

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
Related to the Development of the Integrated Growth Forecast
and Growth Visioning/ 2% Land Use Alternative
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

1. Input from subregions/ local jurisdictions for the 2007/ 2008 Integrated Growth Forecast has accounted for the intensification of land uses at and near transit centers and employment centers, when compared to the land use patterns proposed under the 2004 Regional Transportation Plan update. Why shouldn't the projections adopted by various subregions/local jurisdictions represent their land use intensity and distribution for the growth visioning scenarios?

The 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) may not go far enough to help local governments collectively meet AB 32, Air Quality and Mobility goals. The role of an MPO is to propose regional "What If" alternatives for public and local government consideration to meet these challenges. What SCAG has found is that, within current financial constraints, the RTP performance goals and benefits for the post-2015 period can be increased significantly by incorporating land use strategies that are more efficient and strategic when compared to the baseline that incorporates all subregion/ local projections.

An Envision scenario, or another test, scenario, for instance, calls for an advisory redistribution of growth at the county, subregion, city, and TAZ levels from the baseline. This advisory regional vision focuses on geographic specific locations with transportation/ transit advantage including the interaction between transit network and employment centers. The preferred scenario or vision would call for additional investments to support compact growth and not rely on or compete for traditional transportation funding. Any alternative scenario would be an advisory compliment to the baseline of any local and subregional input.

2. Do any of the alternative growth forecasts, including the RTP preferred growth scenario, change the number and distribution of households and employment as established in subregional/ local jurisdictional projections? Does the subregion/ county as a whole, or any individual jurisdiction, receive more households and more employment than established by the subregional/ local jurisdiction projections? Could other SCAG counties

receive less households and less employment than established through their submitted projections to SCAG?

The idea would be to release the baseline forecast and adopt a preferred land use alternative, representing a regional vision that is voluntary and advisory for purposes of seeking incentive funding to promote development where it will have the most positive regional impact and be consistent with AB 32 requirements to promote a more compact, energy efficient urban form that minimizes greenhouse gas emissions, reduces VMT and improves mobility. Local and subregional input would be used through 2015. This approach will not affect projects submitted to CTC's, and applies only to the out-years of the growth forecast (2015-2035) on an advisory and voluntary basis.

3. Does the growth forecast scenario that is comprised of all the input/approved projections from each of the SCAG subregions last fall/winter and the list of planned transportation projects submitted by the county transportation commissions, achieve air quality conformity? Do the two growth forecasts under development for the Growth Visioning scenarios achieve air quality conformity?

We are not sure at this time whether air quality conformity can be achieved under these scenarios. However, regional land use strategy alternatives will have the potential to be more consistent with the requirements under AB 32 than relying on just the baseline, and this improves the prospects for achieving air quality conformity.

4. Do any of the Alternative Growth Visioning scenarios impact the list of planned transportation projects submitted by the county transportation commissions, due to a shifting of land uses across counties and due to intensification of land uses around transit centers and employment centers?

No.