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The Community, Economic and Human Development Committee may consider and act upon any of the items on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as Information or Action items.

CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
(The Honorable Peggy Huang, Chair)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
Members of the public desiring to speak on items on the agenda, or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Committee, must fill out and present a Public Comment Card to the Assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes per speaker. The Chair has the discretion to reduce the time limit based upon the number of speakers and may limit the total time for all public comments to twenty (20) minutes.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

INFORMATION ITEM
1. SB 2 Housing Funding for Local Jurisdictions
   (Jonathan Nettler, Placeworks)  
   20 mins.  
   Page 8

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEM
2. Regional Housing Need Determination from HCD
   (Kome Ajise, Executive Director, SCAG)  
   Page 18

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Will be provided under a separate cover along with staff analysis.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items
3. Minutes of the August 1, 2019 Meeting  
   Page 25

Receive and File
4. September is Pedestrian Safety Month  
   Page 31
5. EAC Retreat Housing Discussion Follow-Up  
   Page 33
INFORMATION ITEM
   (Kevin Kane, Ph.D.; Senior Regional Planner)

CHAIR’S REPORT
(The Honorable Peggy Huang, Chair)

STAFF REPORT
(Ma’Ayn Johnson, SCAG Staff)

FUTURE AGENDA ITEM/S

ANNOUNCEMENT/S
A Special Meeting of the CEHD Committee is scheduled for Monday, October 21, 2019, from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Please inform staff of your meeting location if participating other than the SCAG’s Los Angeles Office.

ADJOURNMENT
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only – No Action Required

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 7: Secure funding to support agency priorities to effectively and efficiently deliver work products.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Passed in 2017, Senate Bill 2 (SB2) establishes a permanent source of funding to increase affordable housing stock. Jurisdictions that have a certified housing element and have submitted their required annual progress reports to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) are eligible to receive funding. HCD and its consultant team can provide jurisdictions assistance with grant applications, housing element compliance, and annual progress reports. A total of $123 million is available for this round. Applications are due to HCD by November 30, 2019.

BACKGROUND:
Passed in 2017, Senate Bill 2 establishes a permanent source of funding to increase affordable housing stock. Jurisdictions that have a certified housing element and have submitted their required annual progress reports to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) are eligible to receive funding. Eligible applicants may also partner with local entities, including but not limited to housing authorities, schools districts, and community-based organizations. Eligible activities for funding include targeted general plan updates, zoning updates, environmental analyses that eliminate the need for project review, and process updates to improve and expedite local permitting.

HCD and its consultant team can provide jurisdictions assistance with grant applications, housing element compliance, and annual progress reports. A total of $123 million is available for this round. Applications are due to HCD by November 30, 2019.
Jonathan Nettler from Placeworks will present an overview of SB 2 and the application process to the CEHD Committee.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with this item is included in the Fiscal Year 2019-2020 Overall Work Program (080.SC100153.04: Regional Assessment).

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. PowerPoint Presentation on SB 2 Funding
SB 2 Housing Funding for Local Jurisdictions

SCAG
Community, Economic & Human Development (CEHD) Policy Committee
September 5, 2019

In this Briefing

- SB2 Overview
  - Purpose & eligibility
  - Funding
  - Timing
  - Assistance
  - Eligible activities & applicants
  - Priority policy areas
  - Application overview
  - Current Status
- Questions from jurisdiction(s)
- Local contacts/liaisons
**Purpose & Eligibility**

- **Passage.** SB2 was adopted along with 14 other bills that make up the 2017 California Housing Package.

- **Purpose.** Establishes a permanent source of funding to increase affordable housing stock.

- **Eligibility.** Cities and counties that have a Certified Housing Element and a 2017 or 2018 Annual Progress Report submitted to HCD.

**Funding**

- **Allocation.** Half of year 1 funding ($123 million) will be allocated for financial / technical assistance to update planning documents to streamline housing production.
**Funding**

- **Distribution.** $123 million will be distributed on an “over the counter” non-competitive basis to eligible jurisdictions.

