

MAYORS' & COUNCILMEMBERS' ASSOCIATION OF SONOMA COUNTY
Cloverdale, Cotati, Healdsburg, Petaluma, Rohnert Park, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol, Sonoma, Windsor

Meeting of Thursday, June 13, 2019

6:00 pm - 7:00 pm

RECEPTION

7:00 PM

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING

Thursday, June 13, 2019

Sonoma County Library Administration Headquarters
6135 State Farm Drive
Rohnert Park CA

AGENDA

1. **Call to Order –**

2. **Roll Call**

Cloverdale		Petaluma		Sebastopol	
Cotati		Rohnert Park		Sonoma	
Healdsburg		Santa Rosa		Windsor	

3. **Introductions**

4. **Approval of Minutes:** April 11, 2019

5. **Public Comment:**

6. **Correspondence:** Report from Sonoma County Library

7. **Business Item:**

- a. Report on Home Sonoma Leadership Council and Request for Board to Submit a Request to the Cities for Direction on Future Governance (Assistant City Manager Don Schwartz)

8. **Program:**

- a. Presentation by Grant Davis, Sonoma County Water Agency, Regarding the Potter Valley Project

9. **Reports:**

- a. Board of Directors Meeting and Appointments (Chair Harrington)
b. City Manager's Committee – City Manager Chair (Sonoma).
c. Committee Reports (see attached list)
d. City Mayor's Report (Events/Items of Interest) (See Attached reports from Cities)

9. **Announcement:**

10. **Adjournment:** To next General Membership Meeting: August 8, 2019 - City of Santa Rosa CA.

Upcoming Meetings:

August 8, 2019 City of Santa Rosa
October 10, 2019 City of Sebastopol

* * * * *

Copies of all staff reports and documents subject to disclosure that relate to any item of business referred to on the agenda are available for public inspection the Thursday prior to the regularly scheduled meeting at

Sonoma City Hall, City Clerk's Office, No 1 The Plaza, Sonoma, or by visiting the City of Sonoma's website at www.sonomacity.org. Any documents subject to disclosure that are provided to all, or a majority of all, of the

members of the Association regarding any item on this agenda, after the agenda has been distributed, will be made available for inspection at the Sonoma City Hall, City Clerk's Office, No 1 The Plaza, Sonoma, CA during regular business hours. Contact number: (707) 933-2216. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Sonoma City Clerk's office at (707) 933-2216. Notification 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Association to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting.

MAYORS' & COUNCILMEMBERS' ASSOCIATION OF SONOMA COUNTY

Cloverdale, Cotati, Healdsburg, Petaluma, Rohnert Park, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol, Sonoma, Windsor

Meeting of Thursday, January 31, 2019

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP MEETING

Petaluma, CA

7:00PM

MINUTES

1. **Call to Order** – Meeting was called to order by Chair Amy Harrington (Sonoma) at 7:53 p.m.

2. **Roll Call – Chair Harrington called for the roll call:**

Present:	City of Cloverdale	Mayor Melanie Bagby
	City of Cotati	Mayor John Del'Osso
	City of Healdsburg	Mayor David Hagele
	City of Petaluma	Mayor Teresa Barrett
	City of Rohnert Park	Mayor Gina Belforte
	City of Santa Rosa	Mayor Tom Schwedhelm
	City of Sebastopol	Mayor Neysa Hinton
	City of Sonoma	Mayor Amy Harrington
	Town of Windsor	Mayor Dominic Foppoli

3. **Introductions**

Ann Hammond, Sonoma County Library Director, introduced herself and her guests. Each Mayor provided introductions.

4. **Approval of Minutes:** January 31, 2019

Motion by the City of Rohnert Park, seconded by the City of Healdsburg, to approve the January 31, 2019 General Membership Meeting Minutes as submitted.

VOTE:

Ayes: Cities of Cloverdale, Cotati, Healdsburg, Petaluma, Rohnert Park, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol, Sonoma, and Town of Windsor

Noes: None

Absent: None

Abstain: None

Motion carried.

5. **Public Comment:** There was no public comment.

6. **Correspondence:** None

7. **Program:**

(a) Presentation by Supervisor David Rabbitt regarding the Bay Area Housing Crisis

8. **Reports:**

- a. Board of Directors Meeting and Appointments (Chair Harrington)
- b. City Selection Committee and Appointments (Chair Harrington)

Chair Harrington announced the results of the Committee appointments from the City Selection and Mayors and Councilmembers Board Meetings.

- c. City Manager's Committee – City Manager Chair (Sonoma).
- d. Committee Reports (see attached list)
- e. City Mayor's Report (Events/Items of Interest) (See Attached reports from Cities)

9. **Announcement(s)**

Mayor Belforte (Rohnert Park) announced the upcoming Golden Gate Bridge Tour.

10. **Adjournment:** Chair Harrington adjourned the meeting to the next General Membership Meeting: June 13, 2019 in the City of Rohnert Park, CA.

Respectfully Submitted by:

Rebekah Barr
City of Sonoma City Clerk
Recording Secretary – 2019 Chair City

Upcoming Meetings:

August 8, 2019	City of Santa Rosa
October 10, 2019	City of Sebastopol

ITEM 9.b

CITY MANAGER'S COMMITTEE REPORTS



June 13, 2019

TO: Sonoma County Mayors and Councilmembers Association

FROM: Cathy Capriola, City Manager, City of Sonoma
2019 Chair, Sonoma Area City Managers Group

SUBJECT: City Managers' Committee Reports

Below is a list of the discussion items from recent Sonoma County City Managers meetings.

April 12, 2019 (Special Joint Meeting with Napa County City Managers)

Presentation

- Highway 37 & Transportation (Suzanne Smith, SCTA and Kate Miller, NVTA)

Discussions:

- Emergency preparedness and regional 211
- Fire recovery and related legislation
- Housing / CASA Compact
- Impacts of tasting rooms in downtowns
- PG&E bankruptcy
- Marijuana cultivation and dispensaries

May 30, 2019

Presentation

- SCTA Measure M Ballot Measure – Suzanne Smith
- RCPA Strategic Plan / Climate Action Update – Suzanne Smith and Aleka Seville

Discussions:

- Emergency Preparedness / PG&E De-energization
- 2020 Census
- Parks Measure M Maintenance of Effort
- HOME Sonoma County Governance Structure

ITEM 9.c
COMMITTEE REPORTS

MAYORS' & COUNCILMEMBERS' ASSOCIATION OF SONOMA COUNTY

COMMITTEE REPORTS

June 13, 2019

Agency	Appointee	Report
ABAG Executive Board	Jake Mackenzie, Rohnert Park Alternate: Julie Combs, Santa Rosa	Attached
ABAG Hazardous Waste Mgmt Facility Allocation	Susan Harvey, Cotati	
ABAG Regional Planning Committee	Julie Combs, Santa Rosa	
Airport Land Use Commission	Gabe Kearney, Petaluma Sam Salmon, Windsor Jack Tibbets, Santa Rosa	
Bay Area Air Quality Management District Board	Teresa Barrett, Petaluma	Attached
Child Care Planning Council of Sonoma County	Julie Combs, Santa Rosa	
Golden Gate Bridge, Highway & Transportation District	Gina Belforte, Rohnert Park	
Legislative Committee	Appointed by Member Cities	
Local Agency Formation Commission	Pam Stafford, Rohnert Park Teresa Barrett, Petaluma Alternate: Mark Landman, Cotati	Attached
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Jake Mackenzie, Rohnert Park	Attached
North Bay Division, LOCC Executive Board	Susan Harvey, Cotati Rachel Hundley, Sonoma Alt: John Sawver, Santa Rosa	
North Coast Rail Authority (NCRA)	David Hagele, Healdsburg	Attached

Remote Access Network (RAN) Board(meets once a year)	Gina Belforte, Rohnert Park	
Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation & Open Space District (Citizens Advisory Committee)	John Dell'Osso, Cotati Leah Gold, Healdsburg Neysa Hinton, Sebastopol	Attached
Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit Commission (SMART)	SCTA - Joe Naujokes, Healdsburg SCTA - Chris Rogers, Santa Rosa Non-SCTA - Debora Fudge, Windsor	Attached
Sonoma County Oversight Board Committee (County-wide)	Chris Rogers, Santa Rosa Alternate: David Cook, Sonoma	
Note: North Coast Railroad Authority Board of Directors seat rotates to Mendocino, Sonoma, Humboldt		

MTC/ABAG

COMMITTEE REPORT TO MAYORS & COUNCILMEMBERS ASSOCIATION

Council Member Jake Mackenzie
City of Rohnert Park

- I have recently submitted for distribution electronically our combined recent positions on Housing Legislation.
- Attached are membership lists of Chair Haggerty and President Rabbitt's Governance Committee ; this is in Response to the MTC/ABAG MOU which requires a review of possible methods of combined governance.
- Plan Bay Area 2050: Documents attached.

Thanks Jake

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

May 22, 2019

HANDOUT - Agenda Item 2b

Appointments to the Joint ABAG MTC Governance Committee

Subject: Appointments to the Joint ABAG MTC Governance Committee

Background: The Memorandum of Understanding of May 2017 between the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission provides for beginning discussion of future governance options no later than July 1, 2019.

David Rabbitt, ABAG President, and Scott Haggerty, MTC Chair, have agreed to create a Joint ABAG MTC Governance Committee to study options and to report back to the ABAG Executive Board and the MTC Commission on recommendations related to governance.

Chair Haggerty has made the following MTC appointments to the Governance Committee:

- Scott Haggerty, Supervisor, Alameda County
- Alfredo Pedroza, Supervisor, Napa County
- Nick Josefowitz, Mayor's Appointee, City & County of San Francisco
- Jim Spering, Supervisor, Solano County
- Dave Cortese, Supervisor, Santa Clara County
- Amy Worth, Mayor, City of Orinda, Contra Costa County

Issues: None

Recommendation: The Commission is requested to approve MTC appointments to the Joint ABAG MTC Governance Committee.

Attachments: None

Reviewed:



Therese W. McMillan

Association of Bay Area Governments

Executive Board

May 16, 2019

Agenda Item 4.a.

Ratification of Appointments to the Joint ABAG MTC Governance Committee

Subject: Ratification of Appointments to the Joint ABAG MTC Governance Committee

Background: The Memorandum of Understanding of May 2017 between the Association of Bay Area Governments and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission provides for beginning discussion of future governance options no later than July 1, 2019.

David Rabbitt, ABAG President, and Scott Haggerty, MTC Chair, have agreed to create a Joint ABAG MTC Governance Committee to study options and to report back to the ABAG Executive Board and the MTC Commission on recommendations related to governance.

President Rabbitt has selected the following for appointment to the Governance Committee:

- David Rabbitt, Supervisor, Sonoma County
- Jesse Arreguin, Mayor, City of Berkeley, Alameda County
- Cindy Chavez, Supervisor, Santa Clara County
- Julie Pierce, Council Member, City of Clayton, Contra Costa County
- Dennis Rodoni, Supervisor, Marin County
- Warren Slocum, Supervisor, San Mateo County

ABAG members of the Governance Committee are eligible to receive per diem in the amount of \$150 for each meeting attended.

Issues: None

Recommended Action: The ABAG Executive Board is requested to ratify ABAG appointments to the Joint ABAG MTC Governance Committee.

Attachments: None.

Reviewed:



Therese W. McMillan

Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments Joint MTC Planning Committee with the ABAG Administrative Committee

May 10, 2019

Agenda Item 5a

Plan Bay Area 2050 - Regional Growth Framework Revisions

- Subject:** Staff is presenting a status and performance report on current Priority Development Areas (PDAs) as requested at prior meetings. In addition, staff is requesting that the ABAG Administrative Committee and MTC Planning Committee refer the proposed revisions to the Regional Growth Framework (PDA, Priority Conservation Area and proposed new Priority Production Area pilot) highlighted in this memo and its attachments to their respective governing boards for approval.
- Background:** Last month, staff presented on the Regional Growth Framework Update process in advance of Plan Bay Area 2050, which will kick off in September 2019. Staff identified a suite of potential revisions, including addressing shortcomings of today's Priority Development Areas (PDAs), allowing for nominations of new growth areas, and considering incorporating state-identified Transit Priority Areas and High Opportunity Areas. To respond to Committee requests, this month staff is providing in-depth information about the performance and status of each PDA and presenting detailed proposals to strengthen the current framework.
- Issues:** **Priority Development Areas – Status and Performance.** The Horizon Regional Growth Strategies Perspective Paper assessed the region's progress toward implementing the current Regional Growth Framework – a look back at how we've done. While there have been notable successes, many PDAs do not meet the program transit criteria and half of all state-designated Transit Priority Areas (TPAs, or transit-rich locations) have not been nominated by a local jurisdiction to become a PDA. As we chart a path forward, it was equally important to assess the performance of the PDAs against the Horizon Guiding Principles. From that performance analysis, residents of PDAs face disproportionately higher levels of displacement risk and limited access to opportunity. **Attachments D and E** provide detailed information about the status and performance of each PDA, respectively.
- Priority Development Areas – Path Forward.** The regional planning landscape has changed significantly in the past decade, with an escalating housing crisis, growing recognition of the importance of equity and resilience, and new transportation technologies setting the stage for a more comprehensive approach to shaping the Bay Area's growth.
- To reflect this reality, staff proposes updating the definition of a PDA as: *an infill location that is planned for significant housing and job growth, offers a suite of mobility options which enable residents to live a car-free or car-light lifestyle, and promotes greater opportunity for all, regardless of race or income.* To operationalize this new definition and to provide greater flexibility for local jurisdictions to meet program guidelines, staff proposes establishing two categories of PDAs:
- **Transit-Rich PDA**
 - ✓ PDA Plan for housing and job growth, including affordable housing, adopted or to be completed by 2025; and
 - ✓ High-Quality Transit: at least 50% of land in PDA is within ½ mile of an existing or planned rail station, ferry terminal, or bus line with headways of no more than 15 minutes in peak periods (i.e., Transit Priority Area).
 - **Connected Community PDA**
 - ✓ PDA Plan for housing and job growth: adopted, or to be completed no later than 2025; and

- ✓ Basic Transit: at least 50% of land in PDA is within ½ mile of an existing or planned bus line with headways of no more than 30 minutes in peak periods, and one of the following:
 - ✓ High Resource: located in a high resource area (HRA) as defined by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD); or
 - ✓ Supportive Policies: adoption, or commitment to adopt, two or more policies shown to reduce vehicle miles traveled, described in greater detail in **Attachment F** by January 2020.

