

# OneBayArea

Equity Working Group  
January 11, 2012, 11:15 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.  
MetroCenter, Claremont Conference Room  
101 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Oakland, 2nd Floor

## AGENDA

Estimated Time  
for Agenda Item

**11:15 a.m.**

1. Welcome and Self-introductions
2. Equity Working Group Work Plan and Schedule\* (*Jennifer Yeamans, MTC*)
3. Notes from December 7 Meeting\* (*Jennifer Yeamans, MTC*)
4. Reports from Other Regional Advisory Groups:
  - Housing Methodology Committee  
The Housing Methodology Committee did not meet in December. The next meeting is scheduled for February 23.
  - Regional Advisory Working Group  
The Regional Advisory Working Group met December 16.  
Agenda/packet: <http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/events/agendaView.akt?p=1787>

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

**11:30 a.m.**

5. Equity Analysis Results for Alternative Scenarios: Recap and Discussion\* (*Jennifer Yeamans, MTC/Marisa Raya, ABAG*)  
*Staff will continue discussion of the Alternative Scenarios Equity Analysis results and overall effectiveness of the measures analyzed.*
6. Alternative Scenarios Targets Assessment: Recap and Discussion\* (*Marisa Raya, ABAG*)  
*Staff will review the results of the Targets Assessment for the Alternative Scenarios and seek any additional feedback from working group members.*
7. Preferred Scenario Development - Initial Policy Discussion\*\* (*Miriam Chion/ABAG*)  
*Staff will lead a discussion of potential policy considerations that may be suitable for incorporating into the Preferred Scenario based on findings from the Alternative Scenarios analysis.*

## INFORMATION ITEMS / OTHER BUSINESS

**12:40 p.m.**

8. Future Agenda Items (*All*)
9. Public Comment
10. Adjournment

### Next meeting:

Wednesday, February 8, 2012 11:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.  
MetroCenter  
2nd Floor Claremont Conference Room  
101-8th Street, Oakland 94607

\* Agenda items attached

\*\* Attachments to be distributed at the meeting.

*The Equity Working Group assists staff in the development of the Equity Analysis for the Sustainable Communities Strategy/Regional Transportation Plan.*

T:\SCS\SCS Engagement\SCS Equity\Equity Working Group\2012\01-Jan\0\_Jan 11 2011 Agenda.doc





# Equity Working Group Work Plan and Schedule

Revised 11/2/2011

Tasks	2011												2012												2013				
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M
<b>1. Vision Scenario Analysis</b>																													
1.1 Review populations and measures to be analyzed		*																											
1.2 Review results			*																										
<b>2. Alternative Scenarios Analysis</b>																													
2.1 Review populations and measures to be analyzed									*																				
2.2 Review results											*																		
<b>3. Draft Plan (Preferred Scenario) Analysis</b>																													
2.1 Review populations and measures to be analyzed																*													
2.2 Review results																						*							
<b>4. Complementary Tasks</b>																													
4.1 Update Snapshot Analysis/SCS Indicators																													
4.2 Identify other essential equity tasks that can be effectively analyzed																													
4.3 Review/comment on Scenarios relative to equity analysis results														*															
4.4 Support engagement in low-income and minority communities																													
4.5 Recommend possible policies for consideration in the SCS/RTP															*														
<b>Key Committee/Board Meetings</b>			1													2		3				4						5	
<b>RTP/SCS + EIR</b>		Vision		Alternative Scenarios									Plan Preparation					D									F		
<b>RHNA</b>			Methodology											D															F

\* Milestone D = Draft F = Final

Meetings:

- (1) Review Vision Scenario Results
- (2) MTC/ABAG Approve Preferred Scenario (Draft SCS)
- (3) Adopt RHNA methodology/Release Draft RHNA
- (4) Release Draft Plan
- (5) Final RTP/SCS