  Additional funds may be available for larger projects on a competitive basis later in 2019.

- **Amount.** Minimum grant is $25,000; maximum grant based on population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>&lt; 60K</th>
<th>60 – 200K</th>
<th>&gt; 200K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant $</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding**

- **Payment.** Funds dispensed by HCD on a reimbursement basis; no advanced payment.

- **Invoices.** Submit to HCD on a quarterly basis with supporting documentation. Up to 10% may be withheld until grant terms fulfilled.

- **Non-performance.** Implementation and adoption by June 30, 2022 is key; repayment of funds may be required if the efforts are not implemented and/or adopted.
Timing

- **NOFA.** Application released March 29, 2019.
  http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/planning-grants.shtml

- **Submission.** Applications can be submitted April 1 to November 30, 2019.

- **Awards.** Grants will be announced in batches as reviewed and approved by HCD.

- **Expenditure deadline.** All funds must be spent by June 30, 2022.

---

Eligible Applicants

- Eligible applicants are incorporated cities/towns and counties

- **Partners.** Applicants can partner via legally binding agreements with other local entities, such as:
  - Regional government
  - Housing authority
  - Special district
  - School district
  - Community-based organization
  - Governing body of an Indian Reservation or Rancheria
Eligible Applicants

- **Group applications**
  - Each applicant must meet eligibility criteria
  - Each applicant must submit their own form (not one single group application), that includes:
    - Requests for activities to be done solely by the individual jurisdiction
    - Requests for activities to be done as part of a group effort (but specific to the individual jurisdiction)
    - Legally binding agreement signed by all group applicants and partners
  - Funds will not be distributed until all applications submitted
  - Group applications won’t get additional funds beyond allotted amounts for individual jurisdictions

Eligible Activities

- **Eligible activities include planning projects that will directly enhance housing production**
  - Targeted general plan updates
  - Community plans and specific plans
  - Zoning updates, particularly by-right zoning for housing
  - Objective design standards
  - Accessory dwelling unit regulations
  - Environmental analyses that eliminate the need for project-specific review
  - Process updates to improve and expedite local permitting
  - *Other… if they will directly enhance housing production*
Priority Policy Areas

- Priority Policy Areas (eligible high impact activities that will be highly encouraged)
  - Rezone to permit by-right
  - Objective design and development standards
  - Specific plans or form based codes coupled with CEQA streamlining
  - Accessory dwelling units or other innovative building strategies
  - Expedited processing
  - Innovative housing finance, fees, or infrastructure strategies

Eligible Activities

- Eligible expenditures
  - Staff time related to proposed activity
  - Consultants
  - Reimbursable items (when related to eligible activity)
  - Administrative costs capped at 5%

- Project Description
  - Address four main areas: background, scope description, plans/steps to adoption and implementation and anticipated outcomes.
  - Quantify the outcomes, such as projected increases in the number of housing units created; increases in densities; projections of time saved due to expediting review processes; projected affordability levels, etc.
Assistance

- **Technical Assistance Team.** Along with HCD, a consultant team has been contracted to assist with:
  - SB 2 planning grant application assistance
  - Grant writing (limited)
  - Review of ideas and draft applications
  - Identification of eligible activities
  - Housing element compliance
  - Annual progress reports

- **HCD Website for Sample Applications and FAQs:** [http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/planning-grants.shtml](http://www.hcd.ca.gov/grants-funding/active-funding/planning-grants.shtml)

Current Status

- **42 Applications Received**
  - 9 grants awarded thus far totaling $2.3 million
- **Types of Activities**
  - Objective Development Standards
  - Environmental Documents
  - Housing-related Ordinances
  - Rezoning to allow by-right housing, higher density and mixed use
  - Update permit processing software and public interface
  - Complete Overlay Zones and Specific Plans
Local Liaisons
Jonathan Nettler, PlaceWorks
jnettler@placeworks.com

Colin Drukker, PlaceWorks
cdrukker@placeworks.com

Overall Project Manager
Jennifer Gastelum, PlaceWorks
jgastelum@placeworks.com

Additional policy experts are also available as needed.

