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Senate Bill 375
Sustainable Communities Strategy

- Directs ARB to develop passenger vehicle GHG reduction targets for CA’s 18 MPOs for 2020 and 2035
  - Bay Area target for 2020 is 7% reduction in per capita GHG
  - Bay Area target for 2035 is 15% reduction in per capita GHG
- Adds Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as new element to RTPs
- Requires separate Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) if GHG targets not met
- Provides CEQA streamlining incentives for projects consistent with SCS/APS
- Coordinates Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) with the regional transportation planning process
Plan Bay Area

- Road map that guides the nine-county region’s transportation and land-use development over a 28-year period
- Must achieve mandated greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets per Senate Bill 375
- Transportation investment strategy must be financially constrained
- Transportation projects must be consistent with this plan to receive federal and state funding

Regional Growth Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>Growth 2010 - 2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jobs</strong></td>
<td>3,385,000</td>
<td>4,505,000</td>
<td>1,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>7,152,000</td>
<td>9,299,000</td>
<td>2,147,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Units</strong></td>
<td>2,786,000</td>
<td>3,446,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance, US Census, Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy, United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, ABAG
Proposed Jobs-Housing Connection Scenario

- Key objective is to focus growth around transit
- Distributes new growth primarily into Priority Development Areas:
  - 74% new housing (or 500,000 new units)
  - 67% new jobs (or 747,000 new jobs)
- Result is more intense development near high quality transit

Population Growth
Growth Rate by decade

+ 2.15 million by 2040
Population by Age and Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population by Age and Decade

- Population by Age
- Population by Decade

Housing Unit Forecast

- **Local Government Input**
  - Local Plan Capacity
  - Priority Development Areas
  - Place types

- **Market analysis**
  - Access to employment centers
  - Enhanced transit service
  - Neighborhood amenities

- Absorbs current vacancies (6.4%) to 4% in 2040

- Increases group housing to recognize projected growth in the senior population
Jobs – Housing Connection

- Job growth assumes housing production at accessible locations
- 1.1 million jobs assumes 660,000 new Housing Units
- If housing production increases by approximately 85,000 Housing Units, the region could develop an additional 110,000 jobs

Proposed Jobs-Housing Connection Scenario
Share of Bay Area’s Housing Units and Jobs in 2040

- Jobs
- Housing Units
Proposed Jobs-Housing Connection Scenario
% of 2010-2040 Employment & Housing Growth in PDAs

GHG Emission Reductions To Date

- Bay Area's target for 2020 is a 7 percent reduction
- Bay Area’s target for 2035 is a 15 percent reduction

*Draft Preferred Jobs-Housing Connection with T2035 Network meets 2020 target
Plan Bay Area 28-Year Revenue

Subject to Change in April 2012

$266 Billion Plan Revenue

Local – $138 billion (51%)
State – $46 billion (17%)
Federal – $33 billion (13%)
Regional – $37 billion (14%)
Anticipated – $14 billion (5%)

* Based on corrected transit operator submittals

Plan Bay Area 28-Year Expenditures

T2035 by Function - $218B
O&M - Transit 53%
Expansion - Transit 15%
Expansion - Roads and Bridges 9%

Plan Bay Area by Function - $276B
O&M - Transit 58%
Expansion - Roads and Bridges 3%
Expansion - Roads and Bridges 29%

Subject to Change
Local Streets and Roads

Needs Scenarios:

- **Ideal State of Repair**
  - PCI in All Jurisdictions = 75
  - Backlog Reduced to $3B by Year 10
  - Remaining Need = $30 Billion
- **Maintain Existing PCI**
  - All Jurisdictions Maintain Existing PCIs
  - Regional Average PCI = 66
  - Deferred Maintenance Costs Allowed to Grow
  - Remaining Need = $18 Billion

Local Streets and Roads – Regional Investment & Allocation

- **T2035 Investment Level**
  - Maintain Existing Pavement Conditions
  - $7 Billion
  - Same Functional Investment Level would be $9.9 Billion in Plan Bay Area
- **Allocation Basis**
  - Regional LS&R funds are not distributed based on need
  - T2035 – Funds distributed to counties based on 4-Factor Formula (population, mileage, shortfall, and performance)
  - Plan Bay Area – LS&R rehab funds distributed to counties based on population and housing targets
Remaining 28-Year LS&R System Preservation Need By County

