

Section 29b

Bay Vision 2020 Review Draft Report

Bay Vision 2020 Review Draft Report

January, 1991

TO: The People of the San Francisco Bay Area

On behalf of the 31 members of the Bay Vision 2020 Commission, I am pleased to send you this draft report.

As with most people in the region, we cherish the Bay Area and seek to assure its beauty, livability, economic strength, and the opportunities it affords those who live here. We have concluded, however, that these qualities are in jeopardy because we have no effective means for addressing the problems that cross city and county boundaries. Only by some changes in the structure of government in the region can we tackle increasing traffic congestion, long commutes between home and job, shortages of affordable housing, loss of valued open space to urban sprawl, predictable air pollution, and deterioration of our economic base.

We fear that present development trends, unless otherwise channeled, will result in a region that emulates Los Angeles rather than insures the character long associated with the Bay Area.

Our Commission was formed late in 1989. The Convenors* of our Commission asked us to make a one-year, independent examination of the ways in which the nine-county Bay Area is growing in population and changing in character. They also asked us to adopt a general vision for the Bay Area in the year 2020, and to recommend measures to achieve our vision.

This draft report is the result of our work thus far. During January and February, members of our Commission will be available to discuss our findings and recommendations. Then, at the end of February, we will review all the comments and suggestions we have received and we will complete our final report. After that, we expect to continue working to support legislation and other measures necessary to put our recommendations into effect.

* Elected officials of city and county government in the Bay Area, and the Regional Issues Forum created by the Bay Area Council and the Greenbelt Alliance.

Bay Vision 2020 Review Draft Report

Our Assignment

Our Commission was asked to focus primarily on those issues that we noted above. These were our primary concerns. But we also recognized the strong public interest in other issues such as improving public education, providing help for the homeless, combating drugs, etc. In short, the Convenors asked that our first priority be issues of land use, housing, transportation, the regional economy, and environmental quality. But the Convenors also said that our priorities and our recommendations should support efforts to improve education, revitalize inner cities, and help with the region's multiple social concerns.

Our Diversity

When the Convenors appointed our Commission, they made clear that we had been chosen intentionally to be a diverse group of Bay Area citizens. Our vocational backgrounds and experience include business and industry, agriculture, housing and commercial development, finance, education, conservation, and various aspects of public service. Some of us are involved with the concerns of specific constituencies, such as Asian-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, African-Americans, and the Lesbian and Gay community. Many of us are actively seeking solutions to a broad array of economic and social concerns. We come from cities, suburbs, and rural areas; and we represent the racial, ethnic, cultural, and geographic spectrum of the Bay Area.

Naturally, with this much diversity, we began our work with different outlooks and points of view. But as we got to know each other, and as we worked together to learn how the Bay Area is changing, we began to find a striking amount of consensus. Indeed, all of us have learned much from this process, in which we have met for two full afternoons a month and have spent countless additional hours in reading, discussing, and thinking about regional matters.

Nevertheless, there are still some things about which we differ. Some members of our Commission disagree (and, in a few cases, disagree strongly) with individual conclusions and recommendations in this draft report. As I've noted before, we expect to continue our efforts in early 1991 to see whether we can find further common ground, but total agreement on everything may not be possible. In the areas where we have not thus far found complete consensus, we mirror the divergence of views among Bay Area residents generally.

Bay Vision 2020 Review Draft Report

For example, we have noted that current forecasts predict an increase in the Bay Area's population from the current 6 million to well over 7 million by the year 2020. Some of us have concluded that there is a point beyond which the Bay Area's population must not be allowed to grow if the natural resources of the Bay Area are to be protected adequately. Others of us believe that such a population limit is neither desirable nor possible to achieve. Still others believe that the issue is not population growth itself, but the need to manage development so that natural resources are not degraded as population increases. All of us agree, however, that the environmental impacts of an increasing population and an expanding economy will require a new, more comprehensive ability to plan and make regional decisions for the Bay Area.

Our General Principles

Despite some philosophical disagreements, we have general support for three basic principles:

1. We all seek a prosperous economy, a livable environment, and a harmonious society. More and more, however, it is obvious that we will not achieve these goals by chance, particularly during a time of sizable population growth. We will need to manage growth and change if we are to achieve the economic benefits of growth and also to protect the Bay Area's natural resources. We will need, for example, to channel and encourage development in some areas and to discourage or prevent it in others.

2. The Bay Area will continue to have many kinds of communities. But, as part of our diversity, we will need adequate densities and concentrations, both in areas where people live and in areas where they work. This is essential to make public transit financially possible and attractive to people. A new regional emphasis on public transit will be required, along with the necessity of decreasing private vehicle trips, and stronger community commitments to increasing the density of development.

3. We in the Bay Area have no shortage of government but we do not have government organized to do what is needed for the future. We seek not more government, but better, more efficient government. Thus we advocate: (a) vigorous leadership in Sacramento to establish state growth-management policies and to provide ways to finance schools, transportation systems, and other infrastructure; (b) a new, nine-county Bay Area agency for growth management that would initially combine three existing major regional agencies--the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the Association of Bay Area Governments; and (c) local government planning and decision-making effectively exercised in conformity with state and regional growth-management policies.

Bay Vision 2020 Review Draft Report

Our Draft Report

In this report we do three things:

First, we list the major findings and conclusions that have resulted from our year of discussions of regional issues with knowledgeable, experienced people from the Bay Area and throughout the nation.

Second, we outline our goals for what the Bay Area should be like in the year 2020--our vision of a desirable future for the Bay Area.


And, third, we propose the governmental and other means needed to make this vision a reality.

Our recommendations build on existing institutions, propose bold steps where these are required, and are at the same time practical. We recognize that not everyone will agree with every aspect of our recommendations. We expect that those most involved with the issues of governance will be most interested in the recommendations. But we also look forward to comments by the general public and those in the private and non-profit sectors.

We urge readers to focus less on individual details than on the broad objectives we seek to achieve. We intend our report to stimulate discussion about regional issues, not to provide final answers. Our report is thus a beginning, not an end.

And, although our Commission's one-year assignment has been completed, we pledge our further efforts, as individuals, to work with the Convenors and with other interested Bay Area citizens to achieve the vision we set forth in this report.