For PDAs that do not meet the updated transit requirements, staff proposes allowing CTAs and local jurisdictions until September 2019 to identify one or more improvementsⁱ necessary to meet at least the Connected Community standard. Staff proposes providing until September 2019 for jurisdictions without PDA Plans to provide an expected start and adoption date for a Plan.

Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs): No changes are proposed to the definition or criteria for PCAs at this time.

Priority Production Areas (PPAs): PPAs are proposed to be advanced through a pilot program in Plan Bay Area 2050, with an opportunity for further refinement post-Plan adoption in 2021. Staff proposes adoption of the following criteria for PPAs:

- ✓ Zoned for industrial use or has a high concentration of industrial activities, and
- ✓ Does not overlap with a PDA and does not include land within one-half mile of a regional rail station or ferry terminal, and
- ✓ The local jurisdiction has a certified Housing Element

Detailed information about the proposed PPA program is included in **Attachment H**.

Next Steps:

Staff request that the ABAG Administrative Committee and MTC Planning Committee refer the resolutions in Attachment A, which make the revisions to the Regional Growth Framework described in this memo and its attachments, to their respective governing boards for approval. Following adoption, ABAG/MTC staff will engage local jurisdiction and CTA staff, as well as elected officials, to advance new PDAs, PPAs and PCAs, and to ensure existing PDAs meet program standards.

Attachments:

Attachment A: ABAG Resolution 02-19 and MTC Resolution 4386

Attachment B: Overview of Proposed Framework Geographies

Attachment C: Presentation

Attachment D: Status of Current PDAs - Program Criteria and Housing Permits


Attachment E: Performance of Current Priority Development Areas (PDAs) - Key Indicators

Attachment F: Supportive VMT-Reduction Policies

Attachment G: Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) Overview

Attachment H: Proposed Priority Production Area (PPA) Pilot Program Overview

Attachment I: SPUR Comment Letter


Therese W. McMillan

ⁱ Including capital and operating costs

Date: May 22, 2019
W.I.: 1412
Referred by: Planning

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4386

This resolution updates the Regional Growth Framework by (1) revising the definition and criteria for Priority Development Areas (PDAs), and (2) establishing a definition and criteria for Priority Production Areas (PPAs). No changes are made to Priority Conservation Area (PCA) criteria. In addition, the resolution authorizes staff to open a submission window for local jurisdictions to nominate new or modified PDAs, new or modified Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs), and new PPAs through a pilot program.

Further discussion of this subject is contained in the Planning Committee Summary Sheet dated May 10, 2019.

Date: May 22, 2019
W.I.: 1412
Referred by: Planning

Re: Approval of the Plan Bay Area 2050 – Regional Growth Framework Revisions: Next Steps

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 4386

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), a joint exercise of powers entity created pursuant to California Government Code Sections 6500 et seq., is the Council of Governments and the regional land use planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, in 2007 ABAG established a framework (Regional Growth Framework) for future development that seeks to concentrate growth in locally-identified Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and protect locally-identified Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) from development, and established the procedures for designation of PDAs and PCAs; and

WHEREAS, ABAG has adopted 188 PDAs and 165 PCAs nominated by local governments; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code § 65080 et seq. requires MTC to prepare and update a long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), including a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) prepared in conjunction with the ABAG, every four years; and

WHEREAS, Plan Bay Area (“Plan”) constitutes the Regional Transportation Plan and SCS for the San Francisco Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, MTC and ABAG jointly adopted the first Plan Bay Area in 2013 (Plan Bay Area 2013) (MTC Resolution No. 4111 and ABAG Resolution No. 06-13), and the second Plan Bay Area in 2017 (Plan Bay Area 2017) (MTC Resolution No. 4300 and ABAG Resolution No. 10-17); and

WHEREAS, Plan Bay Area 2013 and Plan Bay Area 2017 were consistent with state-mandated targets for greenhouse gas reduction and housing, and included a growth pattern consistent with the Regional Growth Framework, projecting that more 70% of new homes would be built in PDAs and development would not occur in PCAs; and

WHEREAS, the feasibility of implementing the Regional Growth Framework, including the projected levels of growth in PDAs in Plan Bay Area 2013 and Plan Bay Area 2017, was analyzed in the 2015 PDA Assessment and 2019 Horizon Regional Growth Strategies Perspective Paper, respectively, and both documents recommended revisions to the Regional Growth Framework to improve implementation of the upcoming Plan Bay Area 2050; and

WHEREAS, the Plan Bay Area 2040 Action Plan included an action to Establish Criteria for Priority Production Areas (PPAs); and

WHEREAS, potential revisions to the Regional Growth Framework that concerned PDAs, PCAs, and PPAs, were presented to ABAG Regional Planning Committee, MTC Policy Advisory Council, Regional Advisory Working Group, and ABAG Administrative Committee and MTC Planning Committee (collectively, ABAG and MTC Committees), local government staff, and other stakeholders for comment in March and April 2019; and

WHEREAS, comments from ABAG and MTC Committees, local government staff, and stakeholders, and the findings from the 2015 PDA Assessment and 2019 Horizons Regional Growth Strategies Perspective Paper, provided the basis for specific revisions to the criteria for PDAs and PPAs; and

WHEREAS, Attachment A to this Resolution, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length, establishes an updated definition and criteria for PDAs and a definition and criteria for PPAs through a pilot program, and does not modify the existing PCA definition and criteria (ABAG Resolution No. 12-14); and

WHEREAS, ABAG/MTC staff intend to open an application period for local jurisdictions to nominate new or modified PDAs and PCAs, and to nominate PPAs; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC hereby certifies that the foregoing recitals are true and correct and incorporated by this reference; and be it further

RESOLVED, that MTC, as a decision making body, hereby adopts the definition and criteria for PDAs and PPAs in Attachment A, and authorizes staff to open an application period for local jurisdictions to nominate new or modified PDAs and PCAs, and to nominate new PPAs, which may include a submission period for Letters of Interest followed by formal nomination and adoption by MTC and ABAG.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Scott Haggerty, Chair

This resolution was entered into by the
Metropolitan Transportation Commission at a
regular meeting of the Commission held in
San Francisco, California on May 22, 2019.

Priority Development Area (PDAs): Definition and Criteria

Definition

Priority Development Areas (PDAs) are defined as follows:

- PDAs are **infill locations planned for significant housing and job growth.**
- PDAs help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by **offering a suite of mobility options** that enable residents to live a car-free or car-light lifestyle.
- PDAs promote **greater opportunity for all**, regardless of race or income.

Eligibility Criteria

Eligibility criteria for designation as a Priority Development Area (PDA) are shown below. The first set of criteria apply to both categories of PDAs, Transit-Rich and Connected Community. The second set apply only to Transit-Rich PDAs, while the third set of criteria apply only to Connected Community PDAs.

1) Eligibility Criteria Applicable to All PDAs

All Priority Development Areas must meet the following criteria:

- **Locally-Nominated** – The PDA is nominated by the local government with land use authority¹ over the geographic area in which it is located, demonstrated by a resolution of support adopted by its governing body.²
- **Infill** – The area is fully within an existing urbanized area, and lies within an urban growth boundary or limit line if one is established.
- **Planned** – A plan for significant housing growth and/or housing and employment growth at transit-supportive densities has been adopted for the majority of the area by the governing body of the jurisdiction in which the PDA is located, such as a specific, precise, or area plan. In addition, this plan is reflected in the jurisdiction's general plan, zoning ordinance and either a certified environmental impact report, standard conditions of approval, or other environmental document that facilitates development consistent with the plan.

Furthermore, a PDA must either meet the criteria outlined under Transit-Rich PDAs or the criteria outlined under Connected Community PDAs.

¹ This includes, but is not limited to, adopting a zoning ordinance and reviewing development applications.

² In advance of formal applications, staff may periodically accept Letters of Interest that include general information about a PDA, and may be submitted by local government staff, such as a Planning Director, Community Development Director, or designee.

2) Eligibility Criteria Applicable to Transit-Rich PDAs

In addition to criteria applicable to all Priority Development Areas, Transit-Rich PDAs must meet the following criteria:

- **High-Quality Transit** - At least fifty percent of area is within a one-half mile radius of any of the following:
 - Existing rail station; or
 - Planned rail stations in the most recently adopted fiscally-constrained Regional Transportation Plan; or
 - Ferry terminals with bus or rail service; or
 - Planned ferry terminal with bus or rail service in the most recently adopted fiscally-constrained Regional Transportation Plan; or
 - Bus stop served by at least one route with peak headways of 15 minutes or less during the morning and evening peak commute periods, defined as 6AM to 10AM and 3PM to 7PM, respectively.

3) Eligibility Criteria Applicable to Connected Community PDAs

In addition to criteria applicable to all Priority Development Areas, Connected Community PDAs must meet the following criteria:

- **Not Served by High-Quality Transit** – The area is beyond a one-half mile radius of transit service that meets the “high-quality transit” criteria for Transit-Rich Priority Development Areas
- **Basic Transit** – The area is within a half-mile radius of a bus stop served by at least one route with headways of 30 minutes or less during both the morning and evening peak commute periods, defined as 6AM to 10AM and 3PM to 7PM, respectively.
- **High Opportunity or VMT-Reduction Policies** – The area meets at least one of the following:
 - At least fifty percent of the area is within a census tract defined as “High” or “Highest” Resource on the most recent Opportunity Map adopted by the State of California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD); or
 - The jurisdiction in which the area is located has adopted at least two policies demonstrated to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), which may include:
 - Parking and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) ordinance that includes monitoring and enforcement.
 - Development impact fee to be added to a fund that can be invested in citywide VMT-reduction investments.
 - Prioritization of planning and implementation of Class II or better bike infrastructure and safe, pedestrian-scaled streets.
 - Vision Zero and universal design standards.
 - Prioritization of curb space for reliable transit and shared modes.
 - Another policy documented by peer-reviewed research to achieve significant VMT reduction.

The definition and criteria for PDAs may be revised periodically.

Priority Production Areas (PPAs): Definition and Criteria

The definition and eligibility criteria shown below will apply to the Priority Production Area (PPA) pilot program in Plan Bay Area 2050, with potential refinement following adoption of the Plan in 2021.

Definition

Priority Production Areas (PPAs) are defined as follows:

- PPAs are industrial areas of importance to the regional and local economies that encourage middle-wage job opportunities.
- PPAs are locally-designated places where industrial jobs (including manufacturing and supply chain services such as warehousing, distribution and repair) are a priority consideration in determining future land use.
- PPAs have broad community support for continued industrial activity that face pressure for conversion to higher-value uses.

Eligibility Criteria

PPAs must meet all of the following criteria:

- **Locally-Nominated** – The PPA is nominated by the local government with land use authority³ over the geographic area in which it is located, demonstrated by a resolution of support adopted by its governing body.⁴
- **Infill** – The area is fully within an existing urbanized area, and lies within an urban growth boundary or limit line if one is established.
- **Prioritized for Industrial Use** - The area is zoned for industrial use⁵ or has a high concentration of industrial activities.
- **Supports Regional Growth Framework** – The area does not overlap with PDAs and does not include land within one-half mile of a regional rail⁶ station.
- **Certified Housing Element** - The jurisdiction in which the PPA is located has a certified housing element.

The definition and criteria for PPAs may be revised periodically.

³ This includes, but is not limited to, adopting a zoning ordinance and reviewing development applications.

⁴ In advance of formal applications, staff may periodically accept Letters of Interest that include general information about a PDA, and may be submitted by local government staff, such as a Planning Director, Community Development Director, or designee.

⁵ This could include, but is not limited to, industrial zoning, zoning controls that maintain industrial activities in a mixed use area, interim controls protecting existing industrial uses.

⁶ Regional rail is defined as heavy, commuter, or intercity rail, including but not limited to BART, Caltrain, SMART, ACE, and Amtrak.

PLAN BAY AREA 2050

**Plan Bay Area 2050: Regional Growth Framework Update -
Overview of Existing and Proposed Geographies**

This attachment provides a summary of key changes proposed to the Growth Framework, and an overview of the Geographies included in the current and proposed Framework. Proposed action related to each Geography is outlined in **Attachment B**.

Table A1. Summary of Key Proposed Changes to Regional Growth Framework

Designation			
	Priority Development Areas	Priority Conservation Areas	Priority Production Areas
Key Proposed Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PDA Categories: Establishes Transit-rich and Connected Community categories (<i>see Table A2 for detailed criteria</i>), which apply to existing and proposed PDAs • Planning: Defines plan requirement and adoption timeline • Transit: More frequent service required for Transit-rich PDAs than current PDAs; less frequent service required for Connected Community PDAs • Equity: State-designated High Resource Areas (HRAs) eligible for Connected Community PDA designation if transit criteria met • VMT-Reduction: Areas outside HRAs meeting Connected Community transit criteria required to implement policy from menu of VMT-reduction measures 	No change (<i>see Table A2 for detailed criteria</i>)	New designation (<i>see Table A2 for detailed criteria</i>)

Table A2. Overview of Current and Proposed Regional Growth Framework Designations

Designation		Criteria	Additional Information
Current Designations (all require resolutions of support from jurisdiction with land use authority)	Priority Development Area (PDA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within urbanized area, and • Planned for significant housing growth, including affordable housing, and • Served by an existing or planned rail station, ferry terminal, or bus stop served by a route, or routes, with peak headways of 20 minutes or less 	Interactive map of current PDAs is available here .
	Priority Conservation Area (PCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide regionally significant agricultural, natural resource, scenic, recreational, and/or ecological values and ecosystem functions, demonstrated through adopted plans and recognized data sources such as the Conservation Lands Network (CLN), and • Require protection due to pressure from urban development or other factors, and 	Interactive map of current PCAs is available here .