All dates/workplan elements subject to change

Summary of December 7, 2011 Equity Working Group meeting

**Discussion: Draft Results from Alternative Scenarios Equity Analysis**

<b>Draft Results: H+T Affordability</b>	<b>Response and Possible Follow Up</b>
Can the measure account for doubling up?	Current data can capture crowding but not forecasts.
How would an analysis of affordable housing policy affect the analysis?	Staff will investigate this question more during development of the Preferred Scenario.
Households may under-consume transportation to offset high housing costs.	The model is not explicitly sensitive to this; there is no real or perceived “upper limit” to total H+T as a % of income; however, there are generally more options on the transportation side and a greater range of possible costs to attain basic mobility.
<b>Draft Results: Displacement Risk</b>	<b>Response and Possible Follow Up</b>
Inclusion of upper-income rent-burdened households is problematic.	Not sure that issue is impacting the overall results, but staff could bring higher-level regional data to help understand the potential extent of the issue.
What would move the needle on displacement pressure in terms of policy?	This is something that may need to be considered during development of the Preferred Scenario.
<b>Draft Results: VMT Density</b>	<b>Response and Possible Follow Up</b>
Ensure emissions data are available in addition to VMT.	Staff still needs to do some tweaks to this methodology but will bring these results to the working group for review and also include them in the final report.
<b>Draft Results: Travel Time</b>	<b>Response and Possible Follow Up</b>
Show vehicle-hours of delay or other reliability measure since low-income people often don’t have as much flexibility in when they can arrive to work.	Effects of congestion are probably already being seen in analysis of travel times.
Overall the measures don’t reflect a disadvantaged user’s inability to make a trip at all.	This is an ongoing identified issue with this type of analysis. H+T analysis may be best way to get at the issue of implied trip-making feasibility.
Don’t use “mandatory/non-mandatory” in definition of trip purpose.	Will make this change.
Add school trips to commute/mandatory trips.	Will bring some proposed definition revisions to a future working group meeting.
Match up CoCs to subregional areas.	Will bring results by county by CoC to future meeting.
Look at travel distance instead of time.	This is an option that can be considered for revision for the Preferred Scenario.
Look in terms of overall regional efficiency and complete communities	Travel time attempts to capture this, although it is not an explicit representation.
<b>Draft Results: General Discussion</b>	<b>Response and Possible Follow Up</b>
Label measures by key issues of concern.	Can add this information for Preferred Scenario as context.

Capture role of shift to transit	Can bring mode share data for commute trips to future meeting.
Do an accessibility measure to show opportunities.	Can explore this idea vs. travel time at a future meeting where we consider possible revisions to measures for Preferred Scenario.
How will transportation system performance change once constrained for Preferred Scenario?	Difficult to say at this point; there was some difference between scenarios with T-2035 network and Core Capacity, but the constrained and unconstrained were far more similar than different in terms of performance.

T:\SCS\SCS Engagement\SCS Equity\Equity Working Group\2011\12-Dec 7\3\_Nov 9 2011 meeting notes.doc

## TECHNICAL NOTES

Five equity performance measures were analyzed for each of the five Alternative Scenarios as well as the Base Year of 2005, based on key regional equity concerns identified by the Regional Equity Working Group: Affordability, Growing Equitably, Healthy Communities, Equitable Mobility, and Jobs-Housing Connections.

Communities of Concern were identified where there are currently multiple overlapping populations of concern related to transportation, housing, and land use: minority residents, low-income residents, people who don't speak English well or at all, households with no car, seniors 75 and over, people with disabilities, single-parent households, and over-burdened renters. Most of the communities of concern are in the region's urban core, but there are also communities of concern located in suburban areas around the region.

Low-income households earning less than \$38,000 (in 2010 dollars) were compared to households earning more than that amount for the affordability performance measure.

### HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION AFFORDABILITY

This measure is the combined cost of housing and transportation for a household as a share of income by income level. Low-income households spend a far greater share of their incomes on these costs than do higher-income households. Housing costs reflect base-year Census Bureau data on share of income spent on housing costs by income group and forecast to 2035 based on regional income forecasts. Census income reporting does not include non-cash subsidies for food, health, or housing, and no assumptions are made regarding future available housing subsidies or future affordable housing strategies. Transportation costs are estimated by MTC's travel model and take into account auto ownership by income level as well as the costs associated with the amount and type of daily travel by both auto and transit. The regional models used to make these forecasts are projecting actual recent trends forward, but for this analysis did not account for any absolute or perceived upper limit on the share of income spent on housing and/or transportation before low-income households would make other choices besides paying more, such as sharing housing, owning fewer autos, or moving away from the region.

### DISPLACEMENT RISK

This metric identifies households currently considered "over-burdened renters" and relates these households' location to areas of proposed growth in the Alternative Scenarios. In a given area, if more than 15 percent

of the housing units are occupied by renters who pay more than 50 percent of their income for housing (which is the definition of "over-burdened renters" used to help define communities of concern), and the projected growth in that area is more than 30 percent above current conditions (the lowest average amount of growth across the region in the five scenarios), the over-burdened households in that area are considered at risk for displacement. Results are shown as a share of today's cost-burdened renters whose neighborhoods would see greater-than-average growth under the different scenarios, indicating a high-demand real estate market.

### VMT DENSITY

Calculating this measure relies on identifying heavily used roadways — those carrying 10,000 or more vehicles per day — and identifying areas of developed land near these heavily used roadways to include areas of residential, commercial, or industrial land within 1,000 feet of the centerline of the selected roadways. This calculation methodology is consistent with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) "Recommended Methods for Screening and Modeling Local Risks and Hazards" (May 2011, version 2.0) as part of their California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review guidance for proposed land use projects.

The vehicle-miles of travel (VMT) for each affected roadway are forecasted using MTC's travel model across different scenarios.

### NON-COMMUTE TRAVEL TIME

"Non-commute" travel defined for the purposes of this analysis includes travel not associated with a trip involving work or school. For example, going to the grocery store and back home would be included in this definition. These trip purposes include such activities as shopping, recreation, social visits, escorting others, eating out, and "other" trips. Results are extracted from MTC's travel model based on residential location across all scenarios and averaged for communities of concern and the remainder of the region.

### COMMUTE TIME

This measure provides average travel time per trip for commute trips by all modes, based on the location of a worker's residence and place of work. Commute travel time is analyzed separately because travel time between home and work generally provides an indication of the proximity of jobs and housing for different socioeconomic groups. Results are extracted from MTC's travel model across all scenarios and then averaged for communities of concern and the remainder of the region.

# BayArea Plan EQUITY ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

MTC and ABAG conducted an Equity Analysis of alternative scenarios to help inform questions such as:

- What are the disparities in the region now and looking into the future for communities of concern?
- Do the alternative scenarios provide improvements for identified communities of concern relative to the base year (2005)?
- Which scenario(s) provide similar or better results for the Bay Area's communities of concern compared to the rest of the region?

Five equity performance measures were analyzed for the five Alternative Scenarios selected by ABAG and MTC, as well as for a base year of 2005, and results produced for the region's identified communities of concern and for the remainder of the region, in order to compare average results between the two types of communities.

Results across the scenarios did not vary greatly. However, some results indicate challenges that may need to be addressed with additional policies and strategies not analyzed in any of the alternatives. The results showed that:

- **Housing and transportation affordability continue to present a major challenge to low-income households in all future-year scenarios**, with housing costs rising relative to incomes more than transportation costs. The analysis does not incorporate any regional policies or strategies to create affordable housing, which may need to be addressed in the Preferred Scenario.

