

# Scenarios

## Plan Bay Area 2040

### Scenarios In Detail: Targets







# Plan Bay Area 2040

## How do the scenarios measure up?

After six months of public review, MTC and ABAG last year adopted 13 performance targets for Plan Bay Area 2040 to set the region's top priorities for the Plan. These targets help us understand whether the region is expected to move in the right direction or the wrong direction under each scenario.

Many targets are aspirational and are quite difficult to achieve. While most of the targets are voluntary, two — reducing greenhouse gas emissions and housing the projected population — are specified in state law. Below is a comparison of how the three scenarios perform in reaching key adopted performance targets.

Also included is a **"No Project"** alternative to illustrate trends assumed under adopted local general plans and zoning without an adopted regional plan, and assuming no new transportation projects beyond those currently under construction or those that have both full funding and environmental clearance.

	Target	No Project	Main Streets	Connected Neighborhoods	Big Cities
 <p><b>REDUCE PER-CAPITA GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b> While all three scenarios achieve the target, lower levels of driving in the <b>Connected Neighborhoods</b> and <b>Big Cities</b> scenarios demonstrate the strongest performance.</p>	-15%	-3%	-15%	-18%	-20%
 <p><b>DO NOT INCREASE RISK OF DISPLACEMENT</b> Challenges related to affordability and displacement risk increase in all three scenarios, with <b>No Project</b> and <b>Big Cities</b> resulting in the greatest adverse impacts. Despite various housing and land use strategies included across all the scenarios to make the region more affordable, housing costs continue to rise, reflecting an increasingly expensive Bay Area housing market.</p>	+0%	+20%	+9%	+8%	+15%
 <p><b>REDUCE ADVERSE HEALTH IMPACTS</b> The ambitious public health target remains out of reach across all scenarios. Much higher levels of walking and bicycling, combined with significant reductions in traffic collisions, would be needed to improve residents' health outcomes. Slightly stronger performance in <b>Connected Neighborhoods</b> and <b>Big Cities</b> indicates that a denser land use pattern better supports active transportation, and therefore public health outcomes, in the region.</p>	-10%	-0%	-0%	-1%	-1%
 <p><b>DEVELOP WITHIN THE URBAN FOOTPRINT</b> The <b>Connected Neighborhoods</b> and <b>Big Cities</b> meet the target for preserving open space and agricultural lands by restricting growth to areas within locally adopted urban growth boundaries. The <b>Main Streets</b> scenario expands urban growth boundaries resulting in greater development on current agricultural lands.</p>	100%	71%	77%	100%	100%
 <p><b>REDUCE PER-CAPITA DELAY ON FREIGHT NETWORK</b> Goods movement will benefit from regional transportation investments and smart land use decisions. <b>Main Streets'</b> investments in regional express lanes help reduce congestion in major truck corridors while <b>Connected Neighborhoods</b> and <b>Big Cities</b> improve goods movement by focusing growth and promoting alternatives to automobiles.</p>	-20%	+27%	-24%	-21%	-38%
 <p><b>REDUCE IMPACTS FROM AGING INFRASTRUCTURE</b> Residents will save money on auto maintenance under the <b>Main Streets</b> scenario, which prioritizes funding for road maintenance. The <b>Big Cities</b> scenario achieves the greatest reduction in transit system breakdowns thanks to additional funding for transit maintenance.</p>	Roads: -100%	+57%	-65%	-7%	+20%
	Transit: -100%	-56%	-76%	-77%	-83%

 **See Handout For Full Results**

● Performance moving in wrong direction from target
 ● Performance moving in right direction, but falls well short of target
 ● Target achieved