- Remaining Need Pavement: $9,940 million
- Remaining Need Non-Pavement: $8,471

Pavement & Non-Pavement Remaining Needs
Maintain Existing Conditions Scenario

One Bay Area Grant: Regional Initiatives

- **Climate Initiatives Program**
  - EVs, Smart Driving, SR2S, Vanpools, Commuter Benefits, bike/ped

- **Transportation for Livable Communities/Other Planning Funds**
  - Priority Development Area planning grants and the Affordable Transit Oriented Development Fund
  - Priority Conservation Areas planning funds

- **Freeway Performance Initiative**
  - Increase the effectiveness of freeway and major arterial operations

- **Transit Performance Initiative**
  - Increase the effectiveness of transit services

- **Transit Capital Rehabilitation**
  - Keep trains, buses, and supporting infrastructure in a good state of repair
OneBayArea Grant: Local Program

- $250 million federal funds over three years (2013-2015)
- Rewards jurisdictions that accept housing allocations and produce housing with additional transportation dollars
- County congestion management agencies are responsible for project solicitation and selection

Eligible Project Categories
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
- Transportation for Livable Communities
- Road Rehabilitation
- Safe Routes to School
- Climate Initiatives
- Open Space Access and Acquisition

County Priorities - Key Projects

In Millions of YOE Dollars

Alameda

Key projects consist of high performers, projects greater than $250M, & projects subject to Compelling Case requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Discretionary Funds</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit Grand-MacArthur BRT</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington BART Station</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>$127</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Enhancements, Expansion and Safety Program</td>
<td>$3,031</td>
<td>$3,031</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets &amp; Roads Operations and Maintenance (O&amp;M) Program</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART to Livermore Extension, includes project development &amp; construction reserve</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th Street Grade Separation &amp; Roadway Improvement Project</td>
<td>$332</td>
<td>$166</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Harbor Intermodal Terminals</td>
<td>$326</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Parking Management Program</td>
<td>$269</td>
<td>$269</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 84/680 Interchange and Route 84 Widening</td>
<td>$277</td>
<td>$277</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City Passenger Rail Station &amp; Dumbarton Rail Segment G Improvement</td>
<td>$271</td>
<td>$221</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Rail Corridor Phase II</td>
<td>$795</td>
<td>$528</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Draft List – Subject to Change
### County Priorities - Key Projects

**In Millions of YOE Dollars**

**Santa Clara**

Key projects consist of high performers, projects greater than $250M, & projects subject to Compelling Case requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Discretionary Funds</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BART extension from Berryessa to San Jose/Santa Clara</td>
<td>$3,605</td>
<td>$2,391</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Service Frequency Improvements</td>
<td>$1,151</td>
<td>$873</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Improvements</td>
<td>$432</td>
<td>$432</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineta San Jose International Airport APM Connector</td>
<td>$508</td>
<td>$427</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning and Outreach</td>
<td>$382</td>
<td>$382</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies</td>
<td>$287</td>
<td>$287</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Enhancements</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New SR 152 Alignment: Santa Clara County</td>
<td>$848</td>
<td>$848</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Widening from Monterey St. to SR 129</td>
<td>$246</td>
<td>$242</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Expressway light rail extension - Phase II</td>
<td>$276</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Extension to Vasona Junction (Phase II of Vasona Project)</td>
<td>$176</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Working Draft - Not for Public Review**

### Key Milestones

- **April 13**: Draft Transportation Investment Strategy & Compelling Cases
- **May 13**: Preferred Land Use-Transportation Strategy Performance Results
- **May 17**: Approval of Preferred Land Use-Transportation Strategy
- **March 9**: Draft Jobs-Housing Connection Land Use Strategy

**Draft List – Subject to Change**
Next Steps

- **April 13, 2012** - MTC presents a draft transportation investment strategy, which details the maintenance, system efficiency and expansion investment priorities over the next 28-years
- **May 2012** - MTC and ABAG adopt a preferred land use-transportation investment strategy
- **December 2012** - MTC and ABAG release Draft Plan Bay Area and companion EIR
- **Early 2013** – MTC and ABAG conduct another round of public engagement on Draft Plan Bay Area
- **Spring 2013** – MTC and ABAG adopt Final Plan Bay Area
Sustainable Communities Strategy and the Air District