- **Communities of concern have a greater share of renter households identified as vulnerable to displacement based on future growth patterns** than the remainder of the region, and especially in the Core Concentration Scenario (#2), which adds more households to communities of concern than the other scenarios.
- **Compared to the rest of the region, communities of concern see a greater relative increase in vehicle travel** on heavily-used roadways in or near populated areas under the Core Concentration (#2) and Constrained Core Concentration Scenarios (#4), which emphasize development in the region's urban core.
- **Both commute and non-commute travel times increase across all scenarios**, due to increasing congestion and shifts from driving to taking transit for some trips. The Core Concentration and Constrained Core Concentration Scenarios show the greatest increase in travel times for communities of concern; these scenarios also provide enhanced transit service in the region's core.
- **The Outward Growth Scenario (#5) performs slightly better overall in terms of the selected equity performance measures**, as it generally puts the least pressure from future development on communities of concern, which are predominantly located in the region's core.



Scenarios were assessed for equity based on five measures chosen to reflect key regional equity issues. This table shows how each scenario performs for both the region's communities of concern and the rest of the region.

MEASURES ▼										
	<b>1 HOUSING AND TRANSPORTATION AFFORDABILITY</b> Share of income spent on housing and transportation costs  <i>Households less than \$38K/year (2010\$)</i>   <i>Households more than \$38K/year (2010\$)</i>		<b>2 DISPLACEMENT RISK</b> Share of today's overburdened-renter households at risk for displacement based on future growth patterns  <i>Communities of Concern</i>   <i>Remainder of Region</i>		<b>3 VMT DENSITY</b> Average daily miles of vehicle travel per square kilometer in residential and commercial areas near major roadways*  <i>Communities of Concern</i>   <i>Remainder of Region</i>		<b>4 NON-COMMUTE TRAVEL TIME</b> Average travel time in minutes for shopping, visiting, recreation, etc.  <i>Communities of Concern</i>   <i>Remainder of Region</i>		<b>5 COMMUTE TIME</b> Average commute travel time in minutes  <i>Communities of Concern</i>   <i>Remainder of Region</i>	
BASE YEAR ►	77%	41%	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.2	12.5	25.4	27.1
SCENARIOS ▼	10% ---- 100%	10% ---- 100%	0% ----- 50%	0% ----- 50%	0 ----- 3,200	0 ----- 3,200	0 ----- 15	0 ----- 15	0 ----- 30	0 ----- 30
<b>1</b> Initial Vision	77%**	43%	38%	10%	2,900	1,000	12.8	13.1	28.5	28.7
<b>2</b> Core Concentration	84%	44%	40%	10%	3,100	1,000	12.9	13.1	27.6	28.7
<b>3</b> Focused Growth	85%	44%	35%	7%	2,900	1,000	12.7	12.9	27.3	27.7
<b>4</b> Constrained Core Concentration	85%	44%	35%	7%	3,000	1,000	12.7	12.9	27.4	27.8
<b>5</b> Outward Growth	85%	44%	30%	7%	2,800	1,100	12.5	12.8	27.3	27.8

\* The location of "major roadways" is based on 2035 network volumes, so a base year comparison is not provided.

\*\* ABAG revised the regional income forecast after completing the Initial Vision Scenario. Scenarios 2-5 have a greater number and share of low-income households.

# BayArea Plan SCENARIO ANALYSIS

## WHAT ARE THE TARGETS AND HOW ARE THEY MEASURED?

### 1. Reduce per-capita CO2 emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by 15%

SB 375 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to set targets for reducing emissions from cars and light-duty trucks. CARB adopted this target for use in Plan Bay Area; the target results are based on a measurement of pounds of carbon dioxide emissions from passenger vehicles for a typical weekday, on a per-person basis.

### 2. House 100% of the region's projected 25-year growth by income level (very-low, low, moderate, above-moderate) without displacing current low-income residents

SB 375 requires regions to plan for housing all projected population growth, by income level, to prevent growth in in-commuting. This target's results reflect the percentage of year 2035 total housing demand that can be accommodated in the nine-county Bay Area. Only the first two scenarios are able to meet this target, as they assumed higher in-region population levels. In the other three scenarios, some households must live outside the Bay Area (particularly in the San Joaquin County) and commute into the region for employment.