Yours very truly,


Ira Michael Heyman
Chair

BAY VISION 2020 COMMISSIONERS

CHAIR

Ira Michael Heyman, professor of law and city and regional planning, UC Berkeley; former chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley.

VICE CHAIRS

A.W. Clausen, chairman of the Executive Committee, BankAmerica Corporation.

Pamela W. Lloyd, member of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, chair of the Marin Conservation Corps.

Richard J. Rios, deputy executive director of the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Jose.

COMMISSIONERS

Gordon Chin, executive director, Chinese Community Housing Corporation, San Francisco.

Sara Conner, chair, Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council; former president of the Bay Area League of Women Voters.

Paul De Falco, Jr., former regional administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; president of the Bay Area League of Women Voters.

Yvette del Prado, vice president, education and public affairs for Tandem Computers in Cupertino; former superintendent of the Cupertino School District.

Armando F. Flores, superintendent, Bellevue Union School District in Sonoma County; former Mayor of Rohnert Park

Gloria S. Gee, controller, Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Peter B. Giles, president and CEO of the Technology Center of Silicon Valley.

David L. Goodman, vice president of Public Affairs and Marketing Services for Clorox Corporation, Oakland.

S. Reid Gustafson, president of Northern California Division of Shea Homes.

Mary E. Handel, executive director of the Napa County Farm Bureau and the Napa Valley Grape Growers Association.

Aileen C. Hernandez, urban consultant, San Francisco.

James C. Hormel, president of Equidex, Inc., San Francisco.

Melvin B. Lane, former chairman of Lane Publishing Co., publisher of Sunset Magazine and Books.

Glenn H. Larnerd, vice president, Manufacturing, General Products Division, and site general manager of IBM, San Jose.

Lynette Jung Lee, executive director of the East Bay Asian Development Corporation, Oakland.

Robert A. Mang, founder and president of Advance Design Technologies; board member and immediate past president of the Greenbelt Alliance.

J. David Martin, president of The Martin Group, land developers.

David L. Nichols, former county manager of San Mateo County.

Martin Paley, management consultant, San Francisco.

Robert H. Power, chairman of the Nut Tree Partnership, Vacaville.

David M. Reiser, president of the Santa Clara and San Benito Central Labor Council.

Martin J. Rosen, president of the Trust for Public Land.

Dwight C. Steele, board member of the Save San Francisco Bay Association.

Geraldine F. Steinberg, president of Enshallah Developments; former Santa Clara County supervisor.

Reverend Chester B. Tollette, pastor of the Davis Chapel Christian Methodist Episcopal Church, Richmond.

Scott F. Wylie, director of Communications for Raychem Corporation, Menlo Park.

Beth Wyman, former mayor and council member in Morgan Hill; grants coordinator for housing and community development for Santa Clara County.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Our central conclusion is that, in the nine Bay Area Counties, we must improve our ways of managing growth or we will lose many of the qualities that make this region such a special place. The Bay Vision 2020 Commission was formed because of growing public concern about the increase in highway and freeway congestion, long trips between homes and workplaces, fears about a lessening of our economic competitiveness, air quality damaged by the exhausts of internal combustion engines, and unnecessary loss of open space. Without better recognition of our interdependencies in managing future patterns of development in the Bay Area, we are likely to have a future with much more of the same conditions that concern us today.
2. In the Bay Area we have plenty of government, but it is not adequately coordinated. The region has nine counties, 98 cities, and 721 special districts (not counting school districts). Many of these special districts are multi-county and some are regionwide. Most of these governmental units have taxing authority. But we have yet to create a democratic, responsive, and accountable political structure to address our regional interdependencies. Increasingly, our cities and counties make land use decisions to maximize tax revenues, not to carry out other planning goals. Inadequate incentives exist to encourage construction of affordable housing. And there are few political incentives for local officials to make difficult decisions in the broad regional interest rather than in local interests.
3. In many ways, the nine counties that border on San Francisco Bay are a single, interdependent region. But many Bay Area residents do not fully understand this linkage. Most of us do not think much about "regional" issues. Yet we increasingly are used to living in one community, working in another, shopping in a third, and traveling to still others for a symphony, a ball game, a visit to friends or relatives, or traveling across the region to reach the ocean or the Sierra. And all of us recognize that when we are some distance from home and are asked where we live, we are as apt to say "the Bay Area" as to name the city or county where we live.
4. We are regional in at least four general ways: environmentally, economically, functionally, and governmentally. The first may be the easiest to understand: San Francisco Bay is a single body of water that touches all nine counties; changes in one part of it can affect waterways miles away. Similarly, air pollutants from one place in the Bay Area are blown by the winds to many others. And our land is a regional resource. Economically, our cities and counties compete with each other for jobs and development within the region, but we also have a regional economy that competes with other regions of this country and with other areas in the global economy. Functionally, we have a regional array of freeways, transit systems, and patterns of land use that determine how we travel around the region. And governmentally, we have a variety of nine-county, single-purpose agencies (to regulate regional air quality, Bay filling, water quality, transportation funding, etc.). But we have no multi-purpose agency that can deal effectively with issues of broad regional importance.
5. At the same time, our communities are diverse, and we have many issues that are better dealt with locally or "subregionally" (by groups of cities and counties). In addition, many things that concern people in the Bay Area also affect adjoining counties. People commute to jobs in the nine counties from Mendocino, Merced, Monterey, San

Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus, Lake, and Yolo Counties. Thus, some people would define the Bay Area as now consisting of at least 14 or 15 counties. There is no question that the search for affordable housing has led large numbers of people who work in the nine-county region to live in these contiguous counties. But defining the Bay Area to include all of them would have little practical value. Rather, (a) the Bay Area should continue to be defined as the nine counties bordering on San Francisco Bay; (b) those of us who live in the nine counties should recognize the ways in which we are increasingly linked to adjoining counties; (c) these counties should be invited to take part in regional and subregional planning on issues of mutual concern such as housing and transportation; and (d) the Bay Area's efforts to manage its growth should not result in exporting problems to adjacent counties.

