



303 Second Street  
Suite 700 North  
San Francisco, CA 94107  
Tel: (415) 243-4600  
Fax: (415) 243-9501

TO: Beth Walukas, Alameda County Transportation Commission

FROM: Judis Santos, Parsons Brinckerhoff

THROUGH: Rebecca Kohlstrand, Parsons Brinckerhoff

SUBJECT: Results of ACTAC Survey on OneBayArea Grant Criteria

DATE: December 5, 2011

### **Introduction**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this task is to gather information that 1) determines how well Alameda County jurisdictions meet proposed criteria for the OneBayArea grant program and 2) identifies assistance needed by the jurisdictions to meet them. The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) is preparing a response to MTC that will include a discussion of the jurisdictions' needs based on the results of this information-gathering effort.

**Background:** In July 2011, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) released a draft of proposed policies to guide allocation of the Cycle 2 Federal Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (STP/CMAQ) funds, known as the "OneBayArea" Grant Program, for the next three fiscal years. The Program includes funding objectives, funding distributions, policy outcomes and implementation issues. Policy outcomes described in the program to help support the implementation of the Sustainable Communities Strategy include:

1. **Supportive Local Transportation and Land-Use Policies**
  - a. Parking/pricing policies (e.g. cash out, peak pricing, on-street/off-street pricing differentials, eliminate parking minimums, unbundled parking) and adopted city and/or countywide employer trip reduction ordinances.
  - b. Adopted Community Risk Reduction Plans (CRRP) per CEQA guidelines
  - c. Have affordable housing policies in place or policies that ensure that new development projects do not displace low income housing
  - d. Adopted bicycle/pedestrian plan and complete streets policy in general plans pursuant to Complete Streets Act of 2008.

2. **Approved Housing Element:**

- a. Adoption of a housing element that meets the current RHNA before the new RHNA is adopted, or
- b. The adoption of a housing element that meets the new RHNA after its approval early in 2012. Jurisdictions have 18 months after the adoption of the Sustainable Communities Strategy to meet the new RHNA; therefore, compliance is expected and required by September 2014. Any jurisdiction failing to meet either one of these deadlines will not be allowed to receive grant funding. Lastly, any jurisdiction without adopted housing elements addressing the new RHNA by September 2014 will be ineligible to receive any funding after Cycle 2 until they have adopted a housing element.

**Scope:** The objective of this task is to collect baseline information that determines whether jurisdictions have certain policies in place to be compliant with the OneBayArea Grant Program criteria as proposed. Specifically, this task focuses on jurisdictions' readiness to have adopted supportive local transportation and land-use policies and/or to secure an approved housing element. The consultant scope of work includes the following:

- Working with the Alameda CTC, develop a list of questions that assess a jurisdiction's readiness in meeting proposed criteria for the OneBayArea program;
- Determine appropriate methodology based on scope, budget, and schedule deadline (i.e. survey, phone interview, focus group discussion);
- Once methodology determined, contact and work through the Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC) members to obtain the information; and,
- Compile and summarize survey results.

**Methodology:** Information was gathered through a twenty (20) question survey addressing seven (7) topics (Attachment 1). The survey was initially developed in an "on-line"/web-format for user-friendliness. The format was changed to a PDF document/survey because of the likelihood that various departments/individuals may be involved in completing the survey. A total of fifteen (15) ACTAC members were contacted via phone and provided with the survey via email. Twelve (12) jurisdictions responded with completed surveys and comments –Alameda County, City of Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Hayward, Newark, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, and Union City. In addition to the survey, ACTAC members were provided with an introductory email, reference documents and a link to Alameda CTC Board materials. The survey collected information on whether the following policies are in place: Parking and pricing policies, community risk reduction plans, affordable housing policies, complete streets/adopted bicycle plans, and approved housing element. In addition, questions about ineligibility concerns and requested training/support were included to identify additional issues.

### General Findings

To be compliant with OneBayArea grant program's proposed criteria, at least two of the four policies need to be met under supportive local transportation and land-use policies. In addition, an approved housing element is a proposed condition for any jurisdiction receiving Cycle 2 OneBayArea grants. Out of the 12 jurisdictions that reported survey results, to date six (6) jurisdictions (City of Alameda, Emeryville, Hayward, Newark, San Leandro, Union City) meet the supportive local transportation and land-use policies and approved housing element requirements.