Supervisors Haggerty and Lockyer SCS Leadership Workshop

March 31, 2012

Henry Hilken
Director of Planning and Research
Bay Area Air Quality Management District

The Air District and the SCS

- Efficient land use and transportation planning critical to meeting AB 32 and SB 375 GHG reduction goals
- Air quality co-benefits of GHG strategies result in significant public health benefits
- Close collaboration between Air District, ABAG, MTC, BCDC staff on SCS, other regional planning programs
  - Regular staff meetings, technical work groups
  - Developed performance targets for particulate matter (PM)
  - Assisted in One Bay Area Grant program
  - Provide air quality expertise and perspective to modeling, environmental review and regional planning programs
Infill and TOD: Why It’s Important To the Air District

- Motor vehicles are largest source of air pollution in Bay Area – GHGs, PM, ozone, toxics
- A well located and designed TOD/infill project may generate 40% to 75% less VMT than typical suburban development
- Less VMT = less air pollution (GHGs, PM, ozone, toxics)
- Promote strategies that support livable communities
  - Infill, mixed use, TOD
  - Support MTC, ABAG, local programs
  - Help achieve State GHG targets
  - Integrate AQ into local planning
  - Use caution near high concentrations of pollutants

Health Risks Near Freeways

- Living near freeways can have serious health consequences
  - Studies show higher risks of asthma, premature death, and low birth weights
- State, federal, and District programs working to reduce emissions & exposure risks
- Local land use decisions play key role
  - Article 38 – SF ordinance on air quality and infill development
- District helping local governments and regional agencies support healthy infill projects
Supporting Healthy Infill: Air District

- CEQA Guidelines - Technical tools & assistance; mitigation measures, eg,:
  - Setbacks (impacts greater for much freeways than arterials)
  - Project phasing – vehicle fleet becoming cleaner, impacts reduced in future years
  - Building heights – reduced exposure at 2nd story
  - Indoor air quality filters and ventilation
  - Locate HVAC intakes away from pollution sources
  - Truck routes, idling limits, etc.
- Encourage plan-based approaches – Climate Action Plans, Community Risk Reduction Plans
- Streamline environmental review
  - Address issues in EIR for SCS and specific plans to allow future tiering
- Other Air District activities – regulations, grants & incentives, local AQ studies, etc.

Supporting Healthy Infill: Local Governments

- **City of San Francisco, Article 38 Ordinance**
  - Requires new development near freeways to assess and reduce exposure risks through building design and air filtration
- **City of Oakland, Standard Conditions of Approval**
  - Requires projects with potential significant risk impacts to conduct health risk assessment or implement air quality measures (redesign layout, air filtration)
- **City of San Jose, 2040 General Plan Policies**
  - Contains initiatives to reduce exposure, including air modeling requirements for residential projects near freeways, install air filtration in existing schools and residences, encourage tree planting
- **City of Richmond, General Plan Community Health and Wellness Element**
  - Element emphasizes link between health and community design; policies include developing Sensitive Use Location Guidelines and a Truck Route Study
Supporting Healthy Infill: Local Governments

- **City of Emeryville General Plan (2009)**
  - Sustainability Element highlights land use and transportation policies to reduce VMT and GHG emissions

- **City of Fremont General Plan (2011)**
  - Established TOD zones around existing and future BART stations and transit corridors

- **Union City Station Area Plan**
  - Compact, energy efficient, TOD development

- **City of Berkeley Climate Action Plan (2009)**
  - Policy to set minimum building heights in transit-rich areas

- **City of Redwood City General Plan (2010)**
  - Policy to integrate air quality planning in land use and transportation development

- **City of Mountain View General Plan/GHG Reduction Plan (2012)**
  - Zoning ordinance update to encourage transit oriented village centers
Presentation Overview

- Relationship of CWTP-TEP to Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)
- Status of Countywide Transportation Plan Update (CWTP)
- Status of Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)
- Overview of how Alameda CTC and Alameda County jurisdictions are participating in the development of the RTP/SCS
- Next Steps
Relationship of Regional and Countywide Planning Processes