6. If present trends continue, the Bay Area's population will increase. In 1990, there were approximately 6 million people in the nine Bay Area counties. The Association of Bay Area Governments forecasts an increase to about 7 million in the year 2010, and more by 2020. While some argue that this increase in population could be reduced by actions taken over the next decades to limit growth, others believe it is important to incorporate these projections into regional planning. Thus, the potential challenge to the region is to find jobs and housing for many more people while minimizing the potentially adverse consequences of this population growth on the region's resources.

7. The population will be more diverse. Some time in the next 20 or 30 years, if present trends continue in our region and in the rest of urbanized California, all of us will be members of "minority" groups. This greater diversity will strengthen the Bay Area. The Population Reference Bureau in Washington, D.C. forecasts that the nine-county population by the year 2030 will be about 8 percent African-American, 26 percent Asian-American, 25 percent Hispanic-American, and 41 percent non-Hispanic white. The projected changes in the make-up of our population have important consequences: we not only need economic growth and environmental protection, we also need to insure a harmonious society as our diversity grows.

8. Our growth patterns at present emphasize low densities, both for housing and for businesses. Higher development densities would accommodate growth and leave more land for open space. Data developed by ABAG indicate that we continue to settle the Bay Area at approximately the same overall density as we have in the past—eight residential units per acre. As our population and businesses grow, and our density of settlement does not, we convert sizable amounts of undeveloped land each year. ABAG estimates, based upon local government planning, that approximately 285,000 acres of land (214,000 for residential purposes and 71,000 for business purposes) have been or will be set aside for development in the 20-year period from 1985-2005. Based upon actual experience, ABAG further estimates that an average of 8,500 acres per year will be used by 2005 for new residential and business purposes.

Projected population changes, as assembled for the Commission by Professor Richard LeGates of San Francisco State University, indicate that cities with the highest rates of projected growth are at the region's edge. All Bay Area cities with projected growth rates over 30 percent (from 1990 to 2005) are outside the core of the region, except for Emeryville.

9. Our growth patterns also emphasize the movement of both housing and jobs to the edges of the region. The Bay Area has an older, urbanized core consisting of San

Francisco, most of eastern San Mateo County, the San Jose area, and western Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Jobs in the Bay Area have increasingly moved to workplaces outside the older urbanized core. In some cases this may create a better balance of jobs and housing within a subregion.

The suburbanization of jobs, however, also has negative effects. Professor Robert Certero of UC Berkeley concluded in 1989 that more suburbanites live farther from their workplace today than a decade or more ago when the preponderance of jobs was in inner cities. One impact of dispersed employment is that commuting increasingly takes place along secondary roads not designed to handle the volume of traffic they must now accommodate. Another is increased commute travel. And a third is that job opportunities move away from low-income residents of central cities.

In addition, dispersed development requires costly new infrastructure, which must be built even though usable infrastructure is often already available in older communities.

10. Housing prices dictate many aspects of Bay Area life, and the search for affordable housing increasingly leads to long commute trips. Early in 1990, the median price for a detached single-family home in the Bay Area was approximately \$260,000. According to the Bay Area Council, even with the softening of prices later in the year, fewer than 15 percent of those entering the market for a single-family home (newcomers to the Bay Area, first-time buyers, expanding families) could afford the typically-priced home. Mayor Carol Whiteside of Modesto told the Commission that the average price of a home in her city early in 1990 was \$129,000. It appears that housing prices lead many people to accept the disadvantage of long commute trips and to live outside the nine counties.

Many of us live in rental units and in multi-unit buildings. LeGates reported that in the eight-year period from 1980-1988, 43 percent of the housing units built in the region were multi-family, 56 percent single-family, and 1 percent mobile homes. The rate of new multi-family construction in the 80s is very close to the existing Bay Area ratio of multi-family units to single-family housing. The rate at which multi-family housing is constructed has not increased. In turn, as ABAG reports, we have not increased the residential densities with which we develop land.

The Bay Area rental market is also expensive or unaffordable to many of us. In January, 1990, the median advertised Bay Area rent for a two-bedroom apartment was \$750 a month, with a high of \$975 in San Francisco and a low of \$495 in Solano County. The typical homebuyer and apartment renter in the Bay Area finds a cost structure that often makes residences outside of the region's urbanized core more affordable.

11. "Fair share" housing goals, by which communities each accept a reasonable share of the region's affordable housing, represent important efforts to build such housing. But few communities have achieved these goals. If the "fair share" strategy is to work, communities will have to be held more accountable for meeting established targets. They will also need help in determining the best ways for them to meet the goals (for example, higher residential densities, inclusionary zoning, working more with non-profit builders, and zoning vacant commercial or industrial land for housing where appropriate).

In addition, cities need incentives to overcome their fiscal concerns that affordable housing produces relatively little in tax revenues compared to the costs of providing services for its residents. Moreover, some communities are concerned that they may be required to accept a disproportionate amount of the region's affordable housing.

12. Homelessness is increasing in all areas of the region, and funding is needed to cope with it. The Non-Profit Housing Association of Northern California, using the number of AFDC temporary shelter approvals as a base, estimates that more than 220,000 individuals were homeless in the Bay Area at some time in 1989.

Communities need funding help to provide housing for people whose needs cannot be met by the private market. Incentives are needed for communities and neighborhoods to include such housing.

13. Air quality in the Bay Area does not meet the standards of federal and state laws, and it is becoming more and more obvious that air quality, housing, transportation, and land use are not separate issues but, on a regional level, are closely linked. For example, housing and workplaces planned at greater densities, and in closer proximity, as part of a regional land use planning process would make public transit more feasible. This would mean fewer automobile trips, and that, in turn, would mean less air pollution from automobile engines. As long as automobiles are powered by internal combustion engines, there will be pressures to reduce automobile travel and to reduce the use of single-occupant vehicles if current air quality standards are to be met. Moreover, these pressures for trip reduction will also exist regarding truck travel.

14. At present there is no regional framework by which locally-undesirable land uses (or LULUs) can be sited. A regional plan would provide a basis for siting landfills, airports, and other needed regional installations on a "fair share" basis. But at present regional needs may be resolved inappropriately or go unmet entirely.