Questions?
To: Community
   Economic & Human Development Committee (CEHD)
   Regional Council (RC)
From: Kome Ajise, Executive Director, AJISE@scag.ca.gov
Subject: Regional Housing Need Determination from HCD

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Will be provided under a separate cover along with staff analysis.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 2: Advance Southern California’s policy interests and planning priorities through regional, statewide, and national engagement and advocacy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
SCAG has received its regional housing needs determination from the state. Staff will provide an update and recommended action prior to the meeting.

BACKGROUND:
On August 22, 2019, the state Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) transmitted their Regional Housing Need determination of 1,344,740 units for the SCAG region. This number reflects the number of housing units that local jurisdictions in the region must plan for during the 8.25-year period from June 30, 2021 to October 15, 2029 and is split across four income categories:

- Very Low: 350,998
- Low: 206,338
- Moderate: 225,152
- Above Moderate: 562,252

Since Spring 2019, SCAG staff, under consultation from SCAG’s RHNA Subcommittee, have outlined a framework to guide the development of the consultation process between SCAG and HCD which included the following goals:

- Follow the 2020 Connect SoCal RTP/SCS Integrated Growth Forecasting process, procedure,
methodology, and results including bottom-up local review and input

- Provide a robust analysis of housing needs in the SCAG region using the best available data and technical methodology and meet the requirements of the law
- Research the appropriate factors and causes associated with “existing housing needs”
- Develop policy responses for a long-term robust, stable supply of sites and zoning for housing construction

Per state statute, SCAG has 30 days after receipt of the RHNA determination to accept or to file an objection. An objection would be based on failure of HCD to use a population projection consistent with statute or an unreasonable application of the methodology and assumptions outlined in statute. HCD would be required to make a final written determination within 45 days after receiving an objection.

SCAG staff’s recommendation and analysis will be provided as a supplemental report prior to the meeting.

ATTACHMENT(S):
1. Letter from HCD containing SCAG’s 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Determination, dated August 22, 2019
August 22, 2019

Kome Ajise, Executive Director
Southern California Association of Governments
900 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Dear Executive Director Ajise:

RE: Regional Housing Need Determination

This letter provides the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) its determination of the Regional Housing Need Determination. Pursuant to Government Code (Gov. Code) section 65584.01, the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) is required to provide the determination of SCAG’s existing and projected housing need.

In assessing SCAG’s regional housing need, HCD and SCAG staff completed an extensive consultation process starting in March 2017 through August 2019 covering the methodology, data sources, and timeline. HCD also consulted with Walter Schwarm of the California Department of Finance (DOF) Demographic Research Unit.

Attachment 1 displays the minimum regional housing need determination of 1,344,740 total units among four income categories for SCAG to distribute among its local governments. Attachment 2 explains the methodology applied pursuant to Gov. Code section 65584.01.

As you know, SCAG is responsible for adopting a RHNA allocation methodology for the projection period beginning June 30, 2021 and ending October 15, 2029. Pursuant to Gov. Code section 65584(d), SCAG’s RHNA allocation methodology must further the following objectives:

(1) Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in each jurisdiction receiving an allocation of units for low- and very low income households.
(2) Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, the encouragement of efficient development patterns, and the achievement of the region’s greenhouse gas reductions targets provided by the State Air Resources Board pursuant to Section 65080.
(3) Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing, including an improved balance between the number of low-wage jobs and the number of housing units affordable to low-wage workers in each jurisdiction.
(4) Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent American Community Survey.

(5) Affirmatively furthering fair housing.

Pursuant to Gov. Code section 65584.04(e), to the extent data is available, SCAG shall include the factors listed in Gov. Code section 65584.04(e)(1-12) to develop its RHNA allocation methodology, and pursuant to Gov. Code section 65584.04(f), SCAG must explain in writing how each of these factors was incorporated into the RHNA allocation methodology and how the methodology furthers the statutory objectives described above. Pursuant to Government Code section 65584.04(h), SCAG must consult with HCD and submit its draft allocation methodology to HCD for review.