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fall into one or more PCA designation category: Natural Landscapes, Agricultural Lands, Urban Greening, and Regional Recreation 	
Proposed Designations (all require resolutions of support from jurisdiction with land use authority)	Transit-rich PDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within urbanized area, and Specific, precise, or equivalent Plan for housing and job growth adopted, or to be adopted no later than 2025, and The majority of land is within one-half mile of an existing or plannedⁱ rail station, ferry terminal, or intersection of 2 or more bus routes with peak headways of 15 minutes or less. <i>(Meets state definition for Transit Priority Area)</i> 	Transit criteria is consistent with the state definition of a Transit Priority Area (TPA); a map of Bay Area TPAs, some of which are PDAs, is available here .
	Connected Community PDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific, precise, or equivalent Plan for housing and job growth adopted, or to be adopted no later than 2025, and The majority of land is within ½ mile of an existing or planned bus line with headways of no more than 30 minutes in peak periods, and One of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Located in a High Resource Area (HRA) as defined by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), or Adoption, or commitment to adopt, two or more policies shown to reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT) (menu of policies in Attachment E) 	High Resource Areas are identified on HCD- adopted Opportunity Maps. The detailed methodology used to determine these areas, and a current map, are available here . Note that only HRA that meet transit criteria are eligible for designation as Connected Community PDAs.
	Priority Production Area (PPA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zoned for industrial use or has a high concentration of Production, Distribution and Repair (PDR) activities, and Does not overlap with a Priority Development Area and does not include land within one-half mile of a regional rail stationⁱⁱ, and Jurisdiction has a certified Housing Element 	More information PDR, and San Francisco's effort to support PDR activities, is available here .
	PCA	No change	

ⁱ Included in most recently adopted fiscally constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

ⁱⁱ Includes existing and planned service; includes BART, Caltrain, ACE, SMART, Amtrak, and any future heavy/commuter/intercity rail systems.



PLAN BAY AREA 2050

Regional Growth Framework: PDA, PCA, and PPA Updates


Joint MTC Planning Committee with the
ABAG Administrative Committee
May 10, 2019
Mark Shorett, MTC/ABAG

At your last meeting, we discussed potential updates to the Regional Growth Framework.


To inform the update, you asked for additional information about Priority Development Area (PDA) status and performance.

Today, we are providing that information and requesting approval of detailed updates to the Framework.


Key Challenge with Framework	Potential Update for Plan Bay Area 2050
Many PDAs do not meet program criteria for transit and local planning.	Require all PDAs to be consistent with program guidelines by 2020.
Not enough housing is being produced, particularly low- and middle-income.	Invite local jurisdictions to submit new or modified PDAs in 2019; increase regional support.
Strong local interest in nominating new Priority conservation areas (PCAs).	Invite local jurisdictions and partner organizations to submit new or modified PCAs in 2019.
Industrial land and middle-wage jobs are not well-integrated into the current framework.	Establish a Priority Production Area (PPA) pilot program and allow local jurisdictions to submit PDAs in 2019.
The more ambitious GHG target for Plan Bay Area 2050 may be difficult to reach.	Integrate Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) into the regional growth framework.
Many PDAs face displacement risk and lack quality schools and community resources.	Integrate High-Resource Areas (HRAs) with adequate transit service into the regional growth framework.
Priority areas are at risk from sea level rise, wildfires, earthquakes, and more.	Focus on strategies and guidelines to protect the final set of priority areas in the Preferred Plan.



Proposed New Criteria

- 

PDA PLAN

Planned for growth
Plan must be completed by 2025
-  Create two tiers to allow greater flexibility, incorporating new mobility & equity into the mix
- PDAs that do not already align with one of the two tiers would need to address this by late 2019.

Guide to Today's Presentation & Your Packet

Section

PDA Implementation Status

PDA Performance

Framework Update Proposal

Priority Conservation Areas

Priority Production Areas

For Detailed Information:


Attachment C

Attachment D

Attachment E, A

Attachment F

Attachment G




Let's start by
looking back at
how today's PDAs
are performing.
What is their
current status?

What is the implementation status of current PDAs?

Attachment C includes data on individual PDAs.

Current
PDA
Criteria



PDA
PLAN

Permitted
Housing

Frequent
Transit

Planned
for
Housing

Definition

Housing permits issued,
2015-2017

Rail station, ferry terminal, or
bus line with ≤ 20 minute peak
period headways


Adopted Specific
or Precise Plan



Permitted Housing:

Progress varies by county, but we remain behind at a regional level.

Percentage of Annualized Plan Bay Area 2040 PDA Housing Targets Achieved (2015-17)



Data for individual PDAs provided in Attachment C

*Rounded to nearest 100, except Marin 6




Frequent Transit & Planned for Housing:

How many PDAs meet current criteria?

Meets Criteria?	Share of PDAs by County, 2019									
	Alameda	Contra Costa	Marin	Napa	San Francisco	San Mateo	Santa Clara	Solano	Sonoma	ALL
Transit: Yes Planning: Yes	70%	23%	50%	0%	92%	64%	71%	25%	33%	52%
Transit: Yes Planning: No	15%	0%	0%	0%	8%	18%	15%	0%	7%	13%
Transit: No Planning: Yes	11%	62%	0%	100%	0%	14%	7%	42%	58%	26%
Transit: No Planning: No	4%	15%	50%	0%	0%	5%	7%	33%	0%	9%

Shaded cells indicate that a county's share is greater than the regional average.

What about transit-rich* areas not yet designated PDAs?




Integrating Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) currently outside of PDAs could add approximately **50 percent** more land to the Regional Growth Framework.

*meeting the state definition of transit priority areas
([Public Resources Code §21099\(a\)\(7\)](#))


We want to partner with cities to more fully leverage the region’s transit network.

Breakdown of Non-PDA TPA Lands - by county



Top 7 Cities for Transit-Rich Non-PDA Lands	
San Francisco	13,500 acres
San Jose	8,200 acres
Berkeley	2,800 acres
Sunnyvale	2,400 acres
Oakland	2,100 acres
Santa Clara	1,600 acres
Campbell	1,400 acres





These seven cities account for over half of all transit-rich non-PDA land in the region.

An aerial photograph of San Jose, California, taken during the "golden hour" of sunset. The sun is low on the horizon, casting a warm, orange glow over the city. In the foreground, several modern multi-story apartment buildings with flat roofs and balconies are visible. A central street runs vertically through the middle of the frame. The middle ground is filled with a dense urban landscape of various buildings, including some with distinctive domed roofs. The background shows a vast expanse of trees and distant mountains under a hazy sky.


Now, let's look forward to understand PDAs' potential performance in the future.


Horizon
Perspective Paper
3 scored the
region’s census
blocks for
alignment with
the Horizon
Guiding
Principles.

Attachment D
includes data on
individual PDAs


Guiding Principle & Indicator		Definition	
		Low score	High score
 CONNECTED	Connected <i>Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) Reduction Potential</i>	1 <i>Highest VMT</i> <i>Source: MTC Travel Model 1.5; 2015 simulation year, by quintile</i>	5 <i>Lowest VMT</i>
 VIBRANT	Vibrant <i>Access to opportunity</i>	1 <i>Lowest Resource</i> <i>Source: CA HCD/DOF, 2019 Opportunity Maps</i>	5 <i>Highest Resource</i>
 DIVERSE	Diverse <i>Community Stability</i>	1 <i>Highest reduction</i> <i>Source: MTC Vital Signs, 2015</i>	5 <i>Lowest Reduction</i>
 AFFORDABLE	Affordable <i>Housing Cost</i>	1 <i>Highest rent</i> <i>Source: American Community Survey, 2012-2016</i>	5 <i>Lowest rent</i>

Overall, PDAs capture many of the best performing locations for **VMT Reduction**, but make up a small share of areas with **high opportunity** and **low displacement risk**.



An aerial photograph of a city, likely Campbell, California, showing a mix of residential and commercial buildings, trees, and parking lots. In the background, rolling hills and mountains are visible under a blue sky with scattered clouds. A large blue semi-transparent box is overlaid on the right side of the image, containing white text.

In the years ahead, we can use this baseline data to track progress and continue to refine the framework.



Today, let's consider how to strengthen the Growth Framework for Plan Bay Area 2050.

Today's Focus: Locally-Nominated Areas

			May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan (2020)
PDAs	1a	Align PDAs	★	Submission from CTA and/or city/county							
	1b	New PDAs	★	Letter of interest				City Council / Board of Supervisors adoption			
PCAs	2	New PCAs	★	Letter of interest				Local Agency adoption			
New Priority Areas	3a	PPAs	★	Letter of interest				City Council / Board of Supervisors adoption			
	3b	TPAs		Finalize zones				★			
	3c	HRAs		Finalize zones				★			
Cross-Cutting	4	At-Risk Zones						Incorporate strategies into Preferred Plan Bay Area 2050			

★ = Action on Element of Regional Growth Framework Update

First things first: let's better define what a PDA is.



Priority Development Areas are **infill locations planned for significant housing and job growth.**




Priority Development Areas help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by **offering a suite of mobility options** that enable residents to live a car-free or car-light lifestyle.




Priority Development Areas promote **greater opportunity for all**, regardless of race or income.

How would the definition change?

PDA Criteria Since 2007



Proposed New Criteria



Proposed PDA Designations

*Transit requirements include both current & planned (Plan Bay Area 2050) service levels.
50% of land in PDA must be within ½ mile of transit meeting criteria*

Transit-Rich PDAs



High-quality transit



or



or



≤15 min peak

TPAs that are not currently PDAs should apply



Basic transit



≤30 min peak

AND at least one of the following:



High resource



existing high-resource area

OR



Policy commit.




commitment to adopt ≥2 policies by 2025
(e.g. TDM ordinance, curb management, Vision Zero)

HRAs that are not currently PDAs should apply

Best bet for PDAs unable to plan for 15-minute service

Connected Community PDAs

How many PDAs meet proposed transit criteria?




Number of PDAs Meeting Transit Criteria by Proposed Service Thresholds, 2019

Service Threshold	Percentage of PDA Land within ½ Mile				
	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%	Total
Current <i>Rail, ferry or 20-minute peak bus</i>	56	16	15	101	188
Proposed: Transit-Rich <i>Rail, ferry or 15-minute peak bus</i>	66	24	24	74	188
Proposed: Connected Community <i>30-minute peak bus (minimum)</i>	36	12	15	125	188



How are high-resource areas (HRAs) being integrated?

Local jurisdictions are encouraged to **self-nominate** HRAs that meet updated eligibility criteria as PDAs.



Defined by HCD as places that offer *“the best chance at economic advancement, high educational attainment, and good physical and mental health”*

Based upon economic, environmental, and educational indicators shown to affect these outcomes

For more information, see:
<https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity.asp>

No changes
are proposed
for **Priority
Conservation
Areas (PCAs)**.

*Attachment F
includes an overview and criteria for PCAs*

Introducing Priority Production Areas (PPAs).

Attachment G
includes an overview and criteria for PPAs

Defining PPAs

Pilot Program Goals

- Support strong clusters of the region's economy.
- Align with the transportation planning framework for freight and goods movement.
- Plan for space needed for middle-wage job opportunities.
- Encourage middle-wage job growth close to affordable housing.

Proposed PPA Definition



Zoned for **industrial use** or with high concentration of industrial activities



Not located in a PDA and not within one-half mile of a regional rail station*




Jurisdiction has a **certified housing element**

** = includes both existing and planned service; includes BART, Caltrain, ACE, SMART, Amtrak, and any future heavy/commuter/intercity rail systems.*

Where do we go from here with the new PDA definition?

Breakdown of PDAs using Existing Criteria



Where do we go from here with the new PDA definition?

EXISTING PDAs	PDA Status under Current Criteria	# of PDAs	Next Steps
	Transit: Yes Planning: Yes	103 PDAs	1) Reaffirm commitment to rail, ferry, or 15-minute bus headway
	Transit: Yes Planning: No	19 PDAs	2) Submit letter of intent to complete PDA Plan by 2025
	Transit: No Planning: Yes	49 PDAs	3a) Identify transit necessary to become a Transit-Rich PDA; <u>OR</u> 3b) Identify transit and/or policy commitments necessary to become a Connected Community PDA
	Transit: No Planning: No	17 PDAs	4) <i>Complete both (2) and (3) above</i>
NEW AREAS	<u>Transit-Rich Areas:</u> Apply as Transit-Rich PDAs		<u>High-Resource Areas:</u> Apply as Connected Community PDAs
	<i>Submit new PCA and PPA applications this summer as well</i>		

Next Steps

1a

Align PDAs

Already meeting newly proposed PDA requirements:
No action required

- Not meeting transit requirements:
CTA to identify transit improvements needed by **September 2019**
- Not meeting planning requirements: City/county to identify start date by **September 2019**; complete by **2025**
- Not meeting policy requirements: City/county to make commitments by **January 2020** and advance policies by **2025**

1b

New PDAs

2

New PCAs

3a

PPAs



Requested Action:

Refer to the ABAG Executive Board and MTC Commission for approval:

- Revised definition for PDAs.
- Proposed definition for PPAs.
- Submission window for local jurisdictions & partner organizations to submit new or modified PDAs and PCAs, and new PPAs

Plan Bay Area 2050: Regional Growth Framework Update - PDA Implementation Status

This attachment provides detailed information about the status of each of the Bay Area's 188 Priority Development Areas in achieving consistency with PDA program guidelines and in issuing housing permits. The attachment is divided into two tables:

Table C1: PDA Implementation Status - Transit and Planning Criteria shows the consistency of each PDA with current program transit and planning criteria. A detailed definition for each column is provided below. A web-based map highlighting the areas of PDAs that meet transit criteria can be viewed [here](#).

Column	Definition
PDA Name	Name of Priority Development Area (PDA) designated by local jurisdiction
County	County within which PDA is located
Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction within which PDA is located (<i>this is also the jurisdiction that nominated the PDA</i>)
Total Acres	Gross Acres within PDA boundaries
Acres Within ½ Mile of Transit Meeting Standard	Gross Acres within PDA that are 0.5 mile or less from a transit stop that meets PDA program guidelines, defined for this analysis as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an existing or planned rail station or ferry terminal; or an existing or planned bus stop served by one or more route with a 20-minute frequency in the AM and PM peak periods "Planned" is defined as included in the fiscally-constrained Plan Bay Area 2040.
Percent Within ½ Mile of Transit Meeting Standard	Acres Within ½ Mile of Transit Meeting Standard divided by Total Acres
PDA Plan Adopted	"Yes" indicates a plan has been adopted for the entire PDA; "Part of PDA" indicates a plan has been adopted for part of the area within the PDA; "In progress" indicates that a plan for all or part of the PDA is underway; "No" indicates a plan has not been completed and is not underway. "Plan" is defined as a Specific, Precise, or other Plan creating development standards specifically for the area included in the PDA, accompanied by a programmatic EIR
EIR Certified	"Yes" indicates an EIR for an adopted plan for the entire PDA has been certified; "Part of PDA" indicates an EIR for an plan for part of the area within the PDA has been certified; "In progress" indicates an EIR for a plan for all or part of the PDA is underway; "No" indicates an EIR has not been certified for the PDA, and is not underway. plan has not been completed and is not
MTC Funded Plan	"Yes" indicates that an adopted Plan, or update to adopted Plan, was funded by an MTC grant.