15. A number of states and metropolitan areas have enacted programs to manage growth more effectively, but none provides an exact model for the Bay Area. There is much to learn from other areas, but we need to develop our own form of regional home rule; nobody can do it for us. We can, however, learn from the growth-management strategies enacted by different state governments (e.g., Florida, New Jersey, Oregon) and by metropolitan regions (e.g., the seven counties surrounding Minneapolis and St. Paul which have had a form of metropolitan government for more than 20 years, and three counties in the Portland, Oregon area, which have formed a metropolitan government).

16. Among the strategies adopted in other states that appear particularly useful are "consistency," "concurrency," and "compactness." "Consistency" means simply that state, regional, and local plans must be developed so as to be consistent with each other. "Concurrency" means that infrastructure to serve new development (roads, sewers, schools, etc.) must be in place or funded concurrently with the opening of the new development. "Compactness" means that urban sprawl patterns are not permitted, through such means as use of urban growth boundaries.

17. As a region we can do much to manage our own growth, but we must also have strong state policies and strategies. In all states that have progressed toward better growth management, strong state leadership has been an essential component.

18. State leadership and changes in state law are needed, particularly to change the fiscal pressures on land use. State taxation policies, exacerbated by the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, and the limitations it imposed on property taxes, directly affect land use. Local governments increasingly zone land to produce the maximum in property, sales, and other tax revenues, even when this conflicts with long-range planning objectives. Local governments say they have no choice but to do this if they are to have money for the public services they must provide. This process is sometimes called the "fiscalization" of land use. Its results include competition among local governments to use land so as to produce high tax revenues, and a desire to avoid building housing, particularly housing for low-income people.

19. State leadership is needed in other areas as well, such as helping to revitalize our central cities. This means improved public schools, an end to homelessness, adequate health care, etc. Solutions to these problems require federal, state, and local efforts that can be helped by more effective regional governance.

As we have noted before, our assignment was not to propose specific remedies in these areas, but rather to assure that any changes we recommend in regional governance can help in finding solutions. We have, however, specifically considered whether any regional change in school district organization would be helpful. We conclude that it would not--current emphasis is on reducing the size of large school districts, not on increasing it. But we strongly recognize the importance of improving our public schools if we are to maintain the quality of life we seek for the Bay Area.

20. Water supply will more and more be a matter of Bay Area concern. No single agency provides water, or plans water supplies, for the entire region. Instead, 67 different agencies do this for their parts of the region. Some of these agencies are quite small, but others are large--the San Francisco Water Department, for example, and the East Bay Municipal Utility District. Some parts of the region appear to have water supplies adequate for many years, but others have now stopped development because they have no water available for new hookups. These conditions are aggravated by the current drought, but even in years of normal rainfall there will be questions about the availability of water to support new growth. Water supply agencies should continue to be utilities supplying an essential commodity; they should not be the planners or determiners of growth or where it should or should not go.

21. Earthquakes are inevitable in the Bay Area and they do not respect municipal or county boundary lines. At the time of a major earthquake, our regional interdependence is obvious. The steps that we can take to prepare ourselves now and to assist each other in times of emergency require regional planning and the capacity to mobilize our resources on a regional basis.

22. Finally, if we do not become more effective than we currently are in dealing with our regional problems, we will lose that specialness of which we are all so proud. Our open space will continue to vanish and our urban areas will become increasingly formless and incoherent. Our traffic congestion and our commute times will grow worse as we come more and more to resemble Southern California. The search for affordable housing will distort our living patterns, and decent housing reasonably close to where we work will be an unfulfilled wish for many of us.

VALUES AND GOALS

The Commission has developed a general vision of what life can be like for all Bay Area residents in 2020. This general vision incorporates basic elements--who we are, the communities we live in, our surroundings, the continued likelihood of our population growth, etc.--and also specific goals and objectives. First, the basic elements:

Our environment: All of us in the Bay Area are trustees of a special place of great natural beauty and environmental diversity. These qualities are fragile, however, and are threatened by our seeming inability to manage population growth so as to maximize its benefits and minimize its adverse impacts. The specialness of this place needs to be protected for ourselves and for future generations.

Our people: The diversity of those who live here is part of our specialness. By the year 2030, no one racial or ethnic group will be a majority in the nine-county Bay Area. Population projections indicate that our diversity with regard to race, ethnicity, and personal lifestyle will continue to increase. Our diversity needs to be a building block out of which we fashion harmonious communities of shared purpose and equal opportunity. Our ability to have that diversity reflected in all the places where we live and work will, like our natural environment, be a mark of our quality of life.

Our economic well-being: Growth in our economy and growth in our population have gone hand-in-hand. A highly skilled labor force and well-managed businesses serving local, national, and international needs have contributed to a healthy Bay Area economy. That economy needs the support of wise public policies if it is to continue to produce jobs for those of us who live here.

The health of the Bay Area economy is linked to the same factors that affect each of us as individuals: clean air, good schools, safe communities, affordable housing, pure and plentiful water, good public transportation, uncongested highways, and protected open space are all indicative of a good place to live and a good place to do business.

Our communities: The way in which we live in the Bay Area does not follow a random pattern. More of us who are poor and of color live in our central cities. In the year 2020, we look to a Bay Area with more job and housing choices, where economic opportunity and achievement are not linked to skin color or cultural heritage. Even if job opportunities are more equitably distributed, and affordable open housing is more available in both our large and our small cities, many of us will still choose to remain in or relocate to central cities. That choice must be open to all of us, without regard to race, ethnicity or economic status. But that choice will be possible only if our central city schools truly educate our children, if good health care is available to all, and if our neighborhoods are safe and drugfree. We do not consider these concerns to be pious expressions of the good life, but rather goals we must achieve, worthy of our best efforts at all levels of government and in all our private endeavors. Without such achievement, we risk having a Bay Area increasingly divided into estranged enclaves of rich and poor.

