



August 15, 2010

Doug Kimsey, Planning Director
Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
101 Eighth St.
Oakland, CA 94607

Ken Kirkey, Planning Director
Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)
101 Eighth St.
Oakland, CA 94607

Subject: Comments and Requests for Information on the Sustainable Communities Strategy
Detailed Scenarios

Dear Doug and Ken:

We appreciate the hard work you and your staff are undertaking to develop the SCS Detailed Scenarios. As major stakeholders and contributors to the success of the SCS, the “Big Cities” are very interested in providing thoughtful and timely input into this process. The three largest cities account for 1/3 of the region’s housing growth in the Initial Vision Scenario, and our transit systems, including the BART and Caltrain services operating within and among our three cities, carry the vast majority of the region’s transit trips in any scenario. We know that our infrastructure requires major investment to meet this challenge.

The development of the preferred SCS/RTP scenario begins with the development of the detailed scenarios. Our collective planning, housing, and transportation agencies were pleased to see the recent actions at the ABAG Board and MTC Commission, modifying both the land use and transportation components of “Alternative 3 – Focused Growth” to incorporate “PDA-like” areas in the distribution of 70% of regional growth. It is essential that the SCS furthers the region’s planning goals and achievements, particularly in the equitable distribution of growth to communities that are best equipped to support new households and jobs.

As we prepare our input on the development of the detailed SCS land use and transportation networks, we would appreciate it if the regional agencies would provide clearer information about the assumptions and methods that are being used to shape these scenarios. In particular, we request that the following land use, demographic, and transportation data be provided as the region lays out the draft detailed SCS scenarios for public review and comment:

1. More Transparency in Steelhead Model Results: Thank you for the informational session that was provided to the CMA Planning Directors on July 27. We appreciated learning about Steelhead, the new land use model that is being proposed for use in the SCS. In order to assess the model's validity we would like to request base year (2010) and future baseline (2035) maps and tables depicting the following information:
 - a. 2010 population, 2010-2035 population growth by jurisdiction and transportation analysis zone (TAZ);
 - b. 2010 households, 2010-2035 household growth (natural growth and in-commuting/migration) by jurisdiction/TAZ, by income category;
 - c. 2010 employees per household, 2010-2035 growth in employees per household (for the region, or by county/TAZ should this vary across the region), and
 - d. 2010 employment, 2010-2035 employment growth, by jurisdiction/TAZ.
2. Analysis of Household Growth in PDA/GOA/PDA-like areas: We are further keen to understand the degree of change that is represented by the 70% figure of household growth in PDAs/GOAs (from the IVS), as compared with existing conditions. We note that all of our jurisdictions received considerably more growth in the IVS than we originally proposed for our PDAs. With the recent ABAG Board and MTC Commission action, we anticipate that the remaining four SCS scenarios will distribute this housing growth more appropriately to places that can and should accommodate their fair shares. For the growth assigned to the PDA/GOA and PDA-like areas that exceeds what has been proposed by the jurisdictions themselves, we further encourage that the Regional Equity Working Group's recommended quality of life factors approach to allocate the 30% of non-PDA growth also be applied to the distribution of this "excess" growth among the PDA/GOA and PDA-like areas. We request that the regional agencies provide maps and supporting tables showing:
 - a. The number and distribution of households today (existing 2010 conditions) in PDA/GOA/PDA-like areas vs. 2035 baseline;
 - b. The number and distribution of households as originally provided by jurisdictions in proposing their PDAs/GOAs vs. that which was included in the IVS;
 - c. The number and distribution of households – by income – in PDA/GOA/PDA-like areas vs. non PDA/GOA/PDA-like areas, for all five SCS detailed scenarios.
3. Analysis of Employment Growth in PDA/GOA/PDA-like areas: We also would like to see information for employment growth, similar to the information requested for items 2a and 2c.
4. Transportation corridor performance data for Bay Bridge Corridor, 101/BART/Caltrain Corridor, and I-880/BART to San Jose Corridor and clarification of other transportation assumptions. We suspect the IVS represents significantly more demand and a more congested core transportation network as compared with T2035 projected outcomes, as well as existing conditions, but it is difficult to gauge this without comparative information. We

would like to see maps showing the frequency of service, demand, and degree of expected crowding on transit services within and connecting the three big cities in the IVS scenario. We also encourage the transportation networks for the SCS scenarios to maximize Bus Rapid Transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements within and between our jurisdictions. Finally, we request a clarification of the proposed pricing and demand management strategies for both SCS transportation networks, and note that these should be fully deployed as warranted to help meet our regional goals.

Thank you for considering our comments and requests. The above information would be most useful in the coming weeks and months, as the region releases draft SCS scenario definitions and the Project Performance Assessment results. We look forward to discussing these items at the September Regional Advisory Working Group meeting, and other forums.

Sincerely,

David Alumbaugh
Manager, City Design Group
San Francisco Planning Department

Eric Angstadt
Deputy Director
Oakland Community and Economic Development Agency

Tilly Chang
Deputy Director for Planning
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

Laurel Prevetti
Assistant Director
San Jose Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

Iris Starr
Division Manager, Infrastructure Plans and Programming
City of Oakland Public Works Agency