Table C2: PDA Implementation Status - Housing Permits Issued, 2015-2017 shows the number of housing permits issued for each PDA between 2015 and 2017. A detailed definition for each column is provided below:

Column	Definition
PDA Name	Name of Priority Development Area (PDA) designated by local jurisdiction
County	County within which PDA is located
Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction within which PDA is located (<i>this is also the jurisdiction that nominated the PDA</i>)
Very Low¹	Total housing units permitted ² inside PDA affordable to Very-Low income households, defined as 0-50% of Area Median Income (AMI).
Low¹	Total housing units permitted inside PDA between 2015 and 2017 affordable to Low income households, defined as 50-80% of Area Median Income (AMI).
Moderate¹	Total housing units permitted inside PDA between 2015 and 2017 affordable to Moderate income households, defined as 80-120% of Area Median Income (AMI).
Above Moderate¹	Total housing units permitted inside PDA affordable to Above-Moderate income households, defined as greater than 120% of Area Median Income (AMI).
Total	Total housing units permitted inside PDA

1. Income category defined by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). These income levels are measured against the Area Median Income (AMI), which is defined by groupings of counties known as Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs).

2. Permits self-reported by local jurisdictions and mapped by ABAG/MTC staff.

Attachment D, Table D1: PDA Implementation Status - Transit and Planning Criteria

Meets transit and planning criteria
 Meets transit and plan criteria; needs EIR
 Meets transit criteria; does not meet planning criteria
 Meets planning criteria; does not meet transit criteria
 Does not meet transit or planning criteria

PDA Name	County	Jurisdiction	Total Acres	Acres Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	Percent Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	PDA Plan ² Adopted	EIR Certified	MTC Funded Plan
ALAMEDA COUNTY								
University Avenue	Alameda	Berkeley	76	76	100%	Yes	Yes	
Mixed-Use Core	Alameda	Emeryville	584	584	100%	Yes	Yes	
Adeline Street	Alameda	Berkeley	62	62	100%	In Progress	In Progress	Yes
Downtown	Alameda	Berkeley	150	150	100%	Yes	Yes	
West Oakland	Alameda	Oakland	1701	1702	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Northern Waterfront	Alameda	Alameda	329	329	100%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown Transit Oriented Development	Alameda	San Leandro	517	518	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
East 14th Street	Alameda	San Leandro	146	146	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bay Fair BART Village	Alameda	San Leandro	169	169	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Hesperian Boulevard	Alameda	Alameda County	455	455	100%	Yes	Yes	
Mission Boulevard Corridor	Alameda	Hayward	270	270	100%	Yes	Yes	
Castro Valley BART	Alameda	Alameda County	265	265	100%	In Progress	In Progress	
East 14th Street and Mission Boulevard	Alameda	Alameda County	810	811	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
South Hayward BART	Alameda	Hayward	183	183	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
South Hayward BART	Alameda	Hayward	53	53	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Downtown & Jack London Square	Alameda	Oakland	1335	1335	100%	In Progress	In Progress	Yes
Downtown	Alameda	Hayward	304	297	98%	In Progress	In Progress	
Coliseum BART Station Area	Alameda	Oakland	1448	1392	96%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Intermodal Station District	Alameda	Union City	143	134	94%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown Specific Plan Area	Alameda	Dublin	300	275	92%	Yes	Yes	
Town Center ³	Alameda	Dublin	676	603	89%	Yes	Yes	
The Cannery	Alameda	Hayward	124	108	87%	Yes	Yes	
Isabel Avenue/BART Station Planning Area ³	Alameda	Livermore	1131	979	87%	In Progress	In Progress	
TOD Corridors - San Antonio/Central Estuary	Alameda	Oakland	944	809	86%	Yes	Yes	
Transit Center/Dublin Crossings	Alameda	Dublin	280	224	80%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
City Center	Alameda	Fremont	1067	830	78%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	Yes
Downtown	Alameda	Livermore	252	191	75%	Yes	Yes	

Attachment D, Table D1: PDA Implementation Status - Transit and Planning Criteria

PDA Name	County	Jurisdiction	Total Acres	Acres Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	Percent Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	PDA Plan ² Adopted	EIR Certified	MTC Funded Plan
Centerville	Alameda	Fremont	1721	1232	72%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
Naval Air Station	Alameda	Alameda	1052	560	53%	In Progress	In Progress	Yes
TOD Corridors - International Boulevard	Alameda	Oakland	875	875	100%	Yes	No	
South Shattuck	Alameda	Berkeley	21	21	100%	No	No	
San Pablo Avenue	Alameda	Berkeley	106	106	100%	No	No	
San Pablo & Solano Mixed Use Neighborhood	Alameda	Albany	80	80	100%	No	No	
Golden Gate/North Oakland	Alameda	Oakland	935	935	100%	No	No	
Southside/Telegraph Avenue	Alameda	Berkeley	204	204	100%	No	No	
Eastmont Town Center	Alameda	Oakland	733	733	100%	No	No	
Fruitvale and Dimond Areas	Alameda	Oakland	1521	1504	99%	No	No	
MacArthur Transit Village	Alameda	Oakland	1152	1109	96%	No	No	
TOD Corridors	Alameda	Oakland	5004	4569	91%	No	No	
Warm Springs	Alameda	Fremont	1628	591	36%	Yes	yes	Yes
Irvington District	Alameda	Fremont	1388	485	35%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
East Side	Alameda	Livermore	2328	224	10%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development ³	Alameda	Newark	205	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Hacienda	Alameda	Pleasanton	869	215	25%	Yes	No	
Meekland Avenue Corridor	Alameda	Alameda County	171	69	40%	No	No	
Old Town Mixed Use Area	Alameda	Newark	53	0	0%	No	No	
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY								
San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Contra Costa	El Cerrito	119	119	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Contra Costa	El Cerrito	131	131	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Contra Costa	Contra Costa County	73	73	100%	Yes	Yes	
Contra Costa Centre	Contra Costa	Contra Costa County	100	99	99%	Yes	Yes	
San Pablo Avenue & 23rd Street Corridors	Contra Costa	San Pablo	284	279	98%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown	Contra Costa	Martinez	191	179	93%	Yes	Yes	
Waterfront District	Contra Costa	Hercules	244	156	64%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown	Contra Costa	Orinda	155	125	81%	In Progress	No	
Central Richmond & 23rd Street Corridor	Contra Costa	Richmond	774	422	55%	No	No	

Attachment D, Table D1: PDA Implementation Status - Transit and Planning Criteria

PDA Name	County	Jurisdiction	Total Acres	Acres Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	Percent Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	PDA Plan ² Adopted	EIR Certified	MTC Funded Plan
Downtown	Contra Costa	Lafayette	304	148	49%	Yes	Yes	
Railroad Avenue eBART Station	Contra Costa	Pittsburg	1071	503	47%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Downtown	Contra Costa	Concord	486	224	46%	Yes	yes	Yes
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Contra Costa	Contra Costa County	336	146	43%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Core Area	Contra Costa	Walnut Creek	792	335	42%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rivertown Waterfront	Contra Costa	Antioch	474	197	42%	Yes	Yes	
Hillcrest eBART Station	Contra Costa	Antioch	382	102	27%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Community Reuse Area/Los Medanos	Contra Costa	Concord	1066	169	16%	Yes	Yes	Yes
South Richmond	Contra Costa	Richmond	1422	166	12%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Buskirk Avenue Corridor	Contra Costa	Pleasant Hill	320	20	6%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
Employment Area	Contra Costa	Oakley	758	0	0%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
City Center	Contra Costa	San Ramon	456	0	0%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
North Richmond	Contra Costa	Richmond (with Contra Costa Co	1126	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown El Sobrante	Contra Costa	Contra Costa County	171	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Community Reuse Area/Los Medanos	Contra Costa	Concord	1606	0	0%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Downtown	Contra Costa	Danville	546	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Central Hercules	Contra Costa	Hercules	252	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Moraga Center	Contra Costa	Moraga	180	0	0%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Downtown	Contra Costa	Oakley	146	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Old Town San Pablo Avenue	Contra Costa	Pinole	240	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Appian Way Corridor	Contra Costa	Pinole	141	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown	Contra Costa	Pittsburg	435	0	0%	Yes	Yes	Yes
North Camino Ramon	Contra Costa	San Ramon	302	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Contra Costa	Richmond	214	95	44%	No	No	
Central Richmond & 23rd Street Corridor	Contra Costa	Richmond	51	9	17%	No	No	
Potential Planning Area	Contra Costa	Oakley	232	0	0%	No	No	
Diablo Valley College	Contra Costa	Pleasant Hill	58	0	0%	No	No	
Rumrill Boulevard	Contra Costa	San Pablo	55	0	0%	No	No	
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Contra Costa	Contra Costa County	346	0	0%	No	No	

Attachment D, Table D1: PDA Implementation Status - Transit and Planning Criteria

PDA Name	County	Jurisdiction	Total Acres	Acres Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	Percent Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	PDA Plan ² Adopted	EIR Certified	MTC Funded Plan
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Contra Costa	Hercules	74	0	0%	No	No	
MARIN COUNTY								
Downtown	Marin	San Rafael	503	493	98%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Unincorporated Marin County	Marin	Marin County	523	24	5%	No	No	
NAPA COUNTY								
Highway 29 Corridor	Napa	American Canyon	374	0	0%	In Progress	In Progress	
Downtown Napa and Soscol Gateway	Napa	Napa	616	0	0%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
SAN FRANCISCO CITY & COUNTY								
Balboa Park	San Francisco	San Francisco	207	207	100%	Yes	Yes	
Mission Bay	San Francisco	San Francisco	290	291	100%	Yes	Yes	
Mission-San Jose Corridor	San Francisco	San Francisco	1804	1806	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Market-Octavia/Upper Market	San Francisco	San Francisco	425	426	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	San Francisco	San Francisco	2358	2360	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eastern Neighborhoods	San Francisco	San Francisco	2291	2293	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Transit Center District	San Francisco	San Francisco	150	150	100%	Yes	Yes	
Treasure Island & Yerba Buena Island	San Francisco	San Francisco	559	175	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	San Francisco	San Francisco	2854	2597	91%	Yes	Yes	
19th Avenue	San Francisco	San Francisco	1163	1053	91%	In Progress	No	Yes
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	San Francisco	San Francisco & Brisbane	373	346	93%	No	No	
Port of San Francisco	San Francisco	San Francisco	811	736	91%	No	No	
SAN MATEO COUNTY								
Mission Boulevard	San Mateo	Daly City	690	690	100%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
Transit Station Area	San Mateo	Millbrae	237	237	100%	In Progress	Yes	
Burlingame El Camino Real	San Mateo	Burlingame	958	959	100%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
Downtown	San Mateo	San Mateo	102	102	100%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
El Camino Real	San Mateo	San Mateo	140	140	100%	Yes	Yes	
Villages of Belmont	San Mateo	Belmont	555	555	100%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	Yes
Railroad Corridor	San Mateo	San Carlos	69	69	100%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown	San Mateo	Menlo Park	159	159	100%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown	San Mateo	Redwood City	192	192	100%	Yes	Yes	
El Camino Real	San Mateo	South San Francisco	859	858	100%	Yes	Yes	

Attachment D, Table D1: PDA Implementation Status - Transit and Planning Criteria

PDA Name	County	Jurisdiction	Total Acres	Acres Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	Percent Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	PDA Plan ² Adopted	EIR Certified	MTC Funded Plan
Transit Corridors	San Mateo	San Bruno	864	841	97%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
Downtown	San Mateo	South San Francisco	192	147	77%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rail Corridor	San Mateo	San Mateo	498	370	74%	Yes	Yes	
El Camino Real Corridor	San Mateo	Redwood City	178	178	100%	Yes	No	
El Camino Real	San Mateo	Colma	334	334	100%	No	No	
El Camino Real (Unincorporated Colma)	San Mateo	San Mateo County	49	49	100%	No	No	
Grand Boulevard Initiative	San Mateo	San Mateo	1008	1009	100%	No	No	
Bayshore	San Mateo	Daly City	378	343	91%	No	No	
Broadway/Veterans Boulevard Corridor	San Mateo	Redwood City	431	105	24%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	San Mateo	San Francisco &	739	121	16%	In Progress	In Progress	
El Camino Real (North Fair Oaks)	San Mateo	San Mateo County	527	64	12%	Yes	Yes	
Ravenswood ³	San Mateo	East Palo Alto	341	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
SANTA CLARA COUNTY								
San Antonio	Santa Clara	Mountain View	123	123	100%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
El Camino Real	Santa Clara	Mountain View	286	286	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Whisman Station	Santa Clara	Mountain View	151	152	100%	Yes	Yes	
El Camino Real Corridor	Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	411	412	100%	In Progress	In Progress	Yes
Stevens Creek TOD Corridor	Santa Clara	San Jose	259	259	100%	Yes	Yes	
El Camino Real Focus Area	Santa Clara	Santa Clara	317	317	100%	In Progress	In Progress	Yes
Santa Clara Station Focus Area	Santa Clara	Santa Clara	256	256	100%	Yes	Yes	
Bascom TOD Corridor	Santa Clara	San Jose	215	215	100%	In Progress	Yes	
Transit Area	Santa Clara	Milpitas	409	410	100%	Yes	Yes	
Greater Downtown	Santa Clara	San Jose	684	684	100%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Blossom Hill/Snell Urban Village	Santa Clara	San Jose	64	64	100%	In Progress	Yes	
West San Carlos and Southwest Expressway Corridors	Santa Clara	San Jose	1346	1347	100%	In Progress	In Progress	Yes
Cottle Transit Village (Hitachi)	Santa Clara	San Jose	196	196	100%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown	Santa Clara	Morgan Hill	181	181	100%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown "Frame"	Santa Clara	San Jose	2445	2397	98%	Yes	Yes	yes
Downtown	Santa Clara	Mountain View	692	666	96%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
Downtown & Caltrain Station	Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	274	263	96%	Yes	Yes	Yes
East Santa Clara/Alum Rock Corridor	Santa Clara	San Jose	898	863	96%	Yes	Yes	

Attachment D, Table D1: PDA Implementation Status - Transit and Planning Criteria