Our growth: Our population continues to grow and so does our economy, and this growth has consequences both good and bad. The Commission's central recommendation is that, as growth continues, it needs to be managed so as to ensure its positive aspects and minimize its negative impacts. Economic growth has enriched our cultural life and

our educational opportunities, and has brought many of us a high degree of economic prosperity. But this growth has also been accompanied by development that has displaced valued open space, by congestion of our highways, by unacceptable levels of air pollution, by a rapid escalation in the price of housing, and by an aggravation of water quality and supply problems. In the future, our growth must be consistent with the availability of resources and infrastructure. Growth can be managed so as to protect and improve our natural and our human environment. But without effective growth management, our Bay Area quality of life will deteriorate.

There continues to be a lively debate among Commission members on the question of population growth. Some Commission members would seek to discourage population growth so as to keep our population within a yet undefined regional "carrying capacity." Others would manage and accommodate population growth in accordance with population projections. The most powerful Commission consensus is that the growth of the Bay Area has changed life for all of us, and that the challenges to our region cannot be successfully met with our current structure of local governments and regional single-purpose agencies. Equally important is the Commission consensus that future regional efforts to manage or moderate growth cannot unfairly impact any racial, cultural, or economic group.

Our common concerns: In the nine-county Bay Area, we are not only bound together by the Bay but also by our daily crossing of political boundaries for purposes of work, housing, commerce, recreation, and education. City and county boundaries drawn years ago, during far different times, make government increasingly difficult. The Bay Area needs a better balance than now exists between the interests of the region and the interests of individual communities. We have strong governments to speak for local interests. But our current regional agencies, such as the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, are limited by the single-purpose nature of the laws that created them. While preserving our local government decision capacities, we must give ourselves a new regional capacity to debate, decide, and implement regional policies affecting the economy, the environment, transportation, and land use. And on certain issues that are multi-jurisdictional but not necessarily regional in scope, there is a need for subregional groups of cities and counties, bringing together those local governments most affected by the issue at hand.

The Bay Area as a world center: We are the trustees of the place where the United Nations Charter was signed. Now the Bay Area is increasingly a gateway to the nations of the Pacific Rim. We want the Bay Area to continue to be both a place of value to the people who live here and also a place where world leadership gathers to pursue issues of peace, human development, world commerce, and protection of the environment.

The following goals are basic to attaining and maintaining the well-being of the region. We base these goals on the belief that all of us in the present generation are trustees of our environment and the communities we live in for future generations. If we are to have a coherent regional future, the Bay Area's growth needs to be guided by integrated policies developed with a regional perspective.

OUR GENERAL VISION OF THE BAY AREA BY THE YEAR 2020

The Land--Urban Areas and Open Space:

- * Our urban areas would be distinct from our countryside. Urban areas would have established boundaries, and all urban development of a residential and commercial character would take place within those boundaries. New, more effective steps would protect permanent open spaces and agricultural lands. Our growth would be managed so that new development takes place wherever possible within already-urbanized areas. Where currently undeveloped areas are set aside for planned new growth, the areas need to meet the test of being within regionally-agreed-upon urban limit lines. Such boundaries would delineate where growth should go and where it should not.

Urban limit lines, setting boundaries within which the free market would operate, would encourage coherent development for the region. But the lines are not intended to be static and fixed for all time. When they change in the process of regional review, newly designated urban areas need not necessarily be contiguous with already urbanized areas. Wherever urban limit lines are drawn or changed, a primary goal is the protection of a compact growth policy for the Bay Area.

Defined areas for urban development, the permanent protection of valued open space, and a maintenance of agricultural lands need to be a top priority for those who will make policy for the Bay Area. The specific means for achieving these goals need to emerge from regional planning.

- * Within urban areas there would be adequate and appropriate areas of open space for recreation and to serve as "lungs" for our urban life. Outside of urban boundaries, we would carefully manage our open space resources. These resources can include agricultural lands, recreational lands and waters, and protected areas of special environmental importance and sensitivity. Open spaces of a non-urban character would be off-limits to urban development. Protected greenbelts, forests, and waterways become the means by which we define our areas of settlement, and make clear our intention to manage growth without unplanned, piecemeal spread over the lands of the Bay Area.

- * To accommodate population and employment growth within the boundaries of urban areas, and to create the population base for feasible mass transit, there would be some increase in the density and mix of housing and business areas. Within urban areas, adequate supplies of land would thus be maintained for commercial, industrial, and residential development.

New housing and business areas can also be created in already-established urbanized areas by filling in smaller, passed-over sites, and by encouraging the redevelopment of older aging areas for new purposes. In pursuing such policies, we can avoid unnecessary development of open space and can often use existing infrastructure, with significant cost savings.

- * The San Francisco Bay-Delta Estuary including its rivers, streams, and creeks would be restored as a healthy, ecologically diverse, and productive natural resource, protected and valued as essential to the environmental and economic well-being of the region.

- * The sound management of solid and hazardous waste through source reduction, recycling, and disposal is an important aspect of our concern for the land. In 1991, solid waste management is the responsibility of local governments acting within established state policy. That policy needs to be implemented consistent with a regard for the land and the maximum concern for the recycling of all solid waste material.

The air: The Bay Area would have year-round healthful air. There would be full compliance with federal and state clean air laws and the capacity to implement these clean air laws consistent with the special conditions of the Bay Area.

Water management: The continued health and well-being of the Bay Area depends upon an adequate water supply of high quality. The management of our water resources needs to assure:

- * Compliance with federal and state laws affecting water quality and treatment.
- * Planning of water supply, including water conservation, water storage, reclamation, and the potential for desalination, to assure adequacy and high quality.
- * Placement of infrastructure for water supply and treatment so that it supports development in areas designated for urban growth and not in protected, undeveloped areas, outside of urban boundaries.
- * Protection of watershed lands and aquifers.
- * Management of waste disposal so as not to impair the quality of water supply, the Bay-Delta Estuary, and waterways of the Bay Area.

Housing: All parts of the Bay Area would have housing in a variety of price ranges, affordable and available to all segments of the Bay Area's population. Communities would provide their fair shares of affordable housing for all of our population, through appropriate land use planning and incentives. Financial help would be available to households and to local governments so that those with little or no income could also be adequately housed.

People would be able to find good-quality, affordable housing in reasonably close proximity to their workplaces. The search for affordable housing would no longer force workers in the nine-county Bay Area to live at the periphery of these counties and in adjoining areas. The cost of this sprawl in fouled air, congested roads, loss of irreplaceable land resources, wasted energy, and strain on young and growing families, is a cost we would no longer bear as a region.