HCD appreciates the active role of SCAG staff in providing data and input throughout the consultation period. Pursuant to Government Code section 65584.01(c)(1), HCD may accept or reject the information provided by the council of governments or modify its own assumptions based on this information.

The Department especially thanks Ping Chang, Ma’Ayn Johnson, Kevin Kane, and Sarah Jepson. The Department looks forward to its continued partnership with SCAG and its member jurisdictions and assisting SCAG in its planning efforts to accommodate the region’s share of housing need.

If HCD can provide any additional assistance, or if you, or your staff, have any questions, please contact Megan Kirkeby, Assistant Deputy Director for Fair Housing, at megan.kirkeby@hcd.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Megan Kirkeby
Assistant Deputy Director for Fair Housing
### HCD REGIONAL HOUSING NEED DETERMINATION

**SCAG: June 30, 2021 – October 15, 2029 (8.3 years)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Housing Unit Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very-Low*</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>350,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>206,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>225,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above-Moderate</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>562,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td><strong>1,344,740</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Extremely-Low 14.5% Included in Very-Low Category

**Notes:**

*Income Distribution:* Income categories are prescribed by California Health and Safety Code (Section 50093, et.seq.). Percents are derived based on ACS reported household income brackets and regional median income, then adjusted based on the percent of cost-burdened households in the region compared with the percent of cost burdened households nationally.
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ATTACHMENT 2

HCD REGIONAL HOUSING NEED DETERMINATION
SCAG: June 30, 2021 – October 15, 2029 (8.3 years)

Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Formation Groups</th>
<th>HCD Adjusted DOF Projected HH Population</th>
<th>DOF HH Formation Rates</th>
<th>HCD Adjusted DOF Projected Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>under 15 years</td>
<td>20,079,930</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6,801,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 24 years</td>
<td>3,292,955</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34 years</td>
<td>2,735,490</td>
<td>6.45%</td>
<td>176,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44 years</td>
<td>2,526,620</td>
<td>32.54%</td>
<td>822,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54 years</td>
<td>2,460,805</td>
<td>47.16%</td>
<td>1,180,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64 years</td>
<td>2,502,190</td>
<td>50.82%</td>
<td>1,219,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 74 years</td>
<td>2,399,180</td>
<td>52.54%</td>
<td>1,176,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 – 84 years</td>
<td>1,379,335</td>
<td>57.96%</td>
<td>799,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85+</td>
<td>544,750</td>
<td>62.43%</td>
<td>340,070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Projected Households (Occupied Unit Stock) 6,801,760
5. + Vacancy Adjustment (2.63%) 178,896
6. + Overcrowding Adjustment (6.76%) 459,917
7. + Replacement Adjustment (.50%) 34,010
8. - Occupied Units (HHs) estimated (June 30, 2021) -6,250,261
9. + Cost Burden Adjustment (Lower Income: 10.63%, Moderate and Above Moderate Income: 9.28%) 120,418

6th Cycle Regional Housing Need Assessment (RHNA) 1,344,740

Explanation and Data Sources

1-4. Population, Group Quarters, Household Population, & Projected Households: Pursuant to Government Code Section 65584.01, projections were extrapolated from Department of Finance (DOF) projections. Population reflects total persons. Group Quarter Population reflects persons in a dormitory, group home, institution, military, etc. that do not require residential housing. Household Population reflects persons requiring residential housing. Projected Households reflect the propensity of persons, by age-groups, to form households at different rates based on Census trends.

5. Vacancy Adjustment: HCD applies a vacancy adjustment based on the difference between a standard 5% vacancy rate and the region's current "for rent and sale" vacancy percentage to provide healthy market vacancies to facilitate housing availability and resident mobility. The adjustment is the difference between standard 5% and region’s current vacancy rate (2.37%) based on the 2013-2017 5-year American Community Survey (ACS) data. For SCAG that difference is 2.63%.