There are efforts in moving towards becoming compliant with an approved housing element and transportation/land-use policies in place. For example, ten (10) out of the twelve (12) jurisdictions reported expected compliance with the approved housing element by September 2014. Under supportive local transportation and land-use policies, the following policy areas are more likely to have compliance by the jurisdictions: affordable housing policies and an updated General Plan to comply with the state Complete Streets Act. Of the 12 jurisdictions responding, ten (10) jurisdictions have affordable housing policies (Alameda County, Alameda, Albany, Dublin, Emeryville, Hayward, Newark, Piedmont, San Leandro, Union City). Although one (1) jurisdiction's (Piedmont) General Plan has been updated for compliance, eight (8) jurisdictions (Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Hayward, Newark, San Leandro, Union City) plan on revising their General Plans to incorporate the Complete Streets Policy.

### Conclusions

- Survey results report that to date, six (6) out of the twelve (12) reported jurisdictions show compliance with the proposed OneBayArea Grant criteria. The six jurisdictions include the cities of Alameda, Emeryville, Hayward, Newark, San Leandro and Union City.
- One of the challenges for compliance under the supportive local transportation and land-use policies is the development of "Community Risk Reduction Plans." All of the twelve jurisdictions reported not having adopted nor are they in the process of developing a CRRP per CEQA guidelines. Six (6) jurisdictions out of twelve (12) reported on CRRPs being a useful alternative, while nine (9) out of twelve (12) jurisdictions reported on potentially developing a CRRP if additional funding and/or technical assistance was provided.
- Eleven (11) out of the twelve (12) jurisdictions reported that training and additional resources will be needed to create, adopt and/or implement programs to be compliant with OneBayArea grant criteria. Training (i.e. workshops) is helpful mostly in the area of parking/pricing policies.

Other additional training/workshop areas of interest include: trip reduction ordinances, CRRPs, affordable housing policies, Complete Streets, and meeting the deadline of September 2014 to have an approved housing element.

- Lastly, the survey identifies what policies are in place at each jurisdiction. There may be a need to conduct a more in-depth study on causes and reasons why certain policies are in development (and why some are not). This includes such policies as the community risk reduction program and parking/pricing policies. This type of assessment is more appropriate utilizing focus groups or informational interviewing techniques.

Attachment 1

OneBayAreaGrant Criteria Checklist Summary  
 (Date: 12/05/2011)

Legend: X = Yes <input type="checkbox"/> = Did not respond to question		Alameda County	City of Alameda	Albany	Berkeley	Dublin	Emeryville	Fremont	Hayward	Livermore	Newark	Oakland	Piedmont	Pleasanton	San Leandro	Union City
<b>Overall Summary of Requirements Met</b>																
Supportive Local Transportation and Land-Use Policies	a) Parking/pricing policies (e.g. cash out, peak pricing, on-street/off street pricing differentials, eliminate parking minimums, unbundled parking) and adopted city and/or countywide employer trip reduction ordinances.	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X				X	X
	b) Adopted Community Risk Reduction Plans (CRRP) per CEQA guidelines															
	c) Have affordable housing policies in place or policies that ensure that new development projects do not displace low income housing		X	X		X	X		X		X		X		X	X
	d) Adopted bicycle/pedestrian plan and complete streets policy in general plans pursuant to Complete Streets Act of 2008												X			
Approved Housing Element	a) adoption of a housing element that meets the current RHNA before the new RHNA is adopted	X				X	X		X		X				X	X
	b) the adoption of a housing element that meets the new RHNA after is approval early in 2012		X													
<b>Detailed Summary of Requirements Met</b>																
Parking and Pricing Policies	Cash Out Program															X
	Peak Pricing															
	On-Street/Off-Street Parking Differentials		X	X	X											
	Eliminate Parking Minimums								X						X	
	Unbundled Parking?				X		X									
Adopted city and/or countywide employer trip reduction ordinances?															X	

OneBayAreaGrant Criteria Checklist Summary  
 (Date: 12/05/2011)