Transportation: The Bay Area would have an efficient, energy-conserving, convenient, reasonably-priced, and integrated transportation system combining the best of public and private resources. The system would emphasize the use of carriers that are non-polluting.

To meet our goals of clean air and relatively-uncongested highways, a significant reduction will be needed in trips by single-occupant vehicles propelled by internal

combustion engines. Bay Area transportation planning is required by federal and state law to address such reductions, which will be more achievable if some residential densities are increased and if the balance of jobs and housing in urban areas is improved.

Transportation and land use decisions would be supportive of each other and consistent with clean air objectives. Transportation infrastructure would not be an independent stimulant to land use development. Mass transit would be available to population and work centers; in more sparsely-populated rural areas, however, roadways and private vehicles will remain the primary means of transportation.

Air travel is an essential aspect of our private lives as well as of the region's economy. Regional aspects of airport development would be planned in accordance with other objectives.

Our cities and their residents: We are largely an urban people in the Bay Area. We have built cities, large and small, that are vital to our way of life. These cities are rich grounds for commerce, for the exchange of ideas, and for much that we are proud of as a civilized community.

At the same time, serious problems exist in low-income, run-down communities, mostly in older cities, that adversely affect the general quality of life and opportunities for economic growth in the region. But the major adverse impact of these problems is on the residents of these communities. Regional decision-making that encompasses only environmental issues, transportation, housing, and revenue-sharing, is not likely to deal fully with the issues that are of central concern to inner city residents, particularly those of color.

Livable urban areas would thus, in 2020, be places that invite residence by newcomers as well as those who currently live in central cities. The next phase of regional planning, in seeking more compact forms of infill and development, would find a balance between the needs of newcomers to central cities and those who live there. It will not be easy. But a Bay Area that works better for all of us must not be built at the expense of those who live in the communities where change will occur.

The Commission believes that a new regional agency can be helpful in decisions affecting social issues, even though these issues are specifically local or are largely the responsibility of federal and state governments. A new regional agency cannot avoid a concern for the livability of central cities and the well being of their residents. The agency would provide a forum for the discussion of these issues and in the process, people throughout the region would better understand the importance of solving central city problems. Moreover, central city people would be among those making policy for the regional agency.

At the heart of the Commission's concern for inner cities and their residents is the understanding that in specific and sometimes subtle ways we are all linked to each other in the Bay Area. Without livable central cities (as reflected at least in good schools, affordable shelter, adequate child care, access to jobs and safe streets), those who live in the center will remain disadvantaged and others will continue to avoid living in urban centers. If our urban centers do not become more hospitable places for all of us, and the move to suburbs and the periphery of the region continues, the effort to manage growth while protecting our environment is almost certain to fail.

The economy: A strong Bay Area economy produces the employment fundamental to our well-being as a region and it produces the tax revenue that supports a variety of beneficial public activities. A vibrant economy is thus essential to the Bay Area's quality of life.

Regional planning and decision-making would work to insure that a strong economy is compatible with development protective of our environment and consistent with the growth management goals reflected throughout this report.

Governing the Region: The values we put forward to guide us in protecting our environment while managing the Bay Area's growth lead us to recommend a governing capacity for the region that we do not currently have. There are interdependencies in all the critical areas that we have been charged with examining (e.g. the economy, transportation, housing, land, air, water) and these interdependencies require a regional governing framework where necessary cooperation can be assured, creative agreements reached, trade-offs considered, and appropriate authority exercised.

This new regional governing framework would give us capacities appropriate to our regional interdependencies. But it would not replace the role of local government in providing individual services and protecting local community identity and vitality. And subregional arrangements among local governments, where appropriate, would be encouraged. But for the first time, the Bay Area would also have a governing potential to match the extent of its geography and the intertwining of its regional problems.

The elements of a proposed regional agency and the state policies which would provide the context for the regional agency's action, are described in the next section of this report.

REGIONAL GOVERNANCE

1. Present regional governance is inadequate. The Bay Area needs a democratic, accountable, responsive political structure to link and integrate the policies of our many single-purpose agencies. What we have now is sometimes described as "vertical" government--an array of separate, special-purpose agencies in such areas as air quality, water quality, transportation, etc. But there is no "horizontal" agency to reflect the many ways in which the region is interdependent. (ABAG is a voluntary association of local governments and is without authority to make binding decisions on regional issues.) And, despite the best efforts of individual governing boards and staffs, there is no single place where complex regional issues can be considered, decisions made, and policies carried out. Our present system of regional governance is not sufficient to achieve the Commission's goals for the year 2020.
2. A state/regional/local policy for growth management is needed. The Commission's vision for the Bay Area in 2020 includes (a) effective state policies for managing growth and change; (b) a regional agency, as described below, created by state legislation in 1991 and (c) strong local governments acting consistently within approved regional plans. (At a minimum, state policies are needed to reduce the tax pressures that "fiscalize" land use and to provide financing methods for the infrastructure needed to serve a growing population.) Despite the importance of new state policies, a regional agency for the Bay Area can begin to function without waiting for their enactment.
3. For the Bay Area, we need a more integrated governing system. Our goal is to bring coherence to regional planning and regional decision-making, to increase the effectiveness of regional agencies and of local governments. We strongly believe in maintaining the integrity of existing local governments and their autonomy over local decision-making.
4. Rather than create a new layer of government, a new nine-county Regional Commission (RC) should be created by consolidating existing agencies. The RC would combine, at a minimum, the functions of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the Association of Bay Area Governments. The consolidated regional agency would have a new governing board replacing the governing bodies of the three merged agencies. The merger would link, in one agency with one new governing board, responsibility for regional air quality, regional transportation, and regional aspects of land use; it would also make possible effective planning and actions for other, related matters. Because the new agency's work would affect adjoining counties, they would be invited as appropriate to take part in its work.
5. Other regional agencies should be considered for later consolidation into the new RC. These could include such agencies as the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and other single-purpose agencies acting on issues of regional concern. This later consolidation could also include waste management. Some Commission members believe that additional agencies should be added from the start. Others believe that consolidating three major agencies would be an important beginning, and that the new RC should be required to study and report on the advisability of adding more.