6. Overcrowding Adjustment: In region’s where overcrowding is greater than the U.S overcrowding rate of 3.35%, HCD applies an adjustment based on the amount the region’s overcrowding rate (10.11%) exceeds the U.S. overcrowding rate (3.35%) based on the 2013-2017 5-year ACS data. For SCAG that difference is 6.76.

Continued on next page
7. Replacement Adjustment: HCD applies a replacement adjustment between .5% & 5% to total housing stock based on the current 10-year average of demolitions in the region’s local government annual reports to Department of Finance (DOF). For SCAG, the 10-year average is .14%, and SCAG’s consultation package provided additional data on this input indicating it may be closer to .41%; in either data source the estimate is below the minimum replacement adjustment so the minimum adjustment factor of .5% is applied.

8. Occupied Units: Reflects DOF’s estimate of occupied units at the start of the projection period (June 30, 2021).

9. Cost Burden Adjustment: HCD applies an adjustment to the projected need by comparing the difference in cost-burden by income group for the region to the cost-burden by income group for the nation. The very-low and low income RHNA is increased by the percent difference (70.83%-60.20%=10.63%) between the region and the national average cost burden rate for households earning 80% of area median income and below, then this difference is applied to very low- and low-income RHNA proportionate to the share of the population these groups currently represent. The moderate and above-moderate income RHNA is increased by the percent difference (20.48%-11.20%=9.28%) between the region and the national average cost burden rate for households earning above 80% Area Median Income, then this difference is applied to moderate and above moderate income RHNA proportionate to the share of the population these groups currently represent. Data is from 2011-2015 Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS).
The following minutes are a summary of actions taken by the CEHD Committee. A digital recording of the actual meeting is available for listening in SCAG’s office.

The CEHD Committee met at SCAG, 900 Wilshire Blvd., 17th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90017. The meeting was called to order by Chair Peggy Huang. A quorum was present.
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<td>Holtville</td>
<td>ICTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jan Pye</td>
<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td>CVAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Tri Ta</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>District 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mark Waronek</td>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>SBCCOG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Peggy Huang, called the meeting to order at 11:15 a.m. and asked Councilmember Jorge Marquez, City of Covina, District 33 to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

## PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Public comments were received from Connor Finney, Paavo Monkkonen, UCLA; Richard Bourne, AHLA; Hydee Feldstein, Alex Contreras, CA YIMBY; Sandy Genis, Costa Mesa City Council; and Kendrick Rustad, Candidate for City of Los Angeles Council District 14 in 2020. Each expressed their concerns related to agenda item No. 1: Proposed RHNA Methodology.

Joann Africa, Chief Counsel, read into the record the names of individuals who submitted comment letters prior to today’s meeting, regarding the Proposed RHNA Methodology agenda item: Mr. Paavo Monkkonen, UCLA, and Mayor John Mirisch, City of Beverly Hills.
REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEM/S

There were no reprioritization of the agenda.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEM

1. Proposed RHNA Methodology

Ma’Ayn Johnson, SCAG staff, provided a presentation on SCAG’s development of the proposed RHNA methodology. She explained that SCAG is required to develop a proposed RHNA methodology to distribute existing and projected housing need for the 6th cycle RHNA for each jurisdiction. She outlined the five main RHNA objectives and three potential options to determine each jurisdiction’s draft RHNA allocation as a share of the regional determination provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

Ms. Johnson referred to the full presentation included in the agenda packet and noted that today’s recommendation is for the CEHD to recommend approval to the Regional Council to release the propose RHNA methodology options for public comments through September 3, 2019.

Ms. Johnson noted that after the anticipated Regional Council action today, the Committee may refer to the official notice of the public hearing dates, and the full methodology appendix, (that contain a full set of various underlying data and assumptions to support the proposed methodology), at: www.scag.ca.gov/rhna. SCAG staff also developed a tool to provide a general estimate a jurisdiction’s draft RHNA allocation based on the three potential options, which is posted on the RHNA webpage. She noted that written comments will be accepted through September 3, 2019.

