

Reference Growth Scenarios

Envision San Jose 2040
March 23, 2009 Task Force Meeting

Scenario	Growth Capacity	Total Capacity (Growth + 396,000 Jobs and 308,000 Dwelling Units)	Jobs/Employed Resident**	Notes
GP2020 (No Project)*	229,000 New Jobs 70,000 New Dwelling Units	625,000 Jobs 567,000 Employed Residents** 378,000 Dwelling Units	1.1	This will be included in the EIR/CEQA analysis as the “no project” alternative.
“CCSCE Projections”	174,000 New Jobs 179,000 New Dwelling Units	570,000 Jobs 730,500 Employed Residents** 487,000 Dwelling Units	0.8	The CCSCE report only projected household and job growth. Dwelling unit numbers are derived from the household projection.
“ABAG Projections 2009”	312,980 New Jobs (2035) 160,315 New Dwelling Units (2035)	708,980 Jobs 702,473 Employed Residents** 468,315 Dwelling Units	1.0	For 2009, ABAG revised their projections, allocating an additional share of Bay Area job growth to the City of San Jose. These projections are for 2035, not 2040. Dwelling unit projection is derived from ABAG’s household projection.
“CCSCE Adjusted Projections”	281,200 New Jobs 179,000 New Dwelling Units	677,200 Jobs 730,500 Employed Residents** 487,000 Dwelling Units	0.9	The CCSCE projections used ABAG Projections 2007’s percentage of Bay Area job growth assigned to San Jose. For 2009, ABAG adjusted that percentage, so the “CCSCE Adjusted Projections” reflects this change in methodology to project San Jose’s job growth for 2040.

* Scenario evaluated at March 9, 2009 GP Task Force Meeting

** “Employed residents” is calculated as 1.55 employed residents per household (also equal to 1.5 employed residents per dwelling unit). Generally the number of employed residents per household is an output of projections for job and population growth. Higher or lower ratios of employed resident per household would affect the Jobs/Employed Resident ratio corresponding to the amount of job and household capacity in each scenario.

Notes: - For additional discussion of ABAG Projections 2009 & the “CCSCE Adjusted Projections,” see the “Job Growth Projections and Employment Land Demand” report.
- Some numbers/references have changed since last presented to the Task Force in an effort to clarify a household versus housing units discrepancy. To account for vacancy rates, total households are approximately 3.14% less than total housing units.

Identified Growth Scenarios - Summary

Generally listed from least to most intensive growth.

Envision San Jose 2040
March 23, 2009 Task Force Meeting

Scenario	Growth Capacity	Total Capacity (Growth + 396,000 Jobs and 308,000 Dwelling Units)	Jobs/Employed Resident**	Notes
“Housing Trendline & Fewer Jobs”+	201,000–210,000 New Jobs 90,000–96,000 New Dwelling Units	597,000–606,000 Jobs 597,000–606,000 Empl. Res.** 398,000–404,000 Dwelling Units	1.0	Table 2 (Klein) & Table 4 (Prevetti) Lower end assumes 3,000 DU/year Upper end assumes 3,200 DU/year
“More Jobs & Less Housing Alternative 1”+	271,500 New Jobs 137,000 New Dwelling Units	667,500 Jobs 667,500 Employed Residents** 445,000 Dwelling Units	1.0	Table 6 (Ketchum)
“Housing Trendline & More Jobs”*	320,000 New Jobs 90,000 New Dwelling Units	716,000 Jobs 597,000 Employed Residents** 398,000 Dwelling Units	1.2	
“More Jobs & Less Housing Alternative 2”+	334,000 New Jobs 105,000 New Dwelling Units	730,000 Jobs 619,500 Employed Residents** 413,000 Dwelling Units	1.17	Table 4 (Prevetti) – Maintains 334,000 new jobs and reduce DU capacity. Capacity for 105,000 DU results in 1.17 J/ER.
“More Jobs & Less Housing”*	334,000 New Jobs 137,000 New Dwelling Units	730,000 Jobs 667,500 Employed Residents** 445,000 Dwelling Units	1.1	
“Less than Housing Trendline & More Jobs”+	432,000 New Jobs 60,000 New Dwelling Units	828,000 Jobs 552,000 Employed Residents** 368,000 Dwelling Units	1.5	Table 1 (Horwedel) North Coyote as (industrial) urban reserve Mid Coyote as a non-urban reserve
“More Jobs”*	334,000 New Jobs 179,000 New Dwelling Units	730,000 Jobs 730,500 Employed Residents** 487,000 Dwelling Units	1.0	
“More Jobs & Less Housing Alternative 3”+	405,000 New Jobs 137,000 New Dwelling Units	801,000 Jobs 667,500 Employed Residents** 445,000 Dwelling Units	1.2	Table 3 (Crabtree)
“Jobs Surplus”*	479,000 New Jobs 179,000 New Dwelling Units	875,000 Jobs 730,500 Employed Residents** 487,000 Dwelling Units	1.2	
“Housing Trendline & Large Jobs Surplus”+	499,500–798,000 New Jobs 90,000 New Dwelling Units	895,500–1,194,000 Jobs 597,000 Employed Residents** 398,000 Dwelling Units	1.5 - 2	Table 1 (Joe Horwedel) North Coyote would be included for jobs

* Scenario evaluated at March 9, 2009 GP Task Force Meeting

+ Scenario developed from March 9, 2009 GP Task Force Meeting feedback

** “Employed residents” is calculated as 1.55 employed residents per household (also equal to 1.5 employed residents per dwelling unit). Generally the number of employed residents per household is an output of projections for job and population growth. Higher or lower ratios of employed resident per household would affect the Jobs/Employed Resident ratio corresponding to the amount of job and household capacity in each scenario.

