



# Plan BayArea **2040**

FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT



Metropolitan Transportation Commission



Association of Bay Area Governments

MAY 2020



#### Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Scott Haggerty, Chair Alameda County

Alfredo Pedroza, Vice Chair Napa County and Cities

Jeannie Bruins Cities of Santa Clara County

Damon Connolly Marin County and Cities

Dave Cortese Santa Clara County

Carol Dutra-Vernaci Cities of Alameda County

**Dorene M. Giacopini** U.S. Department of Transportation Federal D. Glover Contra Costa County

Anne W. Halsted San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Nick Josefowitz San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Sam Liccardo San Jose Mayor's Appointee

Jake Mackenzie Sonoma County and Cities

**Gina Papan** Cities of San Mateo County

David Rabbitt Association of Bay Area Governments Hillary Ronen City and County of San Francisco

Libby Schaaf Oakland Mayor's Appointee

Warren Slocum San Mateo County

James P. Spering Solano County and Cities

Jimmy Stracner Representing US Department of Housing and Urban Development

Tony Tavares California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA)

Amy R. Worth Cities of Contra Costa County

#### Association of Bay Area Governments

Mayor Jesse Arreguin ABAG President City of Berkeley

Supervisor Belia Ramos ABAG Vice President Napa

#### Representatives From Each County

Supervisor Scott Haggerty Alameda

Supervisor Nathan Miley Alameda

Supervisor Candace Andersen Contra Costa

Supervisor Karen Mitchoff Contra Costa

Supervisor Dennis Rodoni Marin

Supervisor Matt Haney San Francisco

Supervisor Rafael Mandelman San Francisco

Supervisor Gordon Mar San Francisco

Supervisor Dave Pine San Mateo

Supervisor Warren Slocum San Mateo Supervisor Cindy Chavez Santa Clara

Supervisor David Cortese Santa Clara

Supervisor Erin Hannigan Solano

Supervisor David Rabbitt Sonoma

Representatives From Cities in Each County

Mayor Barbara Halliday City of Hayward / Alameda

Councilmember Nikki Fortunato Bas City of Oakland / Alameda

Councilmember Lynette Gibson McElhaney City of Oakland / Alameda

**Councilmember Loren Taylor** City of Oakland / Alameda

Councilmember Dave Hudson City of San Ramon / Contra Costa

**Councilmember Pat Eklund** City of Novato / Marin

Mayor Leon Garcia City of American Canyon / Napa

Mayor London Breed City and County of San Francisco John Rahaim, Planning Director City and County of San Francisco

Councilmember Wayne Lee City of Millbrae / San Mateo

Vice Mayor Rich Garbarino City of South San Francisco / San Mateo

Mayor Lori Wilson City of Suisun City / Solano

Councilmember Jake Mackenzie City of Rohnert Park / Sonoma

Mayor Liz Gibbons City of Campbell / Santa Clara

Councilmember Chris Clark City of Mountain View / Santa Clara

Councilmember Lan Diep City of San Jose / Santa Clara

Councilmember Maya Esparza City of San Jose / Santa Clara

Councilmember Raul Peralez City of San Jose / Santa Clara

#### **Advisory Members**

William Kissinger Regional Water Quality Control Board



## Plan Bay Area 2040: Amendment

## May 2020



METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION



Bay Area Metro Center 375 Beale Street San Francisco, CA 94105

(415) 778-6700 info@bayareametro.gov www.mtc.ca.gov phone e-mail web

(415) 820-7900 info@abag.ca.gov www.abag.ca.gov

## **Project Staff**

Matt Maloney Director, Regional Planning

Therese Trivedi Assistant Director

Adam Noelting Principal Planner, Project Manager

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	.1
2.	Amendment to Plan Bay Area 2040	.1
3.	Comments & Response to Comments	.2
4.	Adoption of the Amendment to Plan Bay Area 2040	.3

### 1. Introduction

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) jointly adopted Plan Bay Area 2040 on July 26, 2017 (MTC Resolution No. 4300 and ABAG Resolution No. 10-17).