PDA Name	County	Jurisdiction	Total Acres	Acres Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	Percent Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	PDA Plan ² Adopted	EIR Certified	MTC Funded Plan
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	Santa Clara	San Jose	3640	3499	96%	Part of PDA	Yes	
Downtown	Santa Clara	Gilroy	254	228	90%	Yes	Yes	
Berryessa Station	Santa Clara	San Jose	664	586	88%	Yes	Yes	
Central Redevelopment Area	Santa Clara	Campbell	257	226	88%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
Communications Hill	Santa Clara	San Jose	1573	1319	84%	Yes	Yes	
North San Jose	Santa Clara	San Jose	5028	3784	75%	Yes	Yes	
Saratoga TOD Corridor	Santa Clara	San Jose	159	119	75%	In Progress	Yes	
Oakridge/Almaden Plaza Urban Village	Santa Clara	San Jose	380	281	74%	In Progress	Yes	
Lawrence Station Transit Village	Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	356	241	68%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Winchester Boulevard TOD Corridor	Santa Clara	San Jose	299	176	59%	Yes	Yes	
California Avenue	Santa Clara	Palo Alto	120	120	100%	Yes	No	
Capitol Corridor Urban Villages	Santa Clara	San Jose	199	199	100%	No	Yes	Yes
Capitol/Tully/King Urban Villages	Santa Clara	San Jose	254	254	100%	No	Yes	Yes
El Camino Real Corridor	Santa Clara	Los Altos	77	77	100%	No	No	
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Tasman Crossing	Santa Clara	Milpitas	121	121	100%	No	No	
	Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	197	191	97%	No	No	
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	Santa Clara	Cupertino	552	487	88%	No	No	
Bascom Urban Village	Santa Clara	San Jose	118	0	0%	In Progress	Yes	
Westgate/El Paseo Urban Village	Santa Clara	San Jose	177	0	0%	In Progress	Yes	
North Bayshore	Santa Clara	Mountain View	651	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Camden Urban Village	Santa Clara	San Jose	108	0	0%	No	Yes	
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority East Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	Gilroy	273	82	30%	No	No	
	Santa Clara	Sunnyvale	460	0	0%	No	No	
SOLANO COUNTY								
Waterfront & Downtown	Solano	Vallejo	200	112	56%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown & Waterfront	Solano	Suisun City	390	202	52%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown South (Jefferson Street)	Solano	Fairfield	289	144	50%	Yes	Yes	
Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station	Solano	Fairfield	2935	242	8%	Yes	Yes	
Sonoma Boulevard	Solano	Vallejo	108	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Downtown	Solano	Vacaville	168	0	0%	In Progress	In Progress	Yes
Downtown	Solano	Benicia	159	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
West Texas Street Gateway	Solano	Fairfield	316	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Northern Gateway - Benicia's Industrial Park	Solano	Benicia	1492	0	0%	No	No	
Downtown	Solano	Dixon	139	0	0%	No	No	

Attachment D, Table D1: PDA Implementation Status - Transit and Planning Criteria

PDA Name	County	Jurisdiction	Total Acres	Acres Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	Percent Within 1/2 Mile of Transit Meeting Standard ¹	PDA Plan ² Adopted	EIR Certified	MTC Funded Plan
North Texas Street Core	Solano	Fairfield	180	0	0%	No	No	
Allison Area	Solano	Vacaville	210	0	0%	No	No	
SONOMA COUNTY								
Downtown Station Area	Sonoma	Santa Rosa	677	587	87%	In Progress	In Progress	Yes
North Santa Rosa Station	Sonoma	Santa Rosa	989	798	81%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Station Area/Downtown Specific Plan Area	Sonoma	Windsor	389	311	80%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Central, Turning Basin/Lower Reach	Sonoma	Petaluma	455	251	55%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	Yes
Mendocino Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue Corridor	Sonoma	Santa Rosa	1447	742	51%	No	No	
Downtown and Cotati Depot	Sonoma	Cotati	133	26	19%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Central Rohnert Park	Sonoma	Rohnert Park	405	45	11%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sebastopol Road Corridor	Sonoma	Santa Rosa	887	29	3%	Part of PDA	Part of PDA	
Downtown/SMART Transit Area ³	Sonoma	Cloverdale	504	0	0%	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sonoma Mountain Village	Sonoma	Rohnert Park	178	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Core Area	Sonoma	Sebastopol	703	0	0%	Yes	Yes	
Roseland	Sonoma	Santa Rosa	1460	0	0%	Yes	Yes	

Notes

1. Defined for the purpose of this analysis as an existing rail station, ferry terminal, or 20-minute frequency bus in peak periods or a future rail station, ferry terminal, or 20-minute frequency bus service in peak periods included in the fiscally-constrained Plan Bay Area 2040.

2. Defined as a Specific, Precise, or other Plan creating development standards specifically for the area included in the PDA, accompanied by a programmatic EIR

3. Part or all of PDA within 1/2 mile of Resolution 3434 station not funded in the fiscally constrained Plan Bay Area 2040

Attachment D, Table D2: PDA Implementation Status - Housing Permits Issued, 2015-2017

PDA Name	Jurisdiction	Housing units permitted by affordability level: 2015-17				
		Low	Very Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total Units
ALAMEDA COUNTY						
Downtown & Jack London Square	Oakland	142	54	11	3,649	3,856
MacArthur Transit Village	Oakland	87	18	0	1,225	1,330
Warm Springs	Fremont	182	194	0	832	1,208
West Oakland	Oakland	2	0	0	742	744
Town Center	Dublin	0	0	0	559	559
Downtown Specific Plan Area	Dublin	26	39	1	353	419
Isabel Avenue/BART Station Planning Area	Livermore	0	0	195	214	409
Transit Center/Dublin Crossings	Dublin	0	0	5	368	373
Centerville	Fremont	0	0	0	358	358
Hacienda	Pleasanton	38	10	0	297	345
East Side	Livermore	0	0	151	137	288
Intermodal Station District	Union City	0	0	243	0	243
Irvington District	Fremont	64	0	1	154	219
TOD Corridors	Oakland	0	0	0	216	216
Downtown	Berkeley	14	0	0	198	212
South Shattuck	Berkeley	14	19	0	172	205
Naval Air Station	Alameda	16	15	14	138	183
San Pablo & Solano Mixed Use Neighborhood	Albany	0	0	0	176	176
Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development	Newark	0	0	0	176	176
Coliseum BART Station Area	Oakland	22	33	0	110	165
City Center	Fremont	0	0	0	146	146
The Cannery	Hayward	0	0	0	138	138
Golden Gate/North Oakland	Oakland	0	0	0	136	136
Mission Boulevard Corridor	Hayward	40	19	0	74	133
University Avenue	Berkeley	11	0	0	117	128
TOD Corridors - San Antonio/Central Estuary	Oakland	0	0	0	123	123
Fruitvale and Dimond Areas	Oakland	72	20	0	26	118

Attachment D, Table D2: PDA Implementation Status - Housing Permits Issued, 2015-2017

PDA Name	Jurisdiction	Housing units permitted by affordability level: 2015-17				
		Low	Very Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total Units
Northern Waterfront	Alameda	35	18	7	50	110
East 14th Street and Mission Boulevard	Alameda County	85	0	0	14	99
Hesperian Boulevard	Alameda County	34	61	3	0	98
Downtown Transit Oriented Development	San Leandro	27	57	0	2	86
Southside/Telegraph Avenue	Berkeley	7	0	0	76	83
Downtown	Livermore	0	0	10	70	80
TOD Corridors - International Boulevard	Oakland	58	0	0	15	73
Adeline Street	Berkeley	31	10	1	0	42
Eastmont Town Center	Oakland	0	0	0	19	19
Meekland Avenue Corridor	Alameda County	1	0	2	2	5
Downtown	Hayward	0	0	0	1	1
Castro Valley BART	Alameda County	0	0	0	0	0
San Pablo Avenue	Berkeley	0	0	0	0	0
Mixed-Use Core	Emeryville	0	0	0	0	0
South Hayward BART	Hayward	0	0	0	0	0
South Hayward BART	Hayward	0	0	0	0	0
Old Town Mixed Use Area	Newark	0	0	0	0	0
Bay Fair BART Village	San Leandro	0	0	0	0	0
East 14th Street	San Leandro	0	0	0	0	0
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY						
Core Area	Walnut Creek	42	16	0	393	451
Waterfront District	Hercules	0	0	0	191	191
Downtown	Lafayette	2	2	17	118	139
San Pablo Avenue Corridor (South of Del Norte Station Area)	El Cerrito	0	6	13	110	129
South Richmond	Richmond	0	0	0	90	90
Employment Area	Oakley	8	66	1	0	75
Downtown	Pittsburg	0	0	0	75	75

Attachment D, Table D2: PDA Implementation Status - Housing Permits Issued, 2015-2017

PDA Name	Jurisdiction	Housing units permitted by affordability level: 2015-17				
		Low	Very Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total Units
Railroad Avenue eBART Station	Pittsburg	0	7	0	59	66
San Pablo Avenue Corridor (Del Norte Station Area)	El Cerrito	62	0	0	1	63
Central Hercules	Hercules	0	0	0	43	43
Downtown El Sobrante	Contra Costa County	0	0	0	32	32
San Pablo Avenue & 23rd Street Corridors	San Pablo	0	0	1	28	29
North Camino Ramon	San Ramon	0	0	2	18	20
Downtown	Danville	0	0	2	16	18
Downtown	Concord	0	0	0	14	14
Moraga Center	Moraga	0	0	0	11	11
North Richmond	Richmond (with Contra Costa County)	0	0	1	2	3
Central Richmond & 23rd Street Corridor	Richmond	0	0	0	3	3
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Contra Costa County	0	0	3	0	3
Downtown	Martinez	0	0	0	1	1
Old Town San Pablo Avenue	Pinole	0	0	0	1	1
Hillcrest eBART Station	Antioch	0	0	0	0	0
Rivertown Waterfront	Antioch	0	0	0	0	0
Contra Costa Centre	Contra Costa County	0	0	0	0	0
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station (Bay Point)	Contra Costa County	0	0	0	0	0
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station (Pittsburg)	Contra Costa County	0	0	0	0	0
Community Reuse Area/Los Medanos	Concord	0	0	0	0	0
Community Reuse Area/Los Medanos	Concord	0	0	0	0	0
Downtown	Oakley	0	0	0	0	0
Potential Planning Area	Oakley	0	0	0	0	0
Downtown	Orinda	0	0	0	0	0
Appian Way Corridor	Pinole	0	0	0	0	0
Diablo Valley College	Pleasant Hill	0	0	0	0	0

Attachment D, Table D2: PDA Implementation Status - Housing Permits Issued, 2015-2017

PDA Name	Jurisdiction	Housing units permitted by affordability level: 2015-17				
		Low	Very Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total Units
Buskirk Avenue Corridor	Pleasant Hill	0	0	0	0	0
Central Richmond & 23rd Street Corridor	Richmond	0	0	0	0	0
City Center	San Ramon	0	0	0	0	0
Rumrill Boulevard	San Pablo	0	0	0	0	0
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Richmond	0	0	0	0	0
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Hercules	0	0	0	0	0
MARIN COUNTY						
Downtown	San Rafael	0	4	0	17	21
Unincorporated Marin County	Marin County	0	0	0	1	1
NAPA COUNTY						
Highway 29 Corridor	American Canyon	49	36	133	0	218
Downtown Napa and Soscol Gateway Corridor	Napa	0	0	0	2	2
SAN FRANCISCO CITY AND COUNTY						
Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	San Francisco	111	298	247	3,252	3,908
Eastern Neighborhoods	San Francisco	77	294	74	2,614	3,059
Market-Octavia/Upper Market	San Francisco	39	110	35	1,126	1,310
Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	San Francisco	708	89	51	450	1,298
Mission Bay	San Francisco	40	158	26	1,005	1,229
Transit Center District	San Francisco	138	0	60	955	1,153
19th Avenue	San Francisco	0	0	8	173	181
Balboa Park	San Francisco	70	3	2	40	115
Mission-San Jose Corridor	San Francisco	0	0	38	50	88
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (San Francisco)	San Francisco & Brisbane	0	0	0	5	5
Port of San Francisco	San Francisco	0	0	0	0	0
Treasure Island & Yerba Buena Island	San Francisco	0	0	0	0	0

Attachment D, Table D2: PDA Implementation Status - Housing Permits Issued, 2015-2017

PDA Name	Jurisdiction	Housing units permitted by affordability level: 2015-17				
		Low	Very Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total Units
SAN MATEO COUNTY						
Rail Corridor	San Mateo	37	23	10	782	852
Downtown	South San Francisco	80	0	2	339	421
Downtown	Redwood City	0	0	0	312	312
Mission Boulevard	Daly City	21	185	5	16	227
Railroad Corridor	San Carlos	0	8	9	190	207
Burlingame El Camino Real	Burlingame	0	0	0	149	149
Villages of Belmont	Belmont	0	0	0	105	105
Broadway/Veterens Boulevard Corridor	Redwood City	7	0	0	83	90
Transit Corridors	San Bruno	0	3	42	41	86
El Camino Real	South San Francisco	0	4	10	61	75
El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown	Menlo Park	2	0	0	31	33
Grand Boulevard Initiative	San Mateo	0	0	2	16	18
El Camino Real Corridor	Redwood City	0	0	0	12	12
El Camino Real (North Fair Oaks)	San Mateo County	0	0	1	7	8
El Camino Real	Colma	0	0	0	6	6
Ravenswood	East Palo Alto	0	0	0	2	2
Bayshore	Daly City	0	0	1	0	1
Downtown	San Mateo	0	0	0	1	1
El Camino Real (Unincorporated Colma)	San Mateo County	0	0	0	0	0
Transit Station Area	Millbrae	0	0	0	0	0
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (Brisbane)	San Francisco & Brisbane	0	0	0	0	0
El Camino Real	San Mateo	0	0	0	0	0
SANTA CLARA COUNTY						
Greater Downtown	San Jose	0	0	95	1,323	1,418
West San Carlos and Southwest Expressway Corridors	San Jose	0	0	110	927	1,037
Downtown "Frame"	San Jose	314	0	80	560	954

Attachment D, Table D2: PDA Implementation Status - Housing Permits Issued, 2015-2017