### 3a. Reduce premature deaths from exposure to fine particulates (PM2.5) by 10%

The Bay Area currently does not meet the federal standard for fine particulate matter, which is extremely hazardous to health. The targeted reduction for PM2.5 reflects the expected benefit from meeting the federal standard. This target's performance was assessed by Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) staff; their analysis considers the impacts of fine particulate (PM2.5) emissions, as well as NOx emissions that produce secondary PM2.5. Note that all direct PM2.5 emissions from vehicles were considered, but road dust and brake/tire wear were not included.

### 3b. Reduce coarse particulate emissions (PM10) by 30%

The Bay Area currently does not attain the state standard for coarse particulate matter. The targeted reduction for PM10 is consistent with the reduction needed to meet the state standard and achieve key health benefits. The target results reflect tailpipe emissions and road dust from all vehicles, but do not include coarse particulates from brake and tire wear.

### 3c. Achieve greater particulate emission reductions in highly impacted areas

A "Yes" rating for this target means that highly impacted areas achieve greater reductions in particulate emissions than the rest of the region. The target assessment identified CARE communities as "highly impacted areas"; CARE communities are defined by BAAQMD as lower-income communities in the Bay Area with high levels of particulate emissions from roads and ports.

### 4. Reduce by 50% the number of injuries and fatalities from all collisions (including bike and pedestrian)

This target is adapted from the State's 2006 Strategic Highway Safety Plan and reflects core goals of improving safety and reducing driving. The target measures the total number of individuals injured or killed in traffic collisions, regardless of transport mode.

### 5. Increase the average daily time walking or biking per person for transportation by 70% (for an average of 15 minutes per person per day)

This target relates directly to U.S. Surgeon General's guidelines on physical activity, for the purposes of lowering risk of chronic disease and increasing life expectancy. The target results are based on the average time spent walking or biking on a typical weekday, only for transportation purposes (i.e. does not include recreational walking or biking).

### 6. Direct all non-agricultural development (100%) within the urban footprint (existing urban development and urban growth boundaries)

SB 375 requires consideration of open space and natural resource protection, which supports accommodating new housing and commercial development within existing areas of urban growth. The intent of this target is to support infill development while protecting the Bay Area's agriculture and open space lands. By focusing on areas with existing urban development, as well as areas specifically selected for future growth by local governments, the target seeks

to avoid both excess sprawl and elimination of key resource lands. The target results are based on the percentage of total housing units located within the year 2010 urban footprint (defined as existing areas of development, as well as areas within existing urban growth boundaries).

### 7. Decrease by 10% the share of low-income and lower-middle income residents' household income consumed by transportation and housing

This target aims to bring Bay Area housing and transportation costs in line with the national average, as the region's costs are currently significantly higher than the rest of the country. The target focuses on cost impacts for low-income and lower-middle income residents (with household income less than \$60,000 in year 2000 dollars).

### 8. Increase gross regional product (GRP) by 90% — an average annual growth rate of approximately 2% (in current dollars)

This target is a key indication of the region's commitment to advance Plan Bay Area in a manner that supports economic growth and competitiveness. Growth patterns and transportation investments in the scenarios affect travel time, cost and reliability. The Plan Bay Area Economic Impact Assessment, developed by consultant Cambridge Systematics, reflects on the cost of on-the-clock travel and access to labor, suppliers, and markets. Any resulting increases in productivity make the region more competitive for attracting new businesses and jobs; this increases employment and wages, which are also reflected in the GRP target.

### 9a. Increase non-auto mode share by 10%

Mode share can be interpreted as the percent of trips made by a particular travel mode (walk, bike, drive, etc.); this target reflects the Plan Bay Area goal of reducing trips made using automobiles. The target benefits from service and infrastructure improvements for the transit, bicycle, and pedestrian networks. The numeric target shown in the table reflects the resulting 10% mode share increase from the forecasted 2005 non-auto mode share of 16%. This updated target language has been proposed to replace the previously adopted non-auto travel time reduction target.