6. The new RC would plan for the region, and would establish and implement policies. But it would not operate or construct such things as transit systems; operating agencies would continue their present functions. During the initial planning period described below, the new commission would:

-- Administer the air quality laws now the responsibility of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District;

-- Administer the transportation programs now the responsibility of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission;

-- Administer regional "fair share housing" programs and other legally-mandated responsibilities of the Association of Bay Area Governments;

-- Prepare a regional plan to achieve the Commission's goals for the Bay Area in the year 2020. The goals statement in the preceding section of this report sets forth the policies and objectives to be used in preparing this plan. The planning should be done with the following provisions:

a) The law establishing the new agency should require the participation in planning of all state, regional, and local agencies. The goal is a highly interactive process.

b) The plan would not be a detailed land use plan, but rather would set standards for meeting regional needs, e.g., jobs-housing proximity, urban/open space boundaries, areas for new infill development, affordable housing targets, water supply, and criteria for siting facilities such as airports and solid waste landfills, which are necessary but might be locally undesirable.

c) Once the regional plan has been approved, cities, counties, Local Agency Formation Commissions, and other governmental units would be required to bring their plans into conformity with the regional plan. When the new RC has approved the plans of local and regional governmental units as being in conformity, they would have total authority to carry out their plans, subject only to appeals to the RC if the approved plan is not being fully followed.

d) In its planning, the RC should make the maximum use of the general plans adopted by cities and counties. The new agency should encourage "subregional" planning--efforts by groups of cities and counties to plan in more detail for their parts of the Bay Area. One such beginning is the establishment of congestion management program agencies in each county. A subregional approach may become the core idea for preparing the regional plan.

-- Recommend measures necessary to carry out the regional plan, including at least:

a) What actions should be taken if a local government does not carry out its own plans in conformity with regional goals. This could include financial penalties (e.g., withholding tax revenues resulting from any new development not in conformity), RC actions legally compelling compliance, additional incentives, or some combination of incentives and disincentives.

b) Whether there should be regional sharing of tax income from new commercial, industrial, and high-cost residential development, and if so, how this should be done;

c) Whether the governing board of the agency empowered to carry out the plan after the initial four-year period should be directly elected or appointed; and

d) Whether other agencies should be merged into the new agency and, if so, when and how.

-- Have authority to permit or deny developments determined by majority vote of the Commission to be of regional importance because of their character, size, or location. The Commission would first determine whether a proposed development is of regional importance. Those that are would be reviewed to insure that, if approved, they would not render major aspects of the regional plan useless before the plan could be completed. There would be no moratorium on development. To insure that the regional review process is workable, regulations would be adopted to establish time limits both for the Commission's determination of whether a development has regional significance and then for the Commission's approving or denying permits for such projects to proceed. Some Commission members do not agree with this proposal, believing that it could result in delaying worthwhile projects, particularly as initial standards are being developed. Other Commissioners point out that a comparable policy of interim permit controls was successfully administered by both the Bay Conservation and Development Commission and the California Coastal Commission.

7. Planning period. The RC should have a four-year planning period. As a practical matter, its plan would have to be completed by the end of the third year, leading to debate within the region and consideration by the Governor and Legislature in the fourth year. Some Commission members believe that legislation establishing the RC should enable it to continue to function after the planning period and to implement the plan unless specific legislative action is taken to prevent this.

8. Participants in planning. State agencies, special-purpose districts, local governments, and the private sector should all be major participants in an open planning process. The goal is a regional plan that all affected parties have helped create, and that all will accept.

9. Governing board. For the initial four-year period, the governing board should be appointed. But, as noted above, the RC should report on the advisability of electing the governing body of the agency designated to carry out the regional plan after the four-year transition period.

10. Criteria for appointment.

-- The governing board of the RC should reflect the racial, ethnic, social, and income diversity of the Bay Area. It should also reflect the region's inner cities, suburbs, and rural areas.

-- Each of the nine counties should have at least one representative. Because larger areas should have representation generally reflecting the size of their

populations, the governing board would be relatively large; a board of 35-40 people would not be unworkable.

-- Half the members of the governing board should represent local governments and half should be chosen from the public at large. Some Commission members note that, because the governing boards of the BAAQMD, MTC, and ABAG consist almost entirely of locally-elected officials, perhaps the same should be true of the new RC governing board. Others believe that locally-elected officials should in any event comprise more than half of the governing board, and still other Commissioners favor having fewer than half from local government.

-- People appointed to the governing board should be able to devote adequate time to the agency's work. Board members should be paid for their work.

11. Method of appointment. During the review period for this draft report, the Commission seeks suggestions as to methods by which the RC governing board could best be appointed so as to meet the criteria established in paragraph 10. The Commission believes that the following alternatives should be considered, but welcomes other proposals.

-- Local government representatives. Whatever the percentage of local government representatives, there are two general alternatives:

a) Locally-elected officials (mayors, city council members, and county supervisors) could themselves serve on the governing board, as they now serve on the boards of the BAAQMD, MTC, and ABAG. If this alternative is chosen, it may be necessary for local officials to be able to appoint alternates who could attend meetings in their absence. Some agencies have found this necessary to insure that quorums are present at meetings, or:

b) Locally-elected officials could appoint people to serve, including former elected officials, as they now appoint members of the planning commissions. Advocates of this alternative believe that the workload for the new RC, plus the time requirements of serving on a city council or board of supervisors, would make it difficult for locally-elected officials to be on the RC. But others point out that locally-elected officials now find time for service on regional bodies.

-- Appointment alternatives. The Commission has reviewed two general ways appointments could be made.

a.) Multiple appointing authorities. Local government representatives on the governing board would be appointed by local governments in either of the ways specified above. The general public representatives would be appointed (1) by statewide officials--the Governor, President Pro Tem of the Senate, and Speaker of the Assembly, or (2) by the Bay Area legislative delegation (the state senators and assembly members elected in the nine Bay Area Counties), or (3) in some other manner.

b.) Single appointing panel. The panel would consist of 10 residents of the nine-county Bay Area. Five would be locally-elected officials chosen by

the Association of Bay Area Governments. One panel member would be appointed by the Governor, one by the President Pro Tem of the State Senate, and one by the Speaker of the Assembly. The other two panel members would be people of community stature and broad regional perspective, such as the President of Stanford University and the Chancellor of UC Berkeley.