• Planning in a New Context - SB 375
• The Bigger Picture:
  ▪ Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - MTC
  ▪ Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) - ABAG
• The Big Picture:
  ▪ CWTP Update – Establishing a Vision and Long Term Transportation Investment Priorities
  ▪ TEP – Responding to Funding Shortfalls
• CWTP-TEP informs the RTP/SCS

Countywide Transportation Plan

• Adopted Vision and Goals (January 2011)
• Adopted Performance Measures (March 2011)
• Call for Projects & Programs (March - May 2011)
• First Evaluation of CWTP (July 2011)
• Conducted Polling & Outreach (Spring & Fall 2011)
• Released Administrative Draft CWTP (September 2011)
• Second Evaluation of CWTP (October 2011 - January 2012)
  ❖ Adopted Final TEP (January 2012)
  ❖ Released Draft CWTP (March 2012)
2012 CWTP Update: Many “firsts”

- This was the first CWTP that:
  - Was completed by the Alameda CTC
  - Used performance-based evaluation
  - Used extensive public planning process
  - Addressed new policy environment including SB 375
  - Used a locally-developed land use alternative addressing Sustainable Communities Strategy and provided significant funding for land use related infrastructure
  - Included projects and programs generated both by jurisdictions and by the public
  - Was designed in tandem with the new Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)

A Multimodal Plan Addressing the County’s Diverse Needs

- Addresses all modes as well as land use linkages, freight, and demand management
- Addresses capital, operating, and maintenance needs
- Addresses regional priorities and adopted vision and goals
Financially Constrained CWTP

- Total estimated funding available to Alameda County = $9.5 Billion
  - Total estimate of funding available increased from $6.8 to $9.5 Billion as a result of planned TEP
    - Assumes passage of TEP in November 2012
- Call for projects and programs resulted in over $30 billion in “need”
  - So, still need for a financially constrained CWTP to be consistent with the RTP

Summary of CWTP Financially Constrained Lists

Programs = 60% of Discretionary Spending in CWTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Discretionary Funding Allocations</th>
<th>% of Discretionary Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1 Projects</td>
<td>$2,554</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1R Projects</td>
<td>$1,006</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 Projects</td>
<td>$265</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision Projects</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>$5,730</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$9,555</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of CWTP Financially Constrained Lists

Emphasis on Transit & Multimodal Projects & Programs

- 48% of Discretionary Funds to Transit Projects and Programs
- TEP to fund Access to School Program, which includes one or more models for a youth transit pass program
- TEP requires a minimum of 15% of LS&R funds to be spent on bike/ped project elements

CWTP Performance – Key Benefits

- Support of modal shifts and increases in non-motorized travel
- Improved access to activity centers and frequent travel service, especially to low-income households
- Reduced congestion in key corridors
- Reduced GHG emissions compared to 2005 conditions, with an understanding that regional coordination and other policies are needed to support additional reductions
CWTP Performance – Access Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Baseline</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2/Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of low-income households with access to activity centers</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of low-income households with access to frequent transit</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CWTP Performance – GHG Reduction

Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Emissions from Alameda County Roadways

- Per-Capita GHG Emissions
- Economy and Land Use Reduction
- Fuel & Vehicle Technology Reduction
- Projects & Programs Reduction

2015
- 2005 Trend Conditions: M.4
- 2035 Trend Conditions: M.1
- Tier 1 Scenario: M.2
- Tier 2/Vision Scenario: M.0

2035
- Reduction from Trend: -24%
- Projected Reduction: -25%
CWTP Performance – Congestion Relief

Roadway Congestion Changes for Tier 1 Scenario

TEP – Responding to Funding Shortfalls

- Investments are focused on a $7.7 Billion multimodal plan over an initial 30 years
  - Mass Transit: 48%
    - Senior/Disabled Transportation
  - Local Streets & Roads: 30%
    - Freight and Economic Development
  - Highway maintenance and improvement: 9%
    - Freight and Economic Development
  - Safer Bike and Pedestrian routes: 8%
- Other Investments to support Sustainable Communities and Innovation
  - Sustainable Land Use and Transportation: 4%
  - Technology and Innovation: 1%
TEP con’t

