

# Plan Bay Area Draft Environmental Impact Report

Under the California Environmental Air Quality Act (CEQA), ABAG and MTC must conduct an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to inform decision makers, responsible and trustee agencies, and the general public of the range of potential environmental impacts that could result from the implementation of Plan Bay Area. The EIR analyzes a range of alternatives to Plan Bay Area adopted by ABAG and MTC in July 2012 that achieve the main objectives of the plan while testing different options to do so.

In addition to the draft Plan Bay Area (the “Project” or “Preferred Alternative” in EIR terminology), the other alternatives that were analyzed in the EIR include:

- A **No Project** alternative which includes the continuation of existing policies with some expansion of urban growth boundaries and only transportation projects that were fully funded and had environmental clearance prior to beginning the Plan Bay Area process. This alternative is required by CEQA.
- A **Transit Priority Focus** alternative which seeks to maximize the benefits of environmental streamlining permitted under SB 375 in high-quality transit areas. As such, these high quality transit areas were upzoned, irrespective of local support for growth. To complement this, a development fee would be instituted in high VMT (vehicle miles traveled) areas and the proceeds would be used to underwrite growth in lower VMT areas. This alternative includes higher Bay Bridge tolls, increased funding for transit, and decreased funding for the Regional Express Lane Network.
- An **Enhanced Network of Communities** alternative was developed in coordination with a coalition of Bay Area business representatives. It envisions a land use development pattern less intense than the draft Plan Bay Area but also less dispersed than the No Project alternative. It too includes subsidies to achieve the desired growth pattern, as well as an increased Bay Bridge toll. Its transportation investments are almost identical to those in the draft Plan Bay Area. This alternative also assumes higher population, housing and employment totals.
- An **Environment, Equity, and Jobs** alternative was developed with various equity and environmental stakeholders. It emphasizes increasing opportunities for low-income housing development in jobs-rich communities through zoning changes and even larger subsidies than the other alternatives. All roadway expansion projects included in the draft Plan Bay Area were eliminated. Additional funding, such as an increased Bay Bridge toll and a VMT tax for miles driven (exempting low-income households), was assumed. The new revenue would fund additional transit service.

The complete EIR providing detailed information on the alternatives as well as the environmental impacts of the draft Plan Bay Area can be found in the *Draft Environmental Impact Report*, listed in Appendix 1.

## Target Assessment of the EIR Alternatives

In addition to the legally required assessment of the EIR alternatives, MTC and ABAG also analyzed the EIR transportation and land use alternatives for their performance against the adopted Plan Bay Area targets and equity metrics in order to inform the final phase of the decision-making process for Plan Bay Area. The targets analysis of these scenarios provides a final assessment of the draft Plan Bay Area. The target results can be found in Table 4. As can be seen, the EIR alternatives perform relatively similarly across almost all the targets, even though the results may be reached by different paths – with a few notable exceptions. For example, due to its more dispersed land use pattern, the No Project alternative lags the other alternatives when it comes to reducing GHGs (Target 1) or protecting open space (Target 6). The Network of Communities scenario, due to higher jobs and housing totals, does not achieve the particulate target (Target 3c), while it does improve state highway conditions (Target 10b) by shifting funds to maintain these roads.

The Equity, Environment and Jobs (EEJ) scenario does best on a number of targets related to reducing auto use (Targets 3b, 4, 5 and 9a) by implementing a VMT tax and eliminating road projects, while shifting funds to transit operations and local road repair (Target 10a). Overall, the Preferred land use pattern and transportation investment strategy embodied in the draft Plan Bay Area holds up well in this assessment, with the greatest decrease in GHGs per capita (Target 1) and similar or equal results for many of the remaining targets.



Naoh Berger

The small differences across the alternatives for many of the targets should be interpreted carefully. The target estimates are derived from analytical tools that attempt to represent very complex patterns of travel and land development behavior. Further, these representations of behavior rely on a host of assumptions about the prevailing economic, political and technological conditions expected in 2040. When these factors are combined, the resulting un-

certainty prevents identifying clear-cut differences across the range of alternatives presented here. However, these tools do provide a consistent framework in which expected (and rational) responses to policies can be assessed and the careful interpretation of results can lead to the insights noted above.