The panel would appoint the public representatives to the governing board, or alternately it would appoint all the members of the RC, both local government and public representatives.

Those selected by the appointing panel would serve four-year terms (the initial existence of the governing board would be four years). The appointment panel would also choose a chair and vice chair for the governing board. After making its appointments, the panel would meet again only if needed to fill vacancies on the governing board.

12. Funding. A state appropriation for the four-year planning period should be sought unless a detailed budget review demonstrates that there would be sufficient cost savings in the merger of the BAAQMD, MTC, and ABAG to fund the work of the new agency.

THE BAY VISION 2020 COMMISSION DISCUSSED GROWTH MANAGEMENT AND REGIONAL ISSUES WITH THE FOLLOWING:

John Barrows, former chief administrative officer, Marin County.

Richard Bate, National Housing Planning Council of England.

Leo Bazile, Oakland city councilman.

Lewis Butler, president, California Tomorrow.

Bruce Cain, professor and associate director, UC Berkeley Institute of Governmental Studies (IGS).

Lawrence Dahms, executive director, Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

John DeGrove, professor and director, Florida Atlantic University/Florida International University Joint Center for Environmental and Urban Problems; architect of Florida's 1985 Growth Management Act.

Rod Diridon, supervisor, Santa Clara County, and 1989-90 chair of MTC.

Milton Feldstein, executive director, Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

James Guthrie, professor, UC Berkeley, Graduate School of Education, and founder of Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE).

Randy Hamilton, IGS visiting scholar, and former dean, Golden Gate University.

Victor Jones, professor emeritus, UC Berkeley Political Science Department.

Todd Kaufman, principal consultant, California State Assembly Office of Research.

John T. Knox, former assembly member from Richmond, former chairman of the Assembly Local Government Committee, and author of regional government legislation in the 1960s and 1970s.

Eugene Lee, professor emeritus, UC Berkeley Political Science Department, and former director, IGS.

Richard LeGates, professor, San Francisco State University Urban Studies Department.

Scott McCreary, environmental policy consultant; lecturer in UC Berkeley Landscape Architecture Department.

Michael McGill, executive director, Bay Area Economic Forum.

Larry Orman, executive director, Greenbelt Alliance.

Neal Peirce, nationally-syndicated urban affairs writer.

Jane Pisano, president, The 2000 Partnership, Los Angeles.

Henry Richmond, executive director, 1000 Friends of Oregon.

Stan Scott, retired assistant director, IGS.

SEDCORP, The Solano Economic Development Corporation, organized a presentation that included congressman Vic Fazio; assembly member Tom Hannigan; John Adams, vice chairperson of Fairfield Vision 2020; Frank Andrews, chair of SEDCORP and one of the county's major developers; Tom Barron, representing a consortium proposing a toll road in the county; Bob Berman, president of the Solano County Farmlands and Open Space Foundation; Brice Bledsoe, secretary-manager of the Solano Irrigation District; Bill Carroll, mayor of Vacaville; Pat Daniels of the Messenger Group; Norman Repanich, SEDCORP president; and John Taylor, Environmental Management Program director and LAFCO officer.

Angelo Siracusa, president, Bay Area Council.

Steven Thompson, director, California State Assembly Office of Research.

Revan Tranter, executive director, Association of Bay Area Governments.

Carol Whiteside, mayor, City of Modesto.

Special papers were prepared for the Commission by:

Ed Blakely, professor and chair, Department of City and Regional Planning, UC Berkeley.

Alex Saragoza, professor and chair, Center for Latin American Studies, UC Berkeley.

L. Ling-chi Wang, professor and chair, Department of Ethnic Studies, UC Berkeley.

COMMISSION ORIGIN

The origins of the commission lie in the 1989 efforts of two groups, working initially without knowledge of each other, to spur efforts toward more effective regional decision-making in the Bay Area. After having considered a number of things that might be done, each group concluded independently that the most promising next step would be formation of a blue-ribbon citizen commission to analyze current trends in the Bay Area, propose a vision for the future, and make specific recommendations to achieve that vision.

The first group was initiated by the chair of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Supervisor Rod Diridon of Santa Clara County. He was joined by the chair of the Association of Bay Area Governments, Mayor Warren Hopkins of Rohnert Park, and by successive chairs of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Supervisor Susanne Wilson of Santa Clara County and Councilmember Shirley Campbell of Hayward. In addition, the local government convenors of the BAY VISION 2020 Commission include the chairs of the nine county boards of supervisors; the mayor of Oakland, San Francisco, and San Jose; representatives of the cities in each of the 9 counties; and the president of the League of California Cities.

Simultaneously, a group of leaders of business and environmental groups were meeting under the auspices of the Regional Issues Forum, which is sponsored jointly by the Bay Area County and the Greenbelt Alliance. As the two groups became aware of their joint interest in establishing a citizen commission, they developed an agreement by which they worked together to select and recruit members of the Commission. Leaders of the Regional Issues Forum include Angelo Siracusa, president of the Bay Area Council, and Larry Orman, executive director of the Greenbelt Alliance.

MANAGEMENT

Management services have been provided to Bay Vision 2020 by the California Environmental Trust, a state-wide, non-profit 501(c)3 organization, incorporated in 1985.

BAY VISION 2020 STAFF

Joseph E. Bodovitz, Project Manager
Tish Sprague, Associate Project Manager
Mel Mogulof, Project Consultant
Kathy Funk, Administrative Assistant/ Accounting
Justine Choy, Associate for work with racial/ethnic groups
Maria Villarreal, Secretary

SUBMISSION OF WRITTEN COMMENTS

The Commission welcomes written comments on this final draft during January and February, 1991. They will be used to help the commission produce its final report in late February.

Please send your suggestions to:

Bay Vision 2020 Commission
Hearst Building, Room 608
5 Third Street
San Francisco, CA 94103