PDA Name	Jurisdiction	Housing units permitted by affordability level: 2015-17				
		Low	Very Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total Units
Cottle Transit Village (Hitachi)	San Jose	0	0	0	762	762
San Antonio	Mountain View	53	0	1	684	738
Tasman Crossing	Sunnyvale	89	19	1	627	736
Berryessa Station	San Jose	0	0	0	641	641
Communications Hill	San Jose	0	0	0	448	448
El Camino Real	Mountain View	54	29	0	354	437
Whisman Station	Mountain View	0	0	0	364	364
Winchester Boulevard TOD Corridor	San Jose	0	0	0	267	267
El Camino Real Focus Area	Santa Clara	0	0	0	246	246
Central Redevelopment Area	Campbell	7	2	13	209	231
East Sunnyvale	Sunnyvale	0	0	18	212	230
Stevens Creek TOD Corridor	San Jose	0	0	0	226	226
North San Jose	San Jose	0	0	0	149	149
Downtown	Morgan Hill	14	8	0	106	128
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	San Jose	82	18	0	8	108
Transit Area	Milpitas	0	0	0	82	82
Downtown	Mountain View	0	2	0	80	82
Downtown & Caltrain Station	Sunnyvale	0	0	4	43	47
Lawrence Station Transit Village	Sunnyvale	0	0	4	31	35
Downtown	Gilroy	0	0	0	26	26
East Santa Clara/Alum Rock Corridor	San Jose	1	0	0	6	7
Saratoga TOD Corridor	San Jose	0	0	0	5	5
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	Cupertino	0	0	5	0	5
California Avenue	Palo Alto	0	0	0	4	4
North Bayshore	Mountain View	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Clara Station Focus Area	Santa Clara	0	0	0	0	0

Attachment D, Table D2: PDA Implementation Status - Housing Permits Issued, 2015-2017

PDA Name	Jurisdiction	Housing units permitted by affordability level: 2015-17				
		Low	Very Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total Units
Oakridge/Almaden Plaza Urban Village	San Jose	0	0	0	0	0
Capitol/Tully/King Urban Villages	San Jose	0	0	0	0	0
Bascom TOD Corridor	San Jose	0	0	0	0	0
Bascom Urban Village	San Jose	0	0	0	0	0
Camden Urban Village	San Jose	0	0	0	0	0
Blossom Hill/Snell Urban Village	San Jose	0	0	0	0	0
Capitol Corridor Urban Villages	San Jose	0	0	0	0	0
Westgate/El Paseo Urban Village	San Jose	0	0	0	0	0
El Camino Real Corridor	Sunnyvale	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	Gilroy	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	Los Altos	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	Milpitas	0	0	0	0	0
SOLANO COUNTY						
Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station	Fairfield	0	0	0	81	81
Downtown South (Jefferson Street)	Fairfield	0	0	0	5	5
Downtown	Benicia	1	0	0	1	2
Downtown	Dixon	0	0	0	2	2
Northern Gateway - Benicia's Industrial Park	Benicia	0	0	0	0	0
North Texas Street Core	Fairfield	0	0	0	0	0
West Texas Street Gateway	Fairfield	0	0	0	0	0
Downtown & Waterfront	Suisun City	0	0	0	0	0
Downtown	Vacaville	0	0	0	0	0
Allison Area	Vacaville	0	0	0	0	0
Waterfront & Downtown	Vallejo	0	0	0	0	0
Sonoma Boulevard	Vallejo	0	0	0	0	0

Attachment D, Table D2: PDA Implementation Status - Housing Permits Issued, 2015-2017

PDA Name	Jurisdiction	Housing units permitted by affordability level: 2015-17				
		Low	Very Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total Units
SONOMA COUNTY						
North Santa Rosa Station	Santa Rosa	1	0	0	140	141
Roseland	Santa Rosa	56	21	0	6	83
Sebastopol Road Corridor	Santa Rosa	0	0	1	41	42
Downtown/SMART Transit Area	Cloverdale	25	7	3	1	36
Station Area/Downtown Specific Plan Area	Windsor	0	0	0	19	19
Mendocino Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue Corridor	Santa Rosa	0	0	0	9	9
Core Area	Sebastopol	0	0	0	4	4
Central, Turning Basin/Lower Reach	Petaluma	0	0	2	1	3
Downtown Station Area	Santa Rosa	0	0	1	2	3
Downtown and Cotati Depot	Cotati	0	0	0	0	0
Sonoma Mountain Village	Rohnert Park	0	0	0	0	0
Central Rohnert Park	Rohnert Park	0	0	0	0	0
	BAY AREA TOTAL	3,198	1,985	1,778	32,834	39,795

Plan Bay Area 2050: Regional Growth Framework Update - Horizon Guiding Principle Indicators

This attachment provides detailed information about the performance of each of Bay Area’s 188 Priority Development Areas relative to the Horizon Guiding Principles. As part of the *Horizon Perspective Paper*, one indicator was identified and analyzed to assess the performance of different locations in achieving each of the Guiding Principles. The Perspective paper, available for download [here](#), analyzed all of the urbanized census blocks in the Bay Area using consistent, objective data shown in the table below. This attachment focuses specifically on Priority Development Areas. Table B1 provides the average score (from 1-5, with 1 lowest and 5 highest) of the census blocks within each PDA on the indicators included in the Paper.ⁱ

A detailed definition for each column, and the indicators, is provided below:

Table D1. Definitions by column

Column	Definition
PDA Name	Name of Priority Development Area (PDA) designated by local jurisdiction
Jurisdiction	Jurisdiction within which PDA is located (<i>this is also the jurisdiction that nominated the PDA</i>)
Access to Opportunity (indicator for “Vibrant” Guiding Principle)	<p>1-5 score corresponding with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)-adopted “Community Resource Level” for the census tracts in each PDA (average of tracts used for PDAs with one more than one census tract).</p> <p>“Community Resource” is a composite score based upon environmental, economic, and educational metrics shown by peer-reviewed research to affect the probability of success for low-income children and families. HCD publishes these Resource Level scores as part of its Opportunity Mapping project. More information is available here.</p> <p>The following scores correspond to each HCD-defined resource level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 (lowest) : High Segregation & Poverty 2: Low Resource 3: Moderate Resource 4: High Resource 5 (highest): Highest Resource <p>Data Source: California HCD, 2018 Opportunity Maps, Bay Area Region.</p>
VMT Reduction Potential (indicator for “Vibrant” Guiding Principle)	<p>1-5 score based upon the average miles driven per day by car per resident for the Transportation Analysis Zone(s) in each PDA (average of TAZs used for PDAs with more than one TAZ), using MTC Travel Model 1.5 2015 model year. Regional data was distributed into quintiles, with a “1” equal to the <i>highest</i> 20% of TAZs by VMT/person, and “5” equal to the <i>lowest</i> VMT/resident.</p> <p>Data Source: MTC Travel Model 1.5, 2015 Model Year.</p>

Housing Affordability (indicator for “Affordable” Guiding Principle)	1-5 score based upon Median monthly rent by Census Block Group (average of Block Groups used for PDAs with more than 1 block group) using the American Community Survey 2012-2016 5-year average. Regional data was distributed into quintiles, with a “1” for the area with the <i>highest</i> 20% of median monthly rent, and a “5” for the area with the <i>lowest</i> 20% median monthly rent. Data source: US Census, American Community Survey, 2012-2016
Community Stability (indicator for “Diverse” Guiding Principle)	1-5 score based upon loss of low-income households by Census Tract (average of Tracts used for PDAs with more than 1 Tract), using the American Community Survey 2012-2016 5 year average, adjusted for tract size. Tracts with no loss of low income population were scored a “5”; while the tracts that lost low income population were scored “1”-“4” based upon the distribution of data across this group. Data source: US Census, American Community Survey, 2012-2016
Total Score	Sum of scores for Access to Opportunity, VMT Reduction Potential, Housing Affordability, and Community Stability

ⁱ Note that one indicator included in the Perspective Paper, Hazard Protection, was not included in Table B1 due to the unique nature of this indicator, which does not measure “performance” in the same way as the other indicators.

Attachment E, Table E1: - PDA Performance - Horizon Guiding Principle Performance by PDA

PDA Name	Jurisdiction Lead	County	Opportunity (1-5)	VMT Reduction Potential (1-5)	Housing Affordability (1-5)	Community Stability (1-5)	Total (0-20)
ALAMEDA COUNTY							
Naval Air Station	Alameda	Alameda	4	4	5	5	18
Northern Waterfront	Alameda	Alameda	4	4	4	5	17
Castro Valley BART	Alameda County	Alameda	2	3	4	5	14
East 14th Street and Mission Boulevard	Alameda County	Alameda	2	4	4	2	12
Hesperian Boulevard	Alameda County	Alameda	2	3	4	2	11
Meekland Avenue Corridor	Alameda County	Alameda	2	3	4	5	14
San Pablo & Solano Mixed Use Neighborhood	Albany	Alameda	5	4	3	5	17
Adeline Street	Berkeley	Alameda	4	5	5	5	19
Downtown	Berkeley	Alameda	1	5	4	5	15
San Pablo Avenue	Berkeley	Alameda	4	5	4	1	14
South Shattuck	Berkeley	Alameda	4	5	5	5	19
Southside/Telegraph Avenue	Berkeley	Alameda	1	5	3	1	10
University Avenue	Berkeley	Alameda	4	5	3	5	17
Downtown Specific Plan Area	Dublin	Alameda	4	3	3	5	15
Town Center	Dublin	Alameda	3	2	2	5	12
Transit Center/Dublin Crossings	Dublin	Alameda	5	2	2	2	11
Mixed-Use Core	Emeryville	Alameda	4	5	3	2	14
Centerville	Fremont	Alameda	3	1	2	2	8
City Center	Fremont	Alameda	4	3	2	2	11
Irvington District	Fremont	Alameda	3	3	2	1	9
Warm Springs	Fremont	Alameda	5	1	2	5	13
Downtown	Hayward	Alameda	2	3	4	5	14
Mission Boulevard Corridor	Hayward	Alameda	2	4	4	5	15
South Hayward BART	Hayward	Alameda	2	3	4	5	14
South Hayward BART	Hayward	Alameda	2	1	3	5	11
The Cannery	Hayward	Alameda	2	3	4	2	11
Downtown	Livermore	Alameda	3	2	4	5	14

Attachment E, Table E1: - PDA Performance - Horizon Guiding Principle Performance by PDA

PDA Name	Jurisdiction Lead	County	Opportunity (1-5)	VMT Reduction Potential (1-5)	Housing Affordability (1-5)	Community Stability (1-5)	Total (0-20)
East Side	Livermore	Alameda	3	2	2	3	10
Isabel Avenue/BART Station Planning Area	Livermore	Alameda	3	1	2	5	11
Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development	Newark	Alameda	2	2	3	5	12
Old Town Mixed Use Area	Newark	Alameda	2	2	2	5	11
Coliseum BART Station Area	Oakland	Alameda	1	5	4	5	15
Downtown & Jack London Square	Oakland	Alameda	1	5	4	2	12
Eastmont Town Center	Oakland	Alameda	2	3	5	5	15
Fruitvale and Dimond Areas	Oakland	Alameda	2	4	5	5	16
Golden Gate/North Oakland	Oakland	Alameda	3	5	4	1	13
MacArthur Transit Village	Oakland	Alameda	2	5	4	1	12
TOD Corridors	Oakland	Alameda	3	5	4	5	17
TOD Corridors - International Boulevard	Oakland	Alameda	2	4	5	5	16
TOD Corridors - San Antonio/Central Estuary	Oakland	Alameda	1	5	5	2	13
West Oakland	Oakland	Alameda	3	5	5	5	18
Hacienda	Pleasanton	Alameda	4	4	2	3	13
Bay Fair BART Village	San Leandro	Alameda	2	4	4	5	15
Downtown Transit Oriented Development	San Leandro	Alameda	2	4	4	5	15
East 14th Street	San Leandro	Alameda	2	3	4	5	14
Intermodal Station District	Union City	Alameda	3	2	2	5	12
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY							
Hillcrest eBART Station	Antioch	Contra Costa	2	2	4	2	10
Rivertown Waterfront	Antioch	Contra Costa	2	3	5	5	15
Community Reuse Area/Los Medanos	Concord	Contra Costa	2	3	3	5	13

Attachment E, Table E1: - PDA Performance - Horizon Guiding Principle Performance by PDA

PDA Name	Jurisdiction Lead	County	Opportunity (1-5)	VMT Reduction Potential (1-5)	Housing Affordability (1-5)	Community Stability (1-5)	Total (0-20)
Community Reuse Area/Los Medanos	Concord	Contra Costa	2	1	2	5	10
Downtown	Concord	Contra Costa	3	3	4	5	15
Contra Costa Centre	Contra Costa County	Contra Costa	3	3	3	5	14
Downtown El Sobrante	Contra Costa County	Contra Costa	2	3	4	5	14
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Contra Costa County	Contra Costa	1	3	4	5	13
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Contra Costa County	Contra Costa	2	2	2	3	9
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Contra Costa County	Contra Costa	2	4	4	5	15
Downtown	Danville	Contra Costa	5	1	2	5	13
San Pablo Avenue Corridor	El Cerrito	Contra Costa	5	4	3	2	14
San Pablo Avenue Corridor	El Cerrito	Contra Costa	3	4	3	2	12
Central Hercules	Hercules	Contra Costa	3	3	3	5	14
Waterfront District	Hercules	Contra Costa	3	3	2	5	13
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Hercules	Contra Costa	3	3	4	5	15
Downtown	Lafayette	Contra Costa	5	1	3	5	14
Downtown	Martinez	Contra Costa	2	3	5	5	15
Moraga Center	Moraga	Contra Costa	5	1	2	5	13
Downtown	Oakley	Contra Costa	2	1	3	2	8
Employment Area	Oakley	Contra Costa	2	1	3	5	11
Potential Planning Area	Oakley	Contra Costa	2	1	4	5	12

Attachment E, Table E1: - PDA Performance - Horizon Guiding Principle Performance by PDA