**Table 4 Target Analysis: Plan Bay Area EIR Alternatives for Year 2040**

Target	Goal	No Project	Preferred	Transit Priority Focus	Network of Communities	Equity, Environment & Jobs
<b>1</b> Reduce per-capita CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from cars and light-duty trucks	<b>-15%</b>	-8%	-18%	-16%	-16%	-17%
<b>2</b> House the region's projected growth	<b>100%</b>	100%	100%	100%	118%	100%
<b>3a</b> Reduce premature deaths from exposure to fine particulates (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	<b>-10%</b>	-71%	-71%	-72%	-69%	-72%
<b>3b</b> Reduce coarse particulate emissions (PM <sub>10</sub> )	<b>-30%</b>	-16%	-17%	-17%	-14%	-18%
<b>3c</b> Achieve greater particulate emission reductions in highly impacted areas	<b>Yes</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>4</b> Reduce the number of injuries and fatalities from all collisions	<b>-50%</b>	+18%	+18%	+17%	+23%	+16%
<b>5</b> Increase the average daily time walking or biking per person for transportation	<b>+70%</b>	+12%	+17%	+18%	+13%	+20%
<b>6</b> Direct all non-agricultural development within the year 2010 urban footprint	<b>100%</b>	53%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>7</b> Decrease the share of low-income and lower-middle income residents' household income consumed by transportation and housing	<b>-10%</b>	+8%	+3%	+5%	+3%	+2%
<b>8</b> Increase gross regional product (GRP)	<b>+110%</b>	+118%	+119%	+118%	+123%	+118%
<b>9a</b> Increase non-auto mode share	<b>26%</b>	19%	20%	20%	19%	21%
<b>9b</b> Decrease automobile vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita	<b>-10%</b>	-5%	-9%	-8%	-9%	-9%
<b>10a</b> Increase local road pavement condition index (PCI)	<b>75</b>	50	68	68	68	71
<b>10b</b> Decrease share of distressed lane-miles of state highways	<b>10%</b>	44%	44%	44%	30%	41%
<b>10c</b> Reduce share of transit assets exceeding useful life	<b>0%</b>	36%	24%	24%	24%	24%

achieves or exceeds performance target  
 falls short of performance target  
 moving in the wrong direction

# Equity Analysis of the EIR Alternatives

Alongside the final target assessment is the equity analysis of this final set of scenarios. As has been the case throughout the equity analysis process, most of the results for the scenarios are quite similar, especially for vehicle miles traveled (VMT) density and travel time. All of the scenarios struggle to address chronic high housing and transportation costs, though the Equity, Environment and Jobs (EEJ) scenario shows slight improvement in housing costs thanks to increased affordable housing production, while the draft Plan Bay Area offers lower transporta-

**Table 5 Results of Plan Bay Area Equity Analysis for EIR Alternatives, 2010-2040**

		2010 Base Year	1 No Project	2 Project	3 Transit Priority	4 Network of Communities	5 Equity, Environment and Jobs
<b>1 Housing and Transportation Affordability</b> % of household income spent on housing and transportation costs	Households <\$38,000/year	H+T % 72%	80%	74%	77%	74%	73%
	Households >\$38,000/year	H+T % 41%	44%	43%	43%	42%	43%
<b>2 Potential for Displacement</b> Share of today's overburdened-renter households located in high-growth areas			1 No Project	2 Project	3 Transit Priority	4 Network of Communities	5 Equity, Environment and Jobs
	Communities of Concern	n/a	21%	36%	25%	31%	21%
	Remainder of Region	n/a	5%	8%	7%	9%	6%
	Regional Average	n/a	12%	18%	13%	17%	12%
<b>3 VMT Density</b> Average vehicle-miles of travel per per square kilometer of residential and commercial land within 1000 feet of major roadways.		2010 Base Year	1 No Project	2 Project	3 Transit Priority	4 Network of Communities	5 Equity, Environment and Jobs
	Communities of Concern	9,737	11,447	11,693	11,536	12,123	11,259
	Remainder of Region	9,861	11,717	11,895	11,804	12,261	11,626
	Regional Average	9,836	11,664	11,855	11,751	12,234	11,554
<b>4 Commute Time</b> Average time in minutes for commute trips		2010 Base Year	1 No Project	2 Project	3 Transit Priority	4 Network of Communities	5 Equity, Environment and Jobs
	Communities of Concern	25	26	26	25	26	25
	Remainder of Region	27	29	27	26	27	27
	Regional Average	26	28	27	26	27	27
<b>5 Non-commute Travel Time</b> Average time in minutes for trips not involving the workplace, including shopping, visiting, recreation, etc.		2010 Base Year	1 No Project	2 Project	3 Transit Priority	4 Network of Communities	5 Equity, Environment and Jobs
	Communities of Concern	12	13	13	13	13	13
	Remainder of Region	13	13	13	13	13	13
	Regional Average	13	13	13	13	13	13

tion costs by locating more housing and jobs near the region’s most robust transit service (see Table 5). In addition, increased vehicle traffic in communities of concern across the scenarios raises safety concerns for those areas where walking and biking are more common modes of travel.

The target showing the biggest variance from the Project Alternative is the Potential for Displacement measure; this is due to the concentrated growth patterns in the draft plan as the region strives to meet its GHG reduction target. More of today’s rent-burdened households in the Communities of Concern could be at risk for displacement than under the baseline forecast scenario, while both the No Project trend and EEJ scenario distribute growth more widely. This result, consistent with past rounds of analysis, led MTC and ABAG to bolster the plan’s investment in the Transit Oriented Affordable Housing fund, add requirements for housing element adoption and affordable housing production considerations to the One Bay Area Grant program, and build into the region’s Prosperity Plan (outlined in Chapter 6) a study of displacement risk and tools to offset it. In addition, this displacement risk could be mitigated in cities such as San Francisco with rent control and other tenant protections in place.

More information and detailed results are included in the *Plan Bay Area Equity Analysis Report*, in Appendix 1.



Lawrence Migdale