### 9b. Decrease automobile vehicle miles traveled per capita by 10%

Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita reflect both the total number of auto trips and the average distance of auto trips; this target would be supported by increased transit service, more opportunities for active transportation, and reduced travel distances between origins and destinations. Given significant traffic congestion in the region, it is critical to reduce VMT per person. The target results are based on model output for total auto vehicle miles traveled and are adjusted based on the total population for the relevant scenario.

### 10a. Increase local road pavement condition index (PCI) to 75 or better

The Pavement Condition Index (PCI) reflects the quality of the roadway surface — the more cracks and potholes form, the lower the Pavement Condition Index. The target reflects a goal of reaching a state of good repair on local roadways, which form the backbone of the transportation network in Priority Development Areas (i.e. key areas for focused growth in the Plan).

### 10b. Decrease distressed lane-miles of state highways to less than 10% of total lane-miles

This target's performance is based on anticipated state funding for highway maintenance. The region must maintain the existing highway infrastructure in order to support the goals of Plan Bay Area.

### 10c. Reduce share of transit assets exceeding their useful life to 0%

This target reflects a goal of replacing all transit assets on-time (i.e. at the end of their useful life); failure to do so would result in unreliable transit service. As frequent, reliable transit service is critical to support focused growth, this target reflects the need to maintain existing transit service in a state of good repair. This updated target language has been proposed to replace the previously adopted average transit asset age target.

## HOW WERE THE SCENARIOS DEFINED AND HOW DO THEY DIFFER?

In June 2011, MTC and ABAG approved five alternative Plan Bay Area land use and transportation scenarios for evaluation and testing to demonstrate how the region might achieve a set of performance targets for the environment, the economy and social equity (see inside for details).

These scenarios place varying degrees of growth in Priority Development Areas (PDAs), which are defined as land near public transit that local officials have determined to be most suitable for development. Likewise, the scenarios recognize Priority Conservation Areas, places local officials have deemed worth keeping undeveloped for farm land, parks or open space. The first two scenarios assume stronger economic growth and financial resources, along with a higher level of housing growth to meet forecasted demand. The remaining three scenarios fall somewhat short of meeting future housing demand but reflect input received from local jurisdictions on the level of growth they think can reasonably be accommodated.

SCENARIOS	LAND USE PATTERN	TRANSPORTATION NETWORK
<b>1</b> Initial Vision	Housing and job growth is concentrated in the PDAs, based on local land use priorities, available transit service, and access to jobs. The scenario is based on input from local jurisdictions on the level of growth they can reasonably accommodate given resources, local plans, and community support. 70 percent of the housing would be accommodated in PDAs. More than half of job growth is expected to occur in the region's 10 largest cities.	<b>Transportation 2035 Plan Network</b> – Investment strategy in MTC's adopted long-range transportation plan.
<b>2</b> Core Concentration	Housing and job growth is concentrated in locations that are served by frequent transit services and within a 45-minute transit commute of Oakland, San Francisco, and San Jose. Also identifies several "game changers," or places with capacity for a high level of growth if coupled with supportive policies and resources. These areas include the Tasman Corridor in Santa Clara County, lands east of Oakland Airport to the Coliseum, the Concord Naval Weapons Station, and the San Francisco Eastern Waterfront, among others. Overall, 72 percent of the housing and 61 percent of the job growth is expected within the PDAs.	<b>Core Capacity Transit Network</b> – Increases transit service frequency along the core transit network
<b>3</b> Focused Growth	Distributes growth most evenly throughout the region's transit corridors and job centers, focusing most household and job growth within the PDAs. 70 percent of the housing production and around 55 percent of the employment growth would be accommodated within PDAs. Provides more housing near transit stations and more local services in existing downtown areas and neighborhood centers.	<b>Core Capacity Transit Network</b> – See description above.
<b>4</b> Constrained Core Concentration	Places more household and job growth in those PDAs situated along several transit corridors ringing the Bay in San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties, and in portions of Alameda and Contra Costa counties. Some 79 percent of the housing production and 58 percent of the employment growth would be accommodated within PDAs. By concentrating more growth in the major downtowns and along key transit corridors, this scenario goes even further than the Focused Growth scenario in trying to maximize the use of the core transit network and provide access to jobs and services to most of the population.	<b>Core Capacity Transit Network</b> – See description above.
<b>5</b> Outward Growth	Closer to recent development trends, places more growth in the cities and PDAs in the inland areas away from the Bay than those considered in the Focused Growth or the Constrained Core Concentration scenarios. Most housing and employment growth would still be accommodated in areas closest to the Bay, but with clusters of jobs and housing in key transit-served locations in the inland areas away from the Bay. Some 67 percent of housing production and 53 percent of employment growth would be in PDAs. While increased use of public transit would be limited in inland areas, some shorter commutes could be expected as jobs are created closer to residential communities.	<b>Transportation 2035 Plan Network</b> – See description above.