- Accountability measures in Plan
  - Independent Watchdog Committee
  - Continuation of other public committees
  - Strict environmental, full funding and reporting requirements
  - Commitment to modes (if projects become unable to move forward, funding stays within mode category)
  - Complete Streets requirement
  - Voter check in and approval of new plan every 20 years

2012 Transportation Expenditure Plan Approvals

- Eight cities and the Board of Supervisors, representing a majority of the population have supported the TEP
  - Fremont, Livermore, Union City, Hayward, Emeryville, San Leandro, Oakland, Piedmont, Board of Supervisors
  - AC Transit supported TEP unanimously
  - All other cities and BART scheduled to take action on the TEP
- Chambers of Commerce, business, labor and other groups are acting on positions on the TEP
- Alameda CTC is actively educating and seeking support throughout the county
Multi-Tiered Evaluation Process

Land Use Evaluation

Transportation Evaluation

Relationship of SCS to CWTP

- Initiate CWTP Update Summer 2010: land use has a key role (SB 375)
- ABAG/MTC release Initial Vision Scenario – March 2011
- ACTC with local agency planning directors prepares land use scenarios with SCS PDA/GOA and mixed use employment focus and conducts first CWTP-TEP evaluation – Summer 2011
- Administrative Draft CWTP released – September 2011
- ABAG releases Five Alternative Scenarios with different growth approaches - September 2011
- ACTC with local planning directors prepares Alameda County Draft Land Use Scenario Concept and conducts second CWTP-TEP evaluation – Fall 2011/Winter 2012
- ACTC adopts TEP and shares local land use concept with ABAG – January 2012
- ACTC releases Draft CWTP with local land use concept – March 2012
Comparison of Alternatives and Next Steps

- A comparison of the Alameda County Land Use Scenario Concept to the Draft Preferred SCS: Jobs-Housing Connection Scenario:
  - Approximately 24,000 less households
  - Approximately 48,000 more jobs
- Next Steps
  - Submit comments to ABAG by April 18
  - Work with Planning Directors on submitting comments
    - Jurisdictions
    - Alameda CTC

What the CWTP-TEP Accomplishes

- Strongly supports transit operations and regional rail plan to move more **people** within and beyond the County
- Establishes guarantees for transit, local roadway, bike and pedestrian funding
- Establishes new policies for Complete Streets and supportive land uses
- Supports roadway and highway investments to address freight movement and congestion relief
- Honors on-going commitments and legislative mandates
- Makes progress on local and regional goals for a multimodal, sustainable transportation network and accommodating housing and employment growth in a sustainable way
Next Steps

- Submit comments on SCS to ABAG by April 18
- Steering Committee and Commission approves Final Draft CWTP and Final TEP (May 2012)
- CWTP incorporates final land use scenario adopted by MTC with RTP/SCS (May 2012)
- Conduct final round of evaluation, if needed (June 2012 – June 2013)
- Place TEP on ballot (November 2012)

Questions?
### Alameda County - Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alameda County Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>32,350</td>
<td>38,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>7,990</td>
<td>8,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>49,450</td>
<td>57,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>11,780</td>
<td>38,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>12,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>73,190</td>
<td>94,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>48,380</td>
<td>62,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>30,140</td>
<td>41,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>13,410</td>
<td>18,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>169,710</td>
<td>206,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>3,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>26,050</td>
<td>31,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>32,420</td>
<td>40,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>21,160</td>
<td>23,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>51,520</td>
<td>56,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alameda County - Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alameda County Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>PDA Share 2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>2010-2040 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>24,030</td>
<td>33,160</td>
<td>9,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>77,020</td>
<td>99,100</td>
<td>22,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>16,760</td>
<td>28,060</td>
<td>11,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>16,040</td>
<td>23,620</td>
<td>7,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>89,590</td>
<td>120,250</td>
<td>30,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>69,190</td>
<td>90,180</td>
<td>21,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>38,370</td>
<td>52,560</td>
<td>14,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>27,870</td>
<td>33,560</td>
<td>5,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>296,290</td>
<td>470,890</td>
<td>40,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>54,210</td>
<td>72,840</td>
<td>17,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>39,900</td>
<td>52,800</td>
<td>12,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>20,560</td>
<td>29,410</td>
<td>8,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>34,270</td>
<td>47,340</td>
<td>29,490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>