Discussion ensued. There was support from several CEHD members for the option which included local inputs. Staff responded on the comments and questions expressed by the Councilmembers, including concerns on the proposed social equity adjustments, and what the consequences could be for those cities who are in non-compliance of the housing element.

Ms. Johnson noted that communication regarding the actual consequences would be outlined and distributed to the Committee before the final deadline. Additionally, Ms. Johnson noted that staff would be reviewing every comment and hope to make a consensus in order to find a middle ground.

Chair Huang concluded discussions and reminded everyone to participate and attend future RHNA Subcommittee meetings so that they are part of the process.

The CEHD thanked staff for their efforts and dedication to the Proposed RHNA Methodology process.
A MOTION was made (Richardson) to approve staff’s recommendation: As recommended by the RHNA Subcommittee, that the CEHD Committee recommend approval to the Regional Council the proposed RHNA methodology options for public comment and review. Motion was SECONDED (Shapiro) and passed by the following votes:

FOR: Avila, Bernal, Berry, Betts, Bucknum, De Ruse, Espinoza, Finlay, Hodge, Holmgren Huang, Hupp, Iglesias, Jahn, Joe, Kelly, Leano, Marquez, Marshall, Meister, Miranda, Mirisch, Mulvihill, Nagel, Ramirez, Richardson, Rodriguez, Santa Ines, Semeta, Shapiro, Shevlin, Tessari and Zerunyan (33).

AGAINST: None (0).

ABSTAIN: None (0).

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Item

2. Minutes of the CEHD Committee Meeting – June 6, 2019

Receive & File

3. Green Region Initiative – Sustainability Map Update

A MOTION was made (Richardson) to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion was SECONDED (Marquez) and passed by the following votes:

FOR: Avila, Berry, Bucknum, De Ruse, Espinoza, Finlay, Hodge, Holmgren Huang, Hupp, Iglesias, Jahn, Joe, Kelly, Leano, Marquez, Marshall, Meister, Miranda, Mirisch, Mulvihill, Ramirez, Richardson, Rodriguez, Santa Ines, Semeta, Shapiro, Shevlin, Tessari and Zerunyan (30).

AGAINST: None (0).

ABSTAIN: Bernal, Betts and Nagel (3) (Agenda Item No. 2, Minutes of the June 6, 2019 Meeting).

CHAIR’S REPORT

Due to time constraints, the Chair’s Report was not heard.
STAFF REPORT

There was no Staff Report given.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Huang welcomed new CEHD member Russell Betts from the City of Desert Hot Springs and new CEHD member, Maria Bernal, from the City of South Gate/GCCOG.

Chair Huang announced that the August and September RHNA Subcommittee meetings are postponed and will be announced when the date is finalized.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chair Huang adjourned the CEHD Committee meeting at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Carmen Summers
Community, Economic and Human Development Committee Clerk