Legend: X = Yes <input type="checkbox"/> = Did not respond to question		Alameda County	City of Alameda	Albany	Berkeley	Dublin	Emeryville	Fremont	Hayward	Livermore	Newark	Oakland	Piedmont	Pleasanton	San Leandro	Union City
CRRP	Familiar with new CEQA Guidelines	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Has your jurisdiction adopted or considered development a Community Risk Reduction Plan per CEQA guidelines?															
	CRRPS could serve as a useful alternative for your jurisdictions?		X	X		X	X		X				X			X
	Would you consider development a CRRP for your projects if additional funding and/or technical assistance were provided? Would you participate in the development of a multi-jurisdictional CRRP?	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Affordable Housing	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	
Complete Street/Adopted Bicycle Pedestrian Plan	Does your jurisdiction have an adopted Complete Streets policy? Have you updated your General Plan to comply with the state Complete Streets Act (2008, AB 1358) which took effect January 1, 2011?		X		X		X						X			
	If no, does your General Plan already meet the requirements? Do you plan to revise it to incorporate Complete Streets Act?															X

OneBayAreaGrant Criteria Checklist Summary  
 (Date: 12/05/2011)

Approved Housing Element	Alameda County	City of Alameda	Albany	Berkeley	Dublin	Emeryville	Fremont	Hayward	Livermore	Newark	Oakland	Piedmont	Pleasanton	San Leandro	Union City
Is your jurisdiction able to demonstrate compliance through one of the two options above?	X	X		/	X	X		X		X			/	X	X
If no, are you scheduled to adopt one in the next 6 months? Jurisdictions are expected to comply with an approved housing element by September 2014. Will your jurisdiction be compliant by then?			X	/								X	/		X

Legend: X = Yes  
 = Did not respond to question

Not Yet Responded:  
 Fremont  
 Oakland  
 Livermore

*This page intentionally left blank.*



Summary of OneBayAreaGrant Criteria Survey Responses  
 (Date: 12/05/2011)

	YES	NO	No Response	Comment
<i>Overall Summary of Requirements Met</i>				
<b>1. Supportive Local Transportation and Land-Use Policies</b>				
a) Parking/pricing policies (e.g. cash out, peak pricing, on-street/off street pricing differentials, eliminate parking minimums, unbundled parking) and adopted city and/or countywide employer trip reduction ordinances	Berkeley Newark Union City Emeryville Albany City of Alameda San Leandro Hayward	Alameda County Dublin Piedmont Pleasanton		Of the 12 jurisdictions, 0 of 12 had all of the six (6) parking/pricing policies listed. Berkeley had 3 of 6 policies (on-street/off-street differentials, unbundled parking, and employer trip reduction ordinances). Newark, Union City, and Emeryville followed having 2 of 6 policies ( Newark: eliminate parking minimums, employer trip reduction ordinances; Union City: cash out, trip reduction ordinances; Emeryville: unbundled parking, employer trip reduction ordinances). Albany and City of Alameda had on-street/off-street differentials. San Leandro had unbundled parking. Hayward has eliminated parking minimums.
b) Adopted Community Risk Reduction Plans (CRRP) per CEQA guidelines	some interest in multi-jurisdictional CRRP	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Berkeley Dublin Emeryville Hayward Newark Piedmont Pleasanton San Leandro Union City		Of the 12 jurisdictions, 9 (Alameda County, Alameda, Albany, Dublin, Emeryville, Hayward, Newark, San Leandro, Union City) were familiar with new CEQA guidelines; None are developing a CRRP. Six (Alameda, Albany, Emeryville, Hayward, Piedmont, Union City) agree that CRRPs are a useful alternative; Nine jurisdictions (Alameda, Alameda County, Emeryville, Hayward, Newark, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, Union City) would consider developing a CRRP for projects if funding/assistance was provided; Nine jurisdictions (Alameda, Alameda County, Emeryville, Hayward, Newark, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, Union City) would participate in a multi-jurisdictional CRRP.
c) Have affordable housing policies in place or policies that ensure that new development projects do not displace low income housing	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Dublin Emeryville Hayward Piedmont Newark San Leandro Union City		Berkeley Pleasanton	Of the 12 jurisdictions, 10 have affordable housing policies in place.
d) Adopted bicycle/pedestrian plan and Complete Streets policy in General Plans pursuant to Complete Streets Act of 2008	Piedmont	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Berkeley Dublin Emeryville Hayward Newark San Leandro Union City	Pleasanton	Of the 12 jurisdictions, 1 (Piedmont) has an adopted bicycle/pedestrian plan and Complete Streets policy in General Plans pursuant to 2008 Complete Streets Act. Nine (Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Hayward, Newark, San Leandro, Union City) are planning to incorporate Complete Streets Act in the next substantial revision of their General Plan.
<b>2. Approved Housing Element</b>				

