other scenarios. An emphasis on multi-family and mixed-use development in downtowns would provide opportunities for households of all incomes to live near a mix of jobs, shopping, services and other amenities. For transportation investments, the Main Streets scenario expands express lanes, increases highway capacity, and increases suburban bus service to increasingly-dispersed job centers. This scenario also includes significant investment for maintaining highways and local roads.

## Scenario 2 – Connected Neighborhoods

The Connected Neighborhoods Scenario emphasizes growth in medium-sized cities with access to the region's major rail services. Outside of PDAs, this scenario has modest infill development and no growth outside the urban footprint on currently undeveloped land. This scenario most closely follows the footprint of the original Plan Bay Area. The Connected Neighborhoods scenario prioritizes transit efficiency investments and the most cost-effective transit expansion projects in the highest-growth PDAs. It also includes a limited set of highway efficiency investments, and balances maintenance investment between roads and transit.

Ultimately, this scenario was eliminated during the EIR scoping process as it most closely resembled the Draft Plan and was not needed to create a reasonable range of alternatives to the Draft Plan.

## Scenario 3 – Big Cities

The Big Cities Scenario targets future population and employment growth within the three largest job centers - San Francisco, Silicon Valley and Oakland. Over two-thirds of household growth and almost half of employment growth would be in these three areas. Neighboring cities already well-connected to the region's three largest cities also would see growth, particularly in their locally adopted PDAs. Growth outside the region's three big cities would be relatively small, with limited infill development in PDAs and no development on currently undeveloped land. This scenario emphasizes core capacity and

connectivity by expanding the South Bay transit system and linking regional rail systems into the heart of San Francisco and San Jose. This scenario also includes congestion pricing in San Francisco and significant investment in transit maintenance.

## Land Use and Transportation Assumptions across Scenarios

As shown in the following table, land use assumptions varied across the scenarios, with different assumptions for upzoning, open space expansion, parking minimums, affordable housing requirements, development fees based on VMT, and subsidies for affordable housing. Maps of estimated land use distributions resulting from these assumptions, for the three scenarios, are shown in Figures 2 through 4.

**Table 1. Land use assumptions across scenarios.**

Land Use Strategy	Main Streets	Connected Neighborhoods	Big Cities
Upzoning	Modest increase in all PDAs, with an emphasis on suburban PDAs	PDAs	TPAs in Big 3 & neighboring cities
Open space/UGB expansion	Modest	None	None
Eased parking minimums	PDAs along regional rail	PDAs along corridors	Big 3 & neighboring cities
Affordable housing requirements on new development	5 percent of units deed-restricted in high-opportunity cities	10 percent of units deed-restricted in cities with PDAs	10 percent of units deed-restricted in cities with PDAs
Fees/subsidies for deed-restricted units in low-VMT areas	Yes- fee on new commercial in high VMT areas	None	Yes- fee on new residential in high VMT areas
Subsidies	Stimulate residential and commercial development in PDAs	Stimulate residential and commercial development in PDAs	Stimulate residential and commercial development in PDAs
Caps on Office Space	Preserves office space caps in job-rich cities	Preserves office space caps in job-rich cities	Eliminates office space caps in San Francisco
Tax Policies	Parcel and housing capital gains tax to raise revenues for affordable housing	None	Change property tax assessment to focus on land value rather than structure value

Transportation investments across scenarios provided a comparison between dispersed, roadway-oriented investments and focused growth with major capacity investments in regional transit. In the Main Streets scenario (scenario 1), over half of all discretionary investments were directed towards state of good repair, fully funding state highway pavement needs and moving the region much closer to a state of good repair on local streets. Major projects were more focused on highway improvements – which feature lower operating and maintenance costs than public transit – and thus constituted a smaller share of the distribution. In Connected Neighborhoods (scenario 2) and Big Cities (scenario 3),

there were significantly greater needs for transit frequency increases and new core capacity transit lines, resulting in a smaller share of funding going towards maintenance (in particular, highway and local street maintenance).

**Table 2. Relative levels of transportation investments across scenarios.**

Transportation Mode and Purpose		Main Streets	Connected Neighborhoods	Big Cities
Streets & Highways	State of Good Repair	●●●	●●	●
	Efficiency	●●●	●●●	●●
	Expansion / Extension	●●●	●●	●
Public Transit	State of Good Repair	●●●	●●	●
	Efficiency / Operations	●●	●●●	●●●
	Expansion / Extension	●	●●	●●●
Bicycle / Pedestrian		●●	●●	●●
Climate Strategies		●●●	●●●	●●●



Figure 2. Household growth pattern for Main Streets scenario




Figure 3. Household growth pattern for Connected Neighborhoods scenario







Figure 4. Household growth pattern for Big Cities scenario



## Scenario 4 – Environment, Equity and Jobs

This scenario was not analyzed during the initial round of scenario planning but instead was added as a result of stakeholder comments during the EIR scoping process.

The Environment, Equity, and Jobs (EEJ) scenario was analyzed in the original Plan Bay Area and was subsequently updated for Plan Bay Area 2040 scenario analysis. The updated scenario, EEJ 2.0, emphasizes household growth in PDAs, transit-priority areas, and in suburban communities with high-quality schools and low levels of crime (referred to as high-opportunity areas). This scenario includes more funding for local bus operations in suburban high-opportunity areas to serve lower-income residents, and reduces funding for highway expansion and modernization. This alternative assumes implementation of a two-cent-per-mile vehicle-miles-traveled (VMT) tax on higher-income travelers. By exploring a blend of a more dispersed land use pattern and a transit-focused investment package, the addition of this scenario expanded the range of reasonable alternatives to the Draft Plan.

In comparison to the proposed Plan, the EEJ (v 2.0) alternative includes strategies to focus more growth in high-opportunity areas than the proposed Plan. Assumptions include upzoning in select PDAs, TPAs and suburban communities with high-quality schools and low levels of crime (i.e., high-opportunity areas), assuming for-profit housing developments make 20 percent of units deed-restricted in perpetuity in select cities with PDAs or TPAs and high-opportunity cities, preserving urban growth boundaries, and easing parking minimums in PDAs and TPAs.