Plan Bay Area 2040 (the "Plan") is the updated long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. Plan Bay Area 2040 is the Bay Area's roadmap for forecasting transportation needs through the year 2040, preserving the character of our diverse communities, and adapting to the challenges of future population growth. The Plan discusses how the Bay Area will grow over the next two decades and identifies transportation and land use strategies to enable a more sustainable, equitable and economically vibrant future. Starting with the current state of the region, the Plan describes Plan Bay Area 2040 and its goals, a proposed growth pattern and supporting transportation investment strategy, and key actions needed to address ongoing and long-term regional challenges. The Plan also includes supplemental reports for additional details. These documents and the adopted Plan can be found at http://2040.planbayarea.org/reports.

MTC and ABAG propose to amend Plan Bay Area 2040 (Plan Amendment) to add the project scope and cost of the Interstate 680 Express Lanes Gap Closure Project in Alameda County.

#### 2. Amendment to Plan Bay Area 2040

An amendment is a major revision to the Plan, including adding or deleting a project, major changes in project costs and scope (e.g., changing project locations or the number of through traffic lanes). As stipulated in MTC's Public Participation Plan (2015), a Plan amendment requires public review and comment, demonstration that the project can be completed based on expected funding, and/or a finding that the change is consistent with federal transportation conformity mandates. Amendments that require an update to the air quality conformity analysis will be subject to the conformity and interagency consultation procedures described in MTC Resolution No. 3757.

In March 2018, MTC and ABAG adopted the first amendment to Plan Bay Area 2040 to modify the project scope and cost of the U.S. Highway 101 Managed Lanes Project in San Mateo County (RTPID 17-06-0007). The amendment aligned the Plan's project assumptions to those of the preferred alternative in the project's Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

In June 2019, the Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) requested the second amendment to Plan Bay Area 2040 to add the project scope and cost of the Interstate 680 Express Lanes Gap Closure Project in Alameda County. The project will add an express lane to the southbound and northbound travel lanes of Interstate 680 between Alcosta Boulevard and State Route 84, closing the gap between existing and in-progress express lane projects directly to the north and south. The accelerated project development would allow for coordinated project delivery with a planned rehabilitation project on the same corridor.

The amendment's total project cost is \$480 million. Funds for the amendment's cost are derived from the Plan's set aside for East and North Bay express lanes projects via the East and North Bay Express Lanes Reserve (RTPID 17-10-0056). Because the project funding is redirected from one adopted project to another within the Plan's financially constrained transportation investment strategy, and no new funds are added to the Plan's investment strategy as part of this amendment, the Plan remains financially constrained by federal and state planning laws.

The Amendment to the Plan changes the following:

- 1. Adds the description, cost, and schedule of the Interstate 680 Express Lanes Gap Closure Project in Alameda County (RTPID 17-01-0065):
  - a. Basic Information | What would this project/program do?
    "Add an express lane to the southbound and northbound travel lanes of Interstate
    680 between Alcosta Boulevard and State Route 84."
  - b. Cost and Funding | How much does this project/program cost?
     \$252 millions (Southbound)
     \$228 millions (Northbound)
  - c. Schedule | By when is the project/program anticipated to open?
     2024 (Southbound)
     2030 (Northbound)
- 2. Changes the cost of the East and North Bay Express Lanes Reserve (RTPID 17-10-0056):
  - a. Cost and Funding | How much does this project/program cost?
     \$2,164 \$1,684 (millions)

No other changes or revisions are proposed in this amendment.

#### 3. Comments & Response to Comments

In accordance with MTC's Public Participation Plan, MTC and ABAG released the Draft Amendment to Plan Bay Area 2040 for a 30-day public review and comment period, starting March 26, 2020, and ending on April 24, 2020. Opportunities to comment were publicized via MTC's website, email notifications, a press release, and display ads in local newspapers. The following is a list of the public comments submitted to MTC along with staff's responses to these comments.