	YES	NO	No Response	Comment
a) Adoption of a housing element that meets the current RHNA before the new RHNA is adopted	Alameda County Dublin Emeryville Hayward Newark San Leandro Union City	Albany Piedmont	Berkeley Pleasanton	Of the 12 jurisdictions, 10 (Alameda County, Alameda, Albany, Dublin, Emeryville, Hayward, Newark, Piedmont, San Leandro, Union City) reported being compliant by September 2014.
b) The adoption of a housing element that meets the new RHNA after is approval early in 2012	City of Alameda			

	YES	NO	No Response	Comment
<i>Detailed Summary of Requirements Met</i>				
<b>A. Parking and Pricing Policies</b>				
1. Cash out program?	Union City (October 2010)	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Berkeley Dublin Emeryville Hayward Newark Piedmont Pleasanton San Leandro		City of Alameda: Does not plan to adopt one, due cost of implementation and limited transportation options Albany: The City has not considered a cash out program Dublin: Does not plan to adopt one because parking is free Newark: There are no parking subsidies in the City. Hayward: Plans to adopt one within 2 or more years Piedmont: Small size and lack of parking facilities. There is little demand. Pleasanton: Does not plan to adopt one, no subsidized parking in Pleasanton San Leandro: Budgetary Constraints
2. Peak Pricing?		Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Berkeley Dublin Hayward Emeryville Newark Piedmont Pleasanton San Leandro Union City		City of Alameda: Does not plan to adopt one, due to cost of implementation and limited transportation options Albany: The City is small and does not have staff capacity to implement congestion pricing Dublin: Does not plan to adopt one, because parking is free Emeryville: Does not plan to adopt one, due to no control over regional roadways Hayward: Plans to adopt one within 2 or more years. Newark: No mechanism for peak pricing in Newark. Piedmont: Small size and largely residential parking, there is little demand for commercial parking Pleasanton: Does not plan to adopt one San Leandro: Need to assess further Union City: Extent of congestion in City does not warrant
3. On-street/Off-Street Parking Differentials?	City of Alameda (11/6/2007) Albany (2009) Berkeley	Alameda County Dublin Emeryville Hayward Newark Piedmont Pleasanton San Leandro Union City		Dublin: Does not plan to adopt one, on-street parking is not regulated Hayward: Plans to adopt one within 2 or more years Newark: No need identified Piedmont: Small size and lack of parking facilities. Little demand. Pleasanton: Do not plan to adopt one, no paid on or off street parking in Pleasanton San Leandro: Need to assess further

	YES	NO	No Response	Comment
4. Eliminate parking minimums?	Hayward Newark	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Berkeley Dublin Emeryville Piedmont Pleasanton San Leandro Union City		Alameda County: Do not plan to adopt one, Draft Design Guidelines incorporate maximum parking concepts City of Alameda: Do not plan to adopt one due to limited transit Albany: Amendment would require public vote Berkeley: To retain leverage with developers, but enabling TDM based waivers Dublin: Does not plan to adopt one, but it is under consideration for a few targeted areas Emeryville: Plans to adopt one within 1 year Hayward: Adopted September 2011 for South Hayward BART Area Newark: Adopted some in August 2011 as part of a specific plan, but not on a Citywide basis. Piedmont: Small size and lack of parking facilities. There is little demand. Pleasanton: Do not plan to adopt one, Pleasanton provides reduced parking minimums for TOD San Leandro: Would need to be assessed further depending on location Union City: Do not plan to adopt one, potential off-site parking impacts
5. Unbundled parking?	Berkeley Emeryville (GP 10/2009) San Leandro (2007)	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Dublin Hayward Newark Piedmont Pleasanton Union City		City of Alameda: Do not plan to adopt one due to lack of development support, limited transit Albany: The City has not considered that policy Berkeley: On a case by case basis. Plan to adopt within 6 months in one area, with the adoption of the Zoning reforms for our Downtown Area. Expected in early 2012 Dublin: Does not plan to adopt one Hayward: Plans to adopt one within 2 or more years Newark: No need identified. Piedmont: Small size and lack of parking facilities. There is little demand. Pleasanton: Do not plan to adopt one, no charged parking in Pleasanton Union City: Plans to adopt one within 1 year
6. Adopted city and/or countywide employer trip reduction ordinances?	Berkeley (2009) Newark (1992) Union City (Sept 2010)	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Dublin Emeryville Hayward Piedmont Pleasanton San Leandro		Alameda County: Do not plan to adopt one, Climate Action Plan includes Employer Trip Reduction strategies City of Alameda: Plans to adopt one in 1 year Albany: Plan to adopt one, our recently adopted Climate Action Plan directs the City to adopt those ordinances Dublin: Does not plan to adopt one, recently adopted downtown SP encourages participation but does not require trip reduction Emeryville: Plans to adopt one within 1 year Hayward: Plans to adopt one within 2 or more years Piedmont: Small size and lack of parking facilities. There is little demand. Pleasanton: Do not plan to adopt one, voluntary program in Pleasanton. Ordinance reference SB 437 (1995) San Leandro: Need to assess further