PDA Name	Jurisdiction Lead	County	Opportunity (1-5)	VMT Reduction Potential (1-5)	Housing Affordability (1-5)	Community Stability (1-5)	Total (0-20)
Downtown	Orinda	Contra Costa	5	1	2	3	11
Appian Way Corridor	Pinole	Contra Costa	3	3	3	5	14
Old Town San Pablo Avenue	Pinole	Contra Costa	3	3	4	5	15
Downtown	Pittsburg	Contra Costa	2	1	5	5	13
Railroad Avenue eBART Station	Pittsburg	Contra Costa	1	4	5	5	15
Buskirk Avenue Corridor	Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa	4	3	3	2	12
Diablo Valley College	Pleasant Hill	Contra Costa	3	3	3	5	14
Central Richmond & 23rd Street Corridor	Richmond	Contra Costa	2	5	5	5	17
Central Richmond & 23rd Street Corridor	Richmond	Contra Costa	2	4	5	5	16
South Richmond	Richmond	Contra Costa	2	3	4	5	14
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Richmond	Contra Costa	3	4	4	2	13
North Richmond	Richmond (with Contra Costa County)	Contra Costa	1	4	4	5	14
Rumrill Boulevard	San Pablo	Contra Costa	2	5	5	5	17
San Pablo Avenue & 23rd Street Corridors	San Pablo	Contra Costa	1	4	5	1	11
City Center	San Ramon	Contra Costa	5	1	2	5	13
North Camino Ramon	San Ramon	Contra Costa	5	1	2	5	13
Core Area	Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	4	2	2	5	13
MARIN COUNTY							
Unincorporated Marin County	Marin County	Marin	5	2	3	5	15
Downtown	San Rafael	Marin	3	3	3	3	12
NAPA COUNTY							
Highway 29 Corridor	American Canyon	Napa	3	3	4	5	15

Attachment E, Table E1: - PDA Performance - Horizon Guiding Principle Performance by PDA

PDA Name	Jurisdiction Lead	County	Opportunity (1-5)	VMT Reduction Potential (1-5)	Housing Affordability (1-5)	Community Stability (1-5)	Total (0-20)
Downtown Napa and Socol Gateway Corridor	Napa	Napa	0	3	4	5	12
SAN FRANCISCO CITY & COUNTY							
19th Avenue	San Francisco	San Francisco	3	5	2	5	15
Balboa Park	San Francisco	San Francisco	3	5	3	5	16
Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	San Francisco	San Francisco	3	5	4	5	17
Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	San Francisco	San Francisco	5	5	3	1	14
Eastern Neighborhoods	San Francisco	San Francisco	3	5	3	5	16
Market-Octavia/Upper Market	San Francisco	San Francisco	3	5	3	1	12
Mission Bay	San Francisco	San Francisco	4	5	2	5	16
Mission-San Jose Corridor	San Francisco	San Francisco	3	5	3	2	13
Port of San Francisco	San Francisco	San Francisco	3	5	2	5	15
Transit Center District	San Francisco	San Francisco	3	5	2	5	15
Treasure Island & Yerba Buena Island	San Francisco	San Francisco	1	4	2	5	12
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	San Francisco & Brisbane	San Francisco	2	5	2	5	14
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area	San Francisco & Brisbane	San Francisco	2	5	3	3	13
SAN MATEO COUNTY							
Villages of Belmont	Belmont	San Mateo	3	3	2	2	10
Downtown	Benicia	San Mateo	4	1	5	5	15
Burlingame El Camino Real	Burlingame	San Mateo	5	3	2	2	12
El Camino Real	Colma	San Mateo	3	4	4	1	12
Bayshore	Daly City	San Mateo	2	5	3	3	13
Mission Boulevard	Daly City	San Mateo	2	5	3	5	15
Ravenswood	East Palo Alto	San Mateo	2	4	3	5	14
Transit Station Area	Millbrae	San Mateo	5	3	3	5	16

Attachment E, Table E1: - PDA Performance - Horizon Guiding Principle Performance by PDA

PDA Name	Jurisdiction Lead	County	Opportunity (1-5)	VMT Reduction Potential (1-5)	Housing Affordability (1-5)	Community Stability (1-5)	Total (0-20)
Broadway/Veterens Boulevard Corridor	Redwood City	San Mateo	2	5	3	5	15
Downtown	Redwood City	San Mateo	2	5	3	5	15
El Camino Real Corridor	Redwood City	San Mateo	2	4	3	5	14
Transit Corridors	San Bruno	San Mateo	2	4	3	5	14
Railroad Corridor	San Carlos	San Mateo	3	3	2	5	13
Downtown	San Mateo	San Mateo	4	4	3	5	16
El Camino Real	San Mateo	San Mateo	3	3	2	2	10
Grand Boulevard Initiative	San Mateo	San Mateo	3	3	2	2	10
Rail Corridor	San Mateo	San Mateo	3	3	2	5	13
El Camino Real (North Fair Oaks)	San Mateo County	San Mateo	2	4	3	2	11
El Camino Real (Unincorporated Colma)	San Mateo County	San Mateo	3	4	4	1	12
Downtown	South San Francisco	San Mateo	2	4	3	1	10
El Camino Real	South San Francisco	San Mateo	3	3	3	5	14
SANTA CLARA COUNTY							
Central Redevelopment Area	Campbell	Santa Clara	3	4	2	3	12
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	Cupertino	Santa Clara	5	4	2	5	16
Downtown	Gilroy	Santa Clara	1	5	4	5	15
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	Gilroy	Santa Clara	2	5	4	5	16
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	Los Altos	Santa Clara	5	3	2	5	15

Attachment E, Table E1: - PDA Performance - Horizon Guiding Principle Performance by PDA

PDA Name	Jurisdiction Lead	County	Opportunity (1-5)	VMT Reduction Potential (1-5)	Housing Affordability (1-5)	Community Stability (1-5)	Total (0-20)
El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown	Menlo Park	Santa Clara	4	4	2	2	12
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	Milpitas	Santa Clara	4	4	2	5	15
Transit Area	Milpitas	Santa Clara	4	4	2	5	15
Downtown	Morgan Hill	Santa Clara	3	4	3	5	15
Downtown	Mountain View	Santa Clara	5	3	2	5	15
El Camino Real	Mountain View	Santa Clara	4	4	2	2	12
North Bayshore	Mountain View	Santa Clara	3	1	4	5	13
San Antonio	Mountain View	Santa Clara	5	3	2	2	12
Whisman Station	Mountain View	Santa Clara	5	4	2	5	16
California Avenue	Palo Alto	Santa Clara	5	4	2	5	16
Bascom TOD Corridor	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	4	3	5	14
Bascom Urban Village	San Jose	Santa Clara	3	3	3	5	14
Berryessa Station	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	4	3	5	14
Blossom Hill/Snell Urban Village	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	3	2	5	12
Camden Urban Village	San Jose	Santa Clara	4	3	2	2	11
Capitol Corridor Urban Villages	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	4	2	5	13
Capitol/Tully/King Urban Villages	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	4	3	5	14
Communications Hill	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	4	3	5	14
Cottle Transit Village (Hitachi)	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	3	2	5	12
Downtown "Frame"	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	4	3	5	14
East Santa Clara/Alum Rock Corridor	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	4	4	5	15
Greater Downtown	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	5	3	5	15
North San Jose	San Jose	Santa Clara	4	4	2	5	15

Attachment E, Table E1: - PDA Performance - Horizon Guiding Principle Performance by PDA

PDA Name	Jurisdiction Lead	County	Opportunity (1-5)	VMT Reduction Potential (1-5)	Housing Affordability (1-5)	Community Stability (1-5)	Total (0-20)
Oakridge/Almaden Plaza Urban Village	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	3	2	2	9
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas	San Jose	Santa Clara	2	4	3	5	14
Saratoga TOD Corridor	San Jose	Santa Clara	4	4	3	5	16
Stevens Creek TOD Corridor	San Jose	Santa Clara	4	4	2	5	15
West San Carlos and Southwest Expressway Corridors	San Jose	Santa Clara	3	4	3	2	12
Westgate/El Paseo Urban Village	San Jose	Santa Clara	4	3	2	2	11
Winchester Boulevard TOD Corridor	San Jose	Santa Clara	3	3	3	2	11
El Camino Real Focus Area	Santa Clara	Santa Clara	1	5	3	2	11
Santa Clara Station Focus Area	Santa Clara	Santa Clara	1	4	3	2	10
Downtown & Caltrain Station	Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	3	4	2	5	14
East Sunnyvale	Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	3	3	2	5	13
El Camino Real Corridor	Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	4	3	2	5	14
Lawrence Station Transit Village	Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	3	3	2	5	13
Tasman Crossing	Sunnyvale	Santa Clara	3	3	2	2	10
SOLANO COUNTY							
Northern Gateway - Benicia's Industrial Park	Benicia	Solano	3	1	4	5	13
Downtown	Dixon	Solano	2	3	5	3	13
Downtown South (Jefferson Street)	Fairfield	Solano	2	4	5	5	16
Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station	Fairfield	Solano	3	2	2	5	12
North Texas Street Core	Fairfield	Solano	1	4	5	2	12
West Texas Street Gateway	Fairfield	Solano	2	4	4	2	12
Downtown & Waterfront	Suisun City	Solano	2	1	3	5	11

Attachment E, Table E1: - PDA Performance - Horizon Guiding Principle Performance by PDA

PDA Name	Jurisdiction Lead	County	Opportunity (1-5)	VMT Reduction Potential (1-5)	Housing Affordability (1-5)	Community Stability (1-5)	Total (0-20)
Allison Area	Vacaville	Solano	2	2	4	5	13
Downtown	Vacaville	Solano	2	3	5	5	15
Sonoma Boulevard	Vallejo	Solano	1	4	5	5	15
Waterfront & Downtown	Vallejo	Solano	2	4	5	5	16
SONOMA COUNTY							
Downtown/SMART Transit Area	Cloverdale	Sonoma	4	4	5	3	16
Downtown and Cotati Depot	Cotati	Sonoma	3	1	4	2	10
Central, Turning Basin/Lower Reach	Petaluma	Sonoma	3	3	4	5	15
Central Rohnert Park	Rohnert Park	Sonoma	2	2	4	5	13
Sonoma Mountain Village	Rohnert Park	Sonoma	3	1	2	2	8
Downtown Station Area	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	2	4	5	5	16
Mendocino Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue Corridor	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	2	4	4	2	12
North Santa Rosa Station	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	2	5	5	5	17
Roseland	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	2	4	4	5	15
Sebastopol Road Corridor	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	2	4	4	5	15
Core Area	Sebastopol	Sonoma	4	1	4	5	14
Station Area/Downtown Specific Plan Area	Windsor	Sonoma	2	3	3	2	10

PLAN BAY AREA 2050

Plan Bay Area 2050: Regional Growth Framework Update - Supportive VMT-Reduction Policies

The table below summarizes a set of proposed policies demonstrated to reduce Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) intended to complement the VMT-reduction of transit service in PDAs, particularly those with limited access. Connected Community PDAs that are outside of a High Resource Area (HRA) would be required to adopt at least 2 of these policies, which may be refined in advance of the final adoption of new PDAs.

Supportive Policy	Description
Senate Bill 743 (SB743)ⁱ Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a Parking and Transportation-Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance that includes a monitoring and enforcement component. The ordinance would apply to new commercial and residential development and require developers and property managers to reduce VMT through measures like free transit passes, bike and car share memberships with the bikes/vehicles on-site. • Create new, or revise existing, development impact fees to be added to a transportation fund that can be invested in VMT-reduction investments citywide
Active Transportation Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a policy to prioritize planning and implementation of Class 2ⁱⁱ or better bike infrastructure and safe, pedestrian-scaled streets • Adopt Vision Zeroⁱⁱⁱ and universal design (designs that accommodate the widest range of potential users, including people with mobility and visual impairments) policies
Curb Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt a policy to prioritize curb space for reliable transit and shared modes (e.g. bicycles, scooters), with consideration to other uses of the curb that provide environmental and social benefits (e.g. carshare, green stormwater infrastructure, small public spaces (parklets), electric vehicle chargers and managed parking with pricing).

ⁱ SB743, adopted in 2013, changes the way that cities are required to analyze the transportation impacts of a development project to focus on its impact on Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) rather than its impact on roadway congestion (commonly analyzed as Level of Service). The policy proposed here would enable a city to achieve the objective of SB743 by putting in place requirements to reduce VMT. Additional information is available [here](#).

ⁱⁱ A striped lane for bicycle travel on a street or highway. Additional information from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is available [here](#).

ⁱⁱⁱ A strategy to eliminate all traffic fatalities and severe injuries, while increasing safe, healthy, equitable mobility. More information is available [here](#).



Plan Bay Area 2050: Regional Growth Framework Update

Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) - Overview and Eligibility Criteria

Program Information

The Priority Conservation Areas (PCA) complement PDAs by protecting a network of locally-identified at-risk open space, farmland, and habitat. Along with PDAs, PCAs were the centerpiece of the Regional Growth Framework that shaped the first two iterations of Plan Bay Area. The goal of the nominating PCAs is to:

- **Protect key open spaces** under pressure from urban development and other factors.
- **Preserve the lands necessary** to maintain the region's quality of life, ecological diversity, and agricultural production capabilities.
- **Provide opportunities for partnerships** and coordination in open space protection and preservation efforts, focusing available resources within a regional framework.
- **Create a regional vision** for open space conservation and preservation needs.

Eligible Areas

For an area to be eligible for nomination as a PCA, it must:

- Provide **regionally significant** agricultural, natural resource, scenic, recreational, and/or ecological values and ecosystem functions, demonstrated through adopted plans and recognized data sources such as the Conservation Lands Network (CLN);
- **Require protection** due to pressure from urban development or other factors; and
- Fall into **one or more PCA designation category**: Natural Landscapes, Agricultural Lands, Urban Greening, and Regional Recreation.

Nomination Process

Similar to the proposed process for PDAs, applicants would have the option of submitting a letter of interest prior to full application for staff review, or submitting a full application.

Letters of interest would include: a) a completed checklist demonstrating consistency with eligibility criteria; b) a narrative description of the proposed area; and c) a map of the area.

Full applications would include all of this information as well as an adopted resolution by the jurisdiction or special district with primary land use control - typically a city, county or park/open space district.

Contact Information

Lee Huo - lhuo@bayareametro.gov

Laura Thompson - lthompson@bayareametro.gov

Plan Bay Area 2050: Regional Growth Framework Update Proposed Priority Production Area (PPA) Pilot Program - Overview and Eligibility Criteria

Program Information

The Priority Production Area (PPA) program would identify industrial areas of importance to the regional and local economies, provide supportive resources and implementation actions for these areas, and encourage middle-wage job opportunities. PPAs would be locally-designated areas where industrial jobs (including manufacturing and supply chain services such as warehousing, distribution and repair) would be a priority consideration in determining future land use. In many cases, PPAs would be areas with broad community support for continued industrial activity that face pressure for conversion to higher-value uses.