[MINUTES ARE UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE CEHD COMMITTEE]
## CEHD Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBERS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>JAN (starts)</th>
<th>FEB</th>
<th>MAR</th>
<th>APR</th>
<th>MAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUG</th>
<th>SEPT</th>
<th>OCT</th>
<th>NOV</th>
<th>DEC</th>
<th>Total Mngs Attended To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Al</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>GCCDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avila, David</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>SCSCTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beanen, Margaret</td>
<td>Coachella</td>
<td>District 06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benad, Maria</td>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>GCCDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry, Stacie</td>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>District 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betts, Russell</td>
<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxton, Wendy</td>
<td>Mission Viejo</td>
<td>District 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantillo, Juan</td>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>North LA County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll, Michael, C.</td>
<td>Irving</td>
<td>District 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelBunte, Steve</td>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td>District 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espinoza, Rosa</td>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>SCSCTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frazier, Margaret</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>District 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gharpetian, Vartan</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesibeath, Michelle, Julie</td>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>SCSCTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodges, Bill</td>
<td>Calexico</td>
<td>ITC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofmayer, Tim</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>District 47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogy, Peggy, Chair</td>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>TCA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopp, Cecilia</td>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>GCCDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignacio, Cecilia</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>District 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, Bill</td>
<td>Big Bear Lake</td>
<td>District 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John, Robert</td>
<td>Sa. Pasadene</td>
<td>WSSCTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Kathleen</td>
<td>Palm Desert</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Jeff</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>SSWCCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magana, Matanla</td>
<td>Perris</td>
<td>District 69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantiques, Inge</td>
<td>Covina</td>
<td>District 33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, Ann</td>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>GCCDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meikle, Lauren</td>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>WSSCCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metz, Jeff</td>
<td>Victorville</td>
<td>SCSCTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miotto, John</td>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td>President's Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mukhtij, James</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>President's Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagel, Steve</td>
<td>Mountain Valley</td>
<td>District 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Neil, Trevor</td>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>District 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paget, Ed</td>
<td>Needles</td>
<td>SCSCTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posey, Michael</td>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>GCCDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predmore, Jim</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pye, Jim</td>
<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td>CVAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramirez, Rita</td>
<td>Victorville</td>
<td>District 60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson, Rex</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>District 29</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodriguez, Paul</td>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>President's Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana, Sunny</td>
<td>Balfour</td>
<td>District 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrano, Lynn</td>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>District 64</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapiro, David</td>
<td>Calabasas</td>
<td>LMCSCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheerin, Betsy</td>
<td>Manroota</td>
<td>SSWCCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tse, Tri</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>District 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tse, Joseph</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>WSSCCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wason, Mark</td>
<td>Locanda</td>
<td>SSWCCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarunyan, Franki</td>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>SSWCCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Receive and File

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
September is California’s Pedestrian Safety Month, dedicated to educating drivers and pedestrians about safe roadway habits and reducing the number of pedestrians killed and injured on California roadways. Staff is conducting and promoting safety activities throughout September to support Pedestrian Safety Month and promote available resources for use during “Walktober,” or Walking October, in an effort to reduce pedestrian fatalities and injuries. Example safety resources will be showcased at the SCAG offices during the September regional council meeting.

BACKGROUND:
The SCAG region, like California and the nation as a whole, experienced a period of annual declines in traffic-related fatalities and serious injuries until 2012 when they began to steadily rise. Although the region has made some progress on safety, 1,500 people are killed, 5,200 are seriously injured and 136,000 are injured in traffic collisions on average each year. About 73 percent of those killed since 2001 were in vehicles or on motorcycles, while the remaining 27 percent were walking or bicycling (disproportionate to their mode share, 12 percent of all daily trips are walking or biking trips). The numbers of both pedestrians and motorcyclists killed are the highest they have been for more than a decade. These collisions are happening in every city across the region.

To heighten awareness of the region’s transportation safety challenges and opportunities, and to
reduce collisions resulting in serious injuries or fatalities, SCAG launched the Go Human campaign in 2015. Go Human is an award winning community outreach and advertising campaign with the goals of reducing traffic collisions and encouraging people to walk and bike more in the SCAG region. Go Human is a collaboration between SCAG and the County Transportation Commissions and Public Health Departments in the region. The campaign provides advertising and educational resources to partners and implements temporary safety demonstration projects to showcase innovative transportation designs and help cities re-envision their streets as safer, more accessible places for walking and biking.

This item is being presented to inform SCAG Policy Members that September is Pedestrian Safety Month and to highlight resources available for use in both September and October, or “Walktober” – National Walking Month. Both months highlight the increased need for safety strategies to reduce fatalities and serious injuries among pedestrians. Resources have been made with through a grant provided by the California Office of Traffic Safety, through the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Resources include opportunities for co-branding advertisements; SCAG’s Go Human Challenge, which consists of educational, interactive programming modules; and temporary safety demonstration treatments, through SCAG’s Safety Kit of Parts. The Kit includes five different design treatments that partner jurisdictions can borrow. All resources are available for use during Pedestrian Safety Month, “Walktober”, and thereafter. Example materials will be showcased on site at the SCAG offices during the Regional Council meeting.