No.	Name	Agency/Organization	Date/Source		
1	Bill Mellberg	No affiliation	03/31/2020, Email		
	"To say you are adding a lane to fill the gap from Alcosta to Sunol or Washington to 580 is a play on words. There is no "new" lanes other than the existing 3 lanes, you can designate the third lane as an express lane, but that is not adding a lane. Let's be honest until there is a fourth lane added both north of Sunol and south of 580 nothing changes. I believe anything you do will be obsolete and ineffective before you even start."				
2	Michael T. Henn	No affiliation	03/31/2020, Email -		
	<ul> <li>"I strongly oppose the construction of any more toll express lanes on any freeway. The High Occupancy Vehicles lanes should be reserved for car pools. It is socially and environmentally counterproductive to allow a single-occupant vehicle to be allowed to pay to drive in a Lexus Lane. It's analogous to being able to pay to have a red light turn green for some and not others. It's fundamentally unfair.</li> <li>Furthermore, having free-flowing HOV lanes encourages people to carpool, thus reducing traffic and pollution. That's why such lanes were created. Filling the lanes up with solo drivers removes the incentive. So-called Express Lanes are the worst idea you could come up with.</li> </ul>				
	Please, stop this misguided program."				

3	David Vartanoff	No affiliation	03/31/2020, Web Comment		
	<ul> <li>"baild variation" [No anniation" [03/31/2020, web comment</li> <li>"building a new HOV lane is no longer the right idea. When and if the current covid crisis abates, thousands of workers will continue WFH. Secondly, if a new lane is added, it will simply encourage more (induced demand is a well understood concept). Redesignating an existing lane to discourage SOVs; fine. Better still deploy Express buses in the no longer wasted lane on short headways with 'bus pads' similar to those on 101, allowing quick off/quick on. and rapid trips from BART in either WC or PH to Dublin. adding a third track and second platform at Bayfair so that trains from Dublin can offer crossplatform connections to Berryessa is the next step.</li> <li>NO new freeway lanes!"</li> </ul>				
4	John Weeks	No affiliation	03/31/2020, Web Comment		
	<ul> <li>"No Fee Cap: Please do not cap the fees on Express Lanes. In high congestion scenarios only a fee which will actually discourage SOV access will maintain throughput. The caps on regional express lanes that are already in place are too low.</li> <li>Driver Education: Please make sure the public knows about safe speeds in express lanes. I operate buses in the express lanes and get complaints from other SOV drivers that think the express lane is the fast lanes on the freeway. They complain that buses operating below the speed limit are in their way and slowing them down and dangerously pass."</li> </ul>				
5	Steven Dunbar	No affiliation	04/07/2020, Web Comment		
	<ul> <li>"I can't believe we are still adding lanes in 2020. Sure, they are better than standard carpool lanes and induce marginally less traffic than regular lanes.</li> <li>But they are not anywhere CLOSE to the level of mitigation we need to be doing in our transportation environment.</li> <li>The highway is already 3 lanes in each direction. You need to do much better than one more</li> </ul>				
	express lane."				

#### 4. Adoption of the Amendment to Plan Bay Area 2040

Plan Bay Area 2040 and this Amendment to Plan Bay Area 2040, taken together, constitute the complete Plan Bay Area 2040 document. Refer also to the companion technical documents that accompany this Draft Amendment: (1) Transportation-Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the Amended Plan Bay Area 2040 and Amended 2019 Transportation Improvement Program, (2) Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Plan Bay Area 2040, and (3) Amended 2019 Transportation Improvement Program.

This amendment is scheduled for review and approval of the governing boards of the MTC and ABAG in May 2020. These pending adopting resolutions – MTC Resolution No. 4425 and ABAG Resolution No. 13-2020 – approving the amendment will be included for reference as part of the Amendment to Plan Bay Area 2040 (see Attachment A).