Scenarios were assessed to determine their impacts on the Bay Area. This table shows how each scenario performs with regard to the adopted Plan Bay Area performance targets.

TARGETS ▼																
	CLIMATE PROTECTION  1 Reduce CO <sub>2</sub> emissions per person from cars and light-duty trucks	ADEQUATE HOUSING  2 House projected regional growth	HEALTHY & SAFE COMMUNITIES  3a Reduce premature deaths from exposure to fine particulate emissions 3b Reduce coarse particulate emissions 3c Achieve greater particulate emissions reduction in highly-impacted areas					4 Reduce injuries and fatalities from all collisions	5 Increase the average daily time walking or biking per person	OPEN SPACE & AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION  6 Direct new non-agricultural development within urban footprint	EQUITABLE ACCESS  7 Reduce housing and transportation costs as share of low-income households' budgets	ECONOMIC VITALITY  8 Increase Gross Regional Product (GRP)	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS  9a** Increase non-auto mode share 9b Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per person 10a Improve local road pavement condition index (PCI) 10b Reduce share of distressed state highway lane-miles 10c** Reduce share of transit assets exceeding their useful life			
NUMERIC GOALS* ▶	-15%	100%	-10%	-30%	Yes	-50%	+70%	100%	-10%	+90%	26%	-10%	+19%	-63%	-100%	
SCENARIOS ▼	-15% ↔ 0	0 ↔ 100%	-40% ↔ 0	-30% ↔ 0		-50% ↔ +50%	0 ↔ 70%	0 ↔ 100%	-10% ↔ +10%	0 ↔ +140%	0 ↔ 26%	-10% ↔ 0	0 ↔ +19%	-63% ↔ +63%	-150% ↔ +150%	
<b>1</b> Initial Vision	-8%	100%	-23%	-6%		+26%	+15%	98%	-4%	131%	19%	-6%	+5%	+30%	+138%	
<b>2</b> Core Concentration	-8%	100%	-27%	-9%		+23%	+20%	92%	+8%	134%	20%	-6%	+5%	+30%	+138%	
<b>3</b> Focused Growth	-9%	98%	-32%	-13%		+19%	+14%	92%	+9%	113%	19%	-6%	+5%	+30%	+138%	
<b>4</b> Constrained Core Concentration	-9%	98%	-32%	-13%		+18%	+15%	92%	+9%	113%	19%	-7%	+5%	+30%	+138%	
<b>5</b> Outward Growth	-8%	98%	-31%	-11%		+20%	+10%	90%	+9%	113%	18%	-5%	+5%	+30%	+138%	

\* Percent changes reflect differences between 2005 and 2035 conditions.

\*\* Alternate target used.

Target results shown with white stripes signify that result is going in the wrong direction with respect to the adopted target.