B. Community Risk Reduction Plans (CRRP)

	YES	NO	No Response	Comment
1. Familiar with new CEQA guidelines?	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Dublin Emeryville Hayward Newark San Leandro Union City	Piedmont Pleasanton	Berkeley	
2. Has your jurisdiction adopted or considered development a Community Risk Reduction Plan per CEQA guidelines?		Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Dublin Emeryville Hayward Newark Piedmont Pleasanton San Leandro Union City	Berkeley	City of Alameda: too costly to prepare Albany: The City does not have funds to develop this plan. Interested in coordinating with other small cities Dublin: Does not plan to adopt one, downtown SP has development standards designed to minimize potential impacts Hayward: Plans to adopt one within 2 or more years Newark: Prefer to do a project by project analysis. Piedmont: Lack of commercial or industrial zones reduces the likelihood of hazardous air quality issues Pleasanton: No knowledge of CRRP. San Leandro: Will be considered when we begin our General Plan Update in 2013 Union City: Lack of funds to prepare
3. Do you agree that CRRPs could serve as a useful alternative for your jurisdiction?	City of Alameda Albany Emeryville Hayward Piedmont Union City	Newark San Leandro	Alameda County Berkeley Dublin Pleasanton	Alameda County: CRRP incorporated into Community Health & Wellness General Plan Element Albany: This will save time in the long run Emeryville: Yes, it will enable developers to tier off our CEQA document. Hayward: Yes, it would be very useful in that it would provide greater ability to develop housing near transit. Newark: No, cost is high and project analysis provides better legal protection. Piedmont: lack of commercial or industrial zones reduces the likelihood of hazardous air quality issues San Leandro: Will be considered when we begin our General Plan Update in 2013 Union City: Agree that CRRPs could serve as a useful alternative.
4. Would you consider development of a CRRP for your projects if additional funding and/or technical assistance were provided?	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Emeryville Hayward Newark Piedmont Pleasanton Union City	San Leandro	Berkeley Dublin	

	YES	NO	No Response	Comment
5. Would you participate in the development of a multi-jurisdictional CRRP?	Alameda County City of Alameda Emeryville Hayward Newark Piedmont Pleasanton San Leandro Union City		Albany Berkeley Dublin	
<b>C. Affordable Housing</b>				
1. Does your jurisdiction have affordable housing policies in place or policies that ensure that new development projects do not displace low income housing?	Alameda County (2011) City of Alameda (1991 & 2003) Albany (2009) Dublin (2002) Emeryville (2009) Hayward (2010) Newark (2001) Piedmont (2005) San Leandro (2005) Union City (Nov 2010)	Berkeley	Pleasanton	Alameda County: The following Ordinance sections comprise our Affordable Housing Policies to date. Berkeley: Berkeley's excellent 2-year history of 20% inclusionary zoning was struck down in 2009 by a California Supreme Court decision. Emeryville: Housing Element 2009 and Zoning Ordinance 2006 Density Bonus Chapter 17.65; Housing Element; Mobile Home Rent Stabilization Section Chapter 3.32.
<b>D. Complete Street/Adopted Bicycle pedestrian Plans</b>				
1. Does your jurisdiction have an adopted Complete Streets policy?	City of Alameda (2009 & 2010) Berkeley Emeryville (2009)	Alameda County Albany Dublin Hayward Newark Piedmont San Leandro Union City	Pleasanton	Alameda County: Timeline for adoption is 6 months; The Complete Streets policy will be adopted in Bicycle Pedestrian Master Plan February 2012 City of Alameda: Bike Plan and Pedestrian Plan Albany: Currently developing first Pedestrian Master Plan and updating Bicycle Master Plan. Includes features of Complete Streets Berkeley: Timeline for adoption is 1 year Dublin: Possibly within 1 year, looking at as part of GP update currently underway but details are unknown Emeryville: General Plan proposes type of streets accommodating all modes and incorporating CS policy Hayward: Plans to adopt one within 2 or more years, will be included as a component of the General Plan update which will begin in the next fiscal year. Newark: Timeline for adoption is 2 or more years Union City: Timeline for adoption is 6 months