The PPA program would complement existing Priority Development Area (PDA) and Priority Conservation Area (PCA) programs. It would build on the regional and local partnerships and knowledge resources that ABAG/MTC has developed over the past three years in establishing the Greater Bay Area Regional Economic Development District. The goals of designating PPAs would be to:

- **Support** strong clusters of the region's economy.
- **Align with the transportation planning framework** for freight and goods movement.
- **Plan for space** needed for middle-wage job opportunities.
- **Encourage middle-wage job growth** close to affordable housing.

For Plan Bay Area 2050, the PPA program will be implemented as a pilot program, with a limited number of PPAs designated from selected jurisdictions. The criteria for the pilot program described below would be improved and revised through testing during the Plan Bay Area 2050 analysis.

Proposed Eligibility Criteria for Pilot PPA Program

Each application will be evaluated according to local context and needs. Staff proposes the following criteria for PPAs:

- **The area is zoned for industrial useⁱ** or has a high concentration of industrial activities
- **The area does not overlap with a Priority Development Area** and does not include land within one-half mile of a regional railⁱⁱ station
- **The jurisdiction has a certified housing element**

Proposed Nomination Process

Applicants would have the option of submitting a letter of interest prior to full application for staff review, or submitting a full application for PPAs. **Letters of interest** would include: a) a completed checklist demonstrating consistency with eligibility criteria; b) a narrative description of the proposed area; and c) a map of the area. **Full applications** would include all of this information as well as an adopted resolution by the City Council or Board of Supervisors. Applications that are not accepted for the pilot program to include in the plan may still be helpful in testing and shaping the PPA program that will be finalized after adoption of PBA 2050.

Staff Contracts:

Bobby Lu - blu@bayareametro.gov

Johnny Jaramillo - jjaramillo@bayareametro.gov

^{i i} This could include, but is not limited to, industrial zoning, zoning controls that maintain industrial activities in a mixed use area, interim controls protecting existing industrial uses.

ⁱⁱ Regional rail is defined as heavy, commuter, or intercity rail, including but not limited to BART, Caltrain, SMART, ACE, and Amtrak.



SPUR

San Francisco | San Jose | Oakland

Bay Area Metro
375 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

May 3, 2019

Re: Regional Growth Framework Revisions: Next Steps Presentation

Dear ABAG President Rabbitt, MTC Chair Haggerty, MTC Commissioners, ABAG Executive Board, and Staff,

The San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR) is member-supported urban policy think tank that promotes good planning and good government through research, education and advocacy. We are located in the three largest cities of the Bay Area and work to drive local and regional change.

We commend MTC and ABAG for re-assessing the Plan Bay Area regional growth strategy and the Priority Development Area tool. The last update of Plan Bay Area offered a sobering wake-up call that our current approach to regional and local planning will continue to worsen the many crises that the Bay Area faces. This major update of Plan Bay Area is an opportunity to be visionary and paint a picture of what we want the future to be, rather than accept current trends.

The *Horizons* Perspective Paper highlights several of the shortcomings with the current growth framework, including:

- Cities opt-in to the Priority Development Area designation, which limits new growth to too few places and worsens housing costs and other displacement pressures around the region.
- Only 6% of Priority Development Areas are located in areas of high opportunity, reflecting a long history of policy decisions that have disadvantaged people of color and low-income people—as well as an opportunity to reverse the trend of growing segregation.
- Approximately half of the region’s housing growth between 2015-2017 has taken place outside of the Priority Development Areas, suggesting that the PDA tools are not adequately shaping where growth is located.
- Some Priority Development Areas do not meet the program criteria, suggesting that these are not the “right” places for new growth.
- Some of the areas in the region with the highest potential to reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions are not PDAs, suggesting that the PDA tool is missing some of the most transit-accessible and sustainable places to grow.

SAN FRANCISCO

654 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 781-8726

SAN JOSE

76 South First Street
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 638-0083

OAKLAND

1544 Broadway
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 827-1900

spur.org

SPUR strongly supports the proposed definition of a PDA: *“an infill location that is planned for significant housing and job growth, offers a suite of mobility options which enable residents to live a car-free or car-light lifestyle, and promotes greater opportunity for all, regardless of race or income”*. **We strongly support using objective, measurable criteria to determine where growth should be located. Locating new growth in Transit Priority Areas and High Opportunity Areas is a big step in the right direction.** As MTC and ABAG consider the adoption of this new framework, we also recommend:

1. **We strongly support locating growth in areas that are rich in transit, high-quality schools, and other resources that promote economic mobility.** However, changing the regional growth framework will not change the fact that some cities have been reluctant to embrace growth and submit plans that conform to the regional growth framework. **We recommend that MTC add requirements to its funding programs to move away from an opt-in approach and continue to explore statewide growth management legislation,** such as those that concentrate growth near transit and require local plans to be consistent with the regional plan.
2. We appreciate that there are two categories of PDAs. All PDAs are not alike, and we should expect more from our urban areas. It is these areas where we also most need to direct job growth to support transit. **For transit-rich PDAs, we recommend a requirement that cities plan for at least 60% of their job growth within ¼-mile of regional rail stations.**
3. **For connected community PDAs, we recommend a closer look at the requirement that “at least 50% of land in PDA be within ½ mile of an existing or planned bus line with headways of no more than 30 minutes in peak periods”**. Many transit agencies are starting to shift their operating models to provide high-ridership routes (high frequency and high span) with less geographic coverage. These shifts are consistent with the need to create a network of local and regional routes and help support the financial stability of transit agencies, but the shifts also mean that the amount of land area proximal to a bus route may change.
4. **Prior to adoption of the proposal, we recommend that staff prepare and circulate a map that shows the area and locations that would be incorporated in the new designations.** That will help determine how much land is available for growth.
5. **Prior to adoption of the proposal, we recommend that staff prepare and circulate a map that compares the areas that are classified as PDAs if they have the current 20-minute transit frequency compared to the proposed 15-minute transit frequency.** Though SPUR supports frequent transit, we are also concerned that this shift may reduce the number of places that are designated for growth.

6. **We recommend that MTC model approximately how much growth could fit within these designations.** SPUR found that in the last two decades we have created a housing shortfall of 700,000 housing units and will need to produce 2.5 million new housing units over the next 50 years to make the region affordable to median income households.¹ It is not clear whether the proposed land area covered by the PDA framework can accommodate this amount of growth, suggesting the possibility of spillover into areas where we do not want to direct growth or into the megaregion.
7. We appreciate that there are two categories of PDAs, one that will help reinforce the urban centers of the Bay Area. All PDAs are not alike, and we should expect more from our urban areas. It is these areas where we also most need to direct job growth to support transit. **We recommend a requirement that cities plan for at least 60% of their job growth within ¼-mile of regional rail stations.**
8. **We appreciate that the two categories of PDAs incorporate job growth.** For many years, SPUR has advocated for Bay Area Metro to revise the PDA program and criteria to incorporate jobs so that the regional growth framework more directly shapes the location, density and diversity of employment.
9. **We support the Priority Production Area (PPA) for industrial jobs in concept, however:**
 - a. **We caution that cities could use the PPA as an excuse to not permit housing and infill development.** One way to avoid this outcome is to require cities to adopt plans for Priority Development Areas (or whatever replaces this program) prior to nominating Priority Production Areas. We also support the staff recommendation that PPAs not overlap with a PDA and does not include land within ½ mile of a regional rail station or ferry terminal.
 - b. **We want to grow the number of middle-wage jobs in the Bay Area, and protecting land for industrial jobs may not achieve that goal.** The Bay Area has had almost no change in the number of middle-wage jobs between 2007 and 2017.² At the same time, the types of industries and occupations that support middle-wage jobs is changing. Many industrial jobs are no longer middle-wage jobs. Jobs in the healthcare, caring occupations, and professional services are

¹ <https://www.spur.org/news/2019-02-21/how-much-housing-should-bay-area-have-built-avoid-current-housing-crisis>

² <https://www.spur.org/news/2019-01-23/wage-trends-show-increases-low-wage-jobs-while-middle-wage-job-growth-slows>

growing and will provide middle-income jobs. We encourage Bay Area Metro to provide support for these jobs within the growth framework.

10. Require cities to rezone their Priority Development Areas. Many cities that have adopted specific plans for their PDAs have not rezoned the land. Rezoning after adopting a plan helps speed up the infill development process. We recommend changing the grant award criteria so that cities that must include rezoning in their scope of work as a condition of funding.

11. Clarify how these designations will be used relative to various funding programs and policies. It is helpful for cities to understand how the criteria and designations will be used to inform Plan Bay Area, as well as OBAG, transit funding, RHNA, fair housing and other programs.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on this critical update to the region's plan for growth. Please do not hesitate to reach out with any questions at ltolkoff@spur.org.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Laura Tolhoff', with a stylized, cursive script.

Laura Tolhoff
Regional Planning Policy Director

COMMISSION AGENDA ITEM 10a - Correspondence Recieved



May 15, 2019

Metropolitan Transportation Commission
375 Beale Street #800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Dear MTC Commissioners and Ms. McMillan:

This letter calls your attention to the need for bolder and more creative strategies on carpooling and travel demand management (TDM) for Plan Bay Area 2050. Our next long-range transportation plan must keep our region on course to meet congestion mitigation and greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals. Travel demand management tools will need to play a central role in this effort. Success requires bold ideas that recognize the essential role that TDM has played in the past, and that leverage new technology and policy levers to deliver much more.

Our region has invested heavily in transit and will continue to do so. For example, Plan Bay Area 2040 devotes roughly \$180 Billion to transit over the plan period, more than 60% of total investments. Nonetheless, the plan still fails to meet targets for non-auto mode share, equitable access, and transit maintenance funding. Some of this can be improved by making smarter transit investments, but we must do more to leverage other strategies.

There are a number of reasons to expect that carpooling and other TDM strategies can deliver a much larger share of our sustainable mobility goals:

1. Carpool trips already comprise a significant proportion of overall trips. Over the past several decades, carpool trips have been roughly equal to the number of transit trips.^[1] In recent years, the share of trips by carpool has grown, while the share by transit has shrunk. Meanwhile, work from home trips represents more than half of transit trips.
2. Technology is rapidly changing the landscape for carpooling, e.g., apps that allow carpools to form more efficiently and provide more reliable enforcement tools for qualifying carpools; ridesharing companies are increasingly focused on groups rides; and growing numbers of cities and large companies are demonstrating that TDM policies such as parking management, and flexible telecommute policies can have dramatic impacts.
3. MTC's commitment to delivering a functioning network of managed lanes and carpool lanes will dramatically change the benefit of carpooling. Uncongested travel across the region will become the major attraction for carpool and shuttle trips.

At present, Horizon anticipates that these tools cannot deliver a growing part of the solution. For example, the latest Horizon strategies include only minimal investment in the strategy to “provide commuters with incentives to carpool.” It is a grave error to give up on the potential for carpooling when it is evolving so quickly and has represented such a large portion of our success in the past.

Rather than give in, MTC needs to step up. We need to explore an entirely different scale of policy and financial incentives for these strategies. Spending even 1/10th of what we spend on transit would be open an entirely new way of thinking about TDM strategies and cannot be written-off without any further analysis. We call for MTC, through the Horizon process, to deliver a strategy to double the share of commuters who carpool in the region.

Sincerely,

Jim Wunderman
CEO and President
Bay Area Council

Matt Vander Sluis
Deputy Director
Greenbelt Alliance

James Paxson
General Manager
Hacienda

[1] 10.2% carpool vs 11.9% transit in 2016.

Requested Commission Action:

Approve Resolution 4386, referred for approval by the Planning Committee on May 10, 2019.

This resolution:

- 1) Revises the definition and criteria for Priority Development Areas (PDAs).
- 2) Establishes a definition and criteria for Priority Production Area (PPAs) Pilot Program.
- 3) Authorizes staff to open a submission window for local jurisdictions to submit new or modified PDAs and PCAs, and new PPAs through a pilot program.



First things first: let's better define what a PDA is.



Priority Development Areas are **infill locations planned for significant housing and job growth.**




Priority Development Areas help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by **offering a suite of mobility options** that enable residents to live a car-free or car-light lifestyle.




Priority Development Areas promote **greater opportunity for all**, regardless of race or income.

How would the definition change?

PDA Criteria Since 2007



Proposed New Criteria



Proposed PDA Designations

*Transit requirements include both current & planned (Plan Bay Area 2050) service levels.
50% of land in PDA must be within ½ mile of transit meeting criteria*

Transit-Rich PDAs



High-quality transit



or



or



≤15 min peak

TPAs that are not currently PDAs should apply



Basic transit



≤30 min peak

AND at least one of the following:



High resource



existing high-resource area

OR



Policy commit.



commitment to adopt ≥2 policies by 2025
(e.g. TDM ordinance, curb management, Vision Zero)

HRAs that are not currently PDAs should apply

Best bet for PDAs unable to plan for 15-minute service

Connected Community PDAs

No changes
are proposed
for **Priority
Conservation
Areas (PCAs)**.

Defining Priority Production Areas (PPAs)

Pilot Program Goals

- Support strong clusters of the region's economy.
- Align with the transportation planning framework for freight and goods movement.
- Plan for space needed for middle-wage job opportunities.
- Encourage middle-wage job growth close to affordable housing.

Proposed PPA Definition for Pilot Program



Zoned for **industrial use** or with high concentration of industrial activities



Not located in a PDA and not within one-half mile of a regional rail station*



Jurisdiction has a **certified housing element**

** = includes both existing and planned service; includes BART, Caltrain, ACE, SMART, Amtrak, and any future heavy/commuter/intercity rail systems.*

Next Steps

1a

Align PDAs

Already meeting newly proposed PDA requirements:
No action required

- Not meeting transit requirements:
CTA to identify transit improvements needed by **September 2019**
- Not meeting planning requirements: City/county to identify start date by **September 2019**; complete by **2025**
- Not meeting policy requirements: City/county to make commitments by **January 2020** and advance policies by **2025**

1b


New PDAs

2

New PCAs

3a

PPAs



Requested Commission Action:

Approve Resolution 4386, referred for approval by the Planning Committee on May 10, 2019.

This resolution:

- 1) Revises the definition and criteria for Priority Development Areas (PDAs).
- 2) Establishes a definition and criteria for Priority Production Area (PPA) Pilot Program.
- 3) Authorizes staff to open a submission window for local jurisdictions to submit new or modified PDAs and PCAs, and new PPAs through a pilot program.