Note: Some numbers/references have changed since last presented to the Task Force in an effort to clarify a household versus housing units discrepancy. To account for vacancy rates, total households are approximately 3.14% less than total housing units.

Identified Growth Scenarios – Descriptions

Envision San Jose 2040
March 23, 2009 Task Force Meeting

Scenario	Growth Capacity	Jobs/ER	Description
“Housing Trendline* & Fewer Jobs”	201,000–210,000 New Jobs 90,000–96,000 New Dwelling Units	1.0	This scenario was developed from feedback received at the March 9, 2009 GPTF meeting. It includes new dwelling unit capacity adequate to allow an amount of development consistent with the average amount constructed in recent years (current housing trendline*). This scenario provides job growth capacity adequate to achieve a 1:1 J/ER ratio for the trendline housing capacity. Both new job and new housing capacity would be less than the capacity of the existing GP 2020.
“More Jobs & Less Housing Alternative 1”	271,500 New Jobs 137,000 New Dwelling Units	1.0	This scenario was developed from feedback received at the March 9, 2009 GPTF meeting, modifying the “More Jobs & Less Housing” scenario by reducing the total amount of job capacity to the amount needed to achieve a 1:1 J/ER ratio. This scenario has more job growth than the “CCSCE Projection” but less than the “Adjusted CCSCE Projection,” and it has more job growth than the existing GP 2020.
“Housing Trendline* & More Jobs”	320,000 New Jobs 90,000 New Dwelling Units	1.2	This scenario was developed by staff in response to feedback received at the February 7, 2009 workshop and presented to the Task Force at their March 9, 2009 meeting. This scenario provides new dwelling unit capacity consistent with the current housing development trendline* and job growth capacity adequate to achieve a 1.2:1 J/ER ratio. This scenario has more job growth than both the original and adjusted CCSCE projections.
“More Jobs & Less Housing Alternative 2”	334,000 New Jobs 105,000 New Dwelling Units	1.2	This scenario was developed from feedback received at the March 9, 2009 GPTF meeting, modifying the “More Jobs & Less Housing” scenario by reducing housing growth capacity in order to achieve a 1.2 J/ER ratio. This scenario has housing growth capacity below the CCSCE projections but above the current housing trendline* and job growth capacity above the original and adjusted CCSCE projections.
“More Jobs & Less Housing”	334,000 New Jobs 137,000 New Dwelling Units	1.1	This scenario was developed by staff in response to input received at the February 7, 2009 workshop and presented to the Task Force at their March 9, 2009 meeting. Workshop participants modified the “More Jobs” scenario by reducing housing capacity to achieve a higher J/ER ratio. This scenario provides housing growth capacity less than the CCSCE projected demand but more than the current housing trendline*. New job growth capacity would exceed the original and adjusted CCSCE projections.
“Less than Housing Trendline* & More Jobs”	432,000 New Jobs 60,000 New Dwelling Units	1.5	This scenario was developed from feedback received at the March 9, 2009 GPTF meeting. This scenario projects less housing unit growth capacity than the current housing trendline* and less than the capacity of the existing GP 2020. To support a high J/ER ratio of 1.5, job growth capacity is provided much above the original and adjusted CCSCE projections.

*The housing trendline projection continues dwelling unit growth at the same rate as the average number of dwelling units built between FY 99/00 and FY07/08 (3,164 DU/year).

Identified Growth Scenarios – Descriptions

Envision San Jose 2040
March 23, 2009 Task Force Meeting

Scenario	Growth Capacity	Jobs/ER	Description
“More Jobs & Less Housing Alternative 3”	405,000 New Jobs 137,000 New Dwelling Units	1.2	This scenario was developed from feedback received at the March 9, 2009 GPTF meeting, modifying the “More Jobs & Less Housing” scenario by reducing the housing growth capacity below the housing growth demand identified in the CCSCE projection, but above the current housing trendline. To achieve a high J/ER ratio of 1.2:1, jobs growth capacity is provided to exceed the original and adjusted CCSCE projections for demand. This scenario provides more jobs than the “More Jobs & Less Housing” scenario and thus has a higher J/ER ratio.
“Jobs Surplus”	479,000 New Jobs 179,000 New Dwelling Units	1.2	This scenario was developed by staff in response to feedback received at the February 7, 2009 workshop and presented to the Task Force at their March 9, 2009 meeting. This scenario provides an amount of new housing growth capacity consistent with the CCSCE demand projection. To achieve a 1.2:1 J/ER ratio, job growth capacity is significantly increased above original and adjusted CCSCE projections.
“Housing Trendline* & Large Jobs Surplus”	499,500–798,000 New Jobs 90,000 New Dwelling Units	1.5 - 2	This scenario was developed from feedback received at the March 9, 2009 GPTF meeting. It provides new dwelling unit capacity consistent with the current housing trendline* and job growth capacity sufficient to allow a very high J/ER ratio in the range of 1.5:1 to 2:1. This job growth capacity would far exceed the original and adjusted CCSCE projections for demand.

*The housing trendline projection continues dwelling unit growth at the same rate as the average number of dwelling units built between FY 99/00 and FY07/08 (3,164 DU/year).