	YES	NO	No Response	Comment
2. Have you updated you General Plan to comply with the state Complete Streets Act (2008, AB 1358) which took effect January 1, 2011?	Piedmont (April 2009)	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Berkeley Dublin Emeryville Hayward Newark San Leandro Union City	Pleasanton	
2A. If no, does your General Plan already meet the requirements?		City of Alameda Albany Berkeley Dublin Hayward Newark Union City	Alameda County Emeryville Piedmont Pleasanton San Leandro	
2B. If not, when is your next planned "substantial revision of the circulation element" of your General Plan?				Alameda County: Castro Valley General Plan (January 2012) City of Alameda: waiting for guidelines to be developed by MTC/Alameda CTC Albany (end of 2012) Berkeley (most likely 2021. It was adopted in 2001) Dublin: 2012 Emeryville: May 12, 2009. Bike & Pedestrian adoption Hayward: Estimated to be completed by 2014-2015. Newark (2012-2013) San Leandro (2013) Union City (March 2012)
2C. Do you plan to revise it to incorporate Complete Streets Act?	City of Alameda Albany Berkeley Dublin Emeryville Hayward Newark San Leandro Union City		Alameda County Piedmont Pleasanton	

	YES	NO	No Response	Comment
2D. As of August 2011, please list your bike and pedestrian plan updates, years and status?				<p>City of Alameda: Bike Plan 11/2010 and Ped Plan 01/2009</p> <p>Albany: Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan will be finalized in the spring of 2012.</p> <p>Berkeley: Bike Plan, adopted 2001, updated 2005. Ped Plan, adopted 2010.</p> <p>Dublin: Bikeways update starting in July 2012: will incorporate a new pedestrian element</p> <p>Emeryville: Updated 1998. Next update 2012. Unclear what language the City needs to add to comply.</p> <p>Hayward: Bicycle Plan adopted 2008. Ped Plan will be incorporated into circulation element update.</p> <p>Newark: In draft form, formal adoption planned in 2012.</p> <p>San Leandro: Last updated in 2011</p> <p>Union City: Adopted Oct 2006, an update is in process.</p>
<b>E. Approved Housing Element</b>				
1. Is your jurisdiction able to demonstrate compliance through one of the two options above?	<p>Alameda County (current RHNA)</p> <p>City of Alameda (new RHNA)</p> <p>Dublin (current)</p> <p>Emeryville (current RHNA)</p> <p>Hayward (current RHNA)</p> <p>Newark (current RHNA)</p> <p>San Leandro (current RHNA)</p> <p>Union City (current RHNA)</p>	<p>Albany</p> <p>Piedmont</p>	<p>Berkeley</p> <p>Pleasanton</p>	<p>City of Alameda: Plans to adopt a housing element that meets the new RHNA on 12/31/2012</p>
1A. If no, are you scheduled to adopt one in the next 6 months?	<p>Albany</p>	<p>Piedmont</p>		<p>Newark: Plans to adopt a housing element that meets the new RHNA after its approval in Spring 2012 and incorporate the new RHNA/adopt a new housing element in 2014</p>
3. If your jurisdiction is not able to demonstrate compliance with one of the two options: why not and what issues are preventing you from adopting a housing element?			<p>Alameda County</p> <p>City of Alameda</p> <p>Berkeley</p> <p>Dublin</p> <p>Emeryville</p> <p>Hayward</p> <p>Newark</p> <p>Pleasanton</p> <p>San Leandro</p> <p>Union City</p>	<p>Albany: The Housing Element is currently being prepared</p> <p>Piedmont: We have adopted a new housing element as of 2005, more information about the RHNA criteria and whether or not it met is needed.</p>
4. Jurisdictions are expected to comply with an approved housing element by September 2014. Will your jurisdiction be compliant by then?	<p>Alameda County</p> <p>City of Alameda</p> <p>Albany</p> <p>Dublin</p> <p>Emeryville</p> <p>Hayward</p> <p>Newark</p> <p>Piedmont</p> <p>San Leandro</p> <p>Union City</p>		<p>Berkeley</p> <p>Pleasanton</p>	
<b>F. Ineligibility for Funding</b>				



	YES	NO	No Response	Comment
1. Alameda CTC is trying to determine how best to assist Alameda County jurisdictions in meeting these criteria as they are currently proposed, what do you think are your jurisdiction's greatest obstacles to overcome in order to fulfill the OneBayArea Grant requirements?			Alameda County Berkeley Pleasanton San Leandro	City of Alameda: City would like to know what is needed to incorporate the Complete Street Policy Albany: The Challenge for urban cities is that we are already built out and there is not much space available for development or redevelopment. Dublin: We should be able to meet requirements, with ped plan and complete streets expected by 2013 and 2012, respectively. Emeryville: None related to Housing except hard to meet RHNA without redevelopment Hayward: Funding to help develop a CRRP, funding to help develop best practices for a citywide TDM program, provision of a boilerplate Complete Streets Policy. Newark: Cost of environmental process Piedmont: Implementing parking regulations Union City: Lack of funding and impact on staff resources to satisfy mandates
<b>G. Training/Support</b>				
2. What are the best methods to gather information from your jurisdiction? (eg, surveys, call, email)			City of Alameda Emeryville Pleasanton	Alameda County: All of the above Albany: Any methods listed works Berkeley: Conduct in person or phone interviews with Planning staff (land use) and Public Works (Transportation) Dublin: email Hayward: Email and phone Newark: Email Piedmont: Email San Leandro: Surveys, call specific contacts Union City: Survey email.
3. Any other comments?			Alameda County Albany Newark Piedmont Pleasanton San Leandro	<i>City of Alameda</i> : City would like to obtain help in reviewing the current Transportation Element. City believes that it has policies that meet the Complete Street Requirements. <i>Berkeley</i> : There are only 14 cities in Alameda County. Surveys like this are not the best way to gather information from such a small pool. You're not looking for bits of statistically significant information; you're looking for full answers. Also the questions don't have sufficient definitions to be useful. There are many scopes possible for Trip Reduction Ordinance, for instance. An off-street/on-street parking differential can mean almost anything (except that they're exactly the same.) <i>Emeryville</i> : Unclear what language we need to add to our general plan to comply with Ab 1358 or if in compliance as approved prior. <i>Hayward</i> : The City is currently working to implement a form based code for several areas. A FBC has been adopted for the South Hayward BART area and will be adopted for the Mission corridor next year. Form based codes accomplish many of the objectives of complete streets policies since they look at areas from a complete community standpoint to analyze of the streets and the buildings and community spaces work together to promote more sustainable communities. <i>Union City</i> : we appreciate all the hard work by the Alameda CTC staff and consultants.

G. Training/Support				
	<i>Training (i.e. workshops)</i>	<i>Resources other support (i.e. staff)</i>		
Parking/Pricing policies	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Emeryville Piedmont San Leandro Union City	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Berkeley Emeryville Hayward Newark Piedmont Union City		
Trip Reduction Ordinances	Alameda County City of Alameda Emeryville San Leandro Union City	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Berkeley Emeryville Hayward Newark Union City		
CRRPs	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Hayward Union City	Alameda County City of Alameda Berkeley Emeryville Newark San Leandro Union City		
Affordable housing policies	Alameda County City of Alameda Union City	Alameda County City of Alameda Newark San Leandro Union City		
Complete Streets policies/Develop or Update Bike Pedestrian Plans	Alameda County City of Alameda Emeryville Piedmont Union City	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Hayward Newark Piedmont San Leandro Union City		
Meeting the deadline of September 2014 to have an approved housing element	Alameda County Emeryville Piedmont Union City	Alameda County City of Alameda Albany Emeryville Hayward Newark Piedmont San Leandro Union City		