Visit www.GoHumanSoCal.org to learn more about available safety resources.

FISCAL IMPACT:
All costs associated with this item are included in the FY 2019-20 Overall Work Program (OWP) under project number 225-3564.13 and funded by a Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Program Grant from the California Office of Traffic Safety.
RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Receive and File

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the following Strategic Plan Goal 1: Produce innovative solutions that improve the quality of life for Southern Californians.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Increasing housing production in the SCAG region to address the housing crisis is a core priority for President Bill Jahn and SCAG’s Executive Officers. During the July 2019 SCAG Executive Administration Committee Retreat, the Board Officers and Committee Members discussed SCAG’s role in fostering housing development, beyond administering the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process. Committee members highlighted opportunities for SCAG to play a greater leadership role on housing issues and provided direction to staff on policy priorities to consider in developing a robust housing program.

This report provides background on housing planning at SCAG and an update on staff actions to advance ideas discussed during the EAC Retreat, including the process for preparing a proposal and delivering programs supported by Assembly Bill 101.

BACKGROUND:

EAC Retreat: Policy Discussion Summary
During the July 2019 SCAG Executive Administration Committee Retreat, the Board Officers and Committee Members discussed SCAG’s role in fostering housing development, beyond administering the RHNA process. The conversation was facilitated by housing experts, Steve PonTell and Randall Lewis. PonTell is Chief Executive Officer and President of National CORE, one of...
the nation’s largest non-profit affordable housing developers. Lewis is an Executive Vice President at the Lewis Group of Companies, a privately held real estate development company focused on the development of master planned communities. Their presentation provided an overview of segments within the housing market and some of the challenges for-profit and non-profit developers face in producing new units. The Committee discussed the importance of ensuring elected officials and planning commissions are educated about the market and some of the unintended consequences of policy decisions. Challenges posed by state regulation including CEQA and the financial structure of cities, which has resulted in the fiscalization of land use and an oversupply of retail, were also discussed. Committee members were asked to provide input on SCAG’s role in addressing the barriers to housing production. Areas of interest included working with the state to bring back redevelopment funds and enhance other financing mechanism; providing cities with resources to engage their residents around the type of housing they can support; convening public-private stakeholders to foster collaborative solutions; developing a toolbox of pro-housing policies for local jurisdictions; and addressing abuses of CEQA through legislative reform. SCAG staff was directed to summarize the conversation and come back to the Regional Council with next steps including a work program.

SCAG’s Housing Program
The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) is mandated by State Housing Law as part of the periodic process of updating local housing elements of the General Plan. The RHNA quantifies the need for housing within each jurisdiction during specified planning periods. SCAG is in the process of developing the 6th cycle RHNA allocation plan which will cover the planning period October 2021 through October 2029. It is planned for adoption by SCAG in October 2020. The RHNA does not produce housing, but rather allows communities to anticipate growth, so that collectively the region and subregion can grow in ways that enhance quality of life, improve access to jobs, promotes transportation mobility, and addresses social equity, fair share housing needs. Historically, SCAG has had limited resources to support work on RHNA and housing issues. However, AB 101 recognized the important role regions can play in addressing the housing crisis, beyond RHNA, and established a new funding program for regional councils of governments.

AB 101
AB 101 is the comprehensive budget trailer bill dealing with housing production and homeless initiatives. The legislation includes updates to farmworker housing and the density bonus law, and budget allocations for the Infill Infrastructure Program, Low Income Housing Tax Credit program, and to cities/counties/continuums of care for homelessness prevention programs, and a variety of other programs. AB 101 also establishes the Local Government Planning Support Grants Program administered by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for the purpose of providing regions with one-time funding. The bill allocates $250 million to HCD for councils of governments and jurisdictions to be used for technical assistance, the preparation and adoption of planning documents, process improvements to accelerate housing production and to
facilitate the compliance with the 6th cycle of RHNA. SCAG is expected to be eligible for up to $50 million of these dollars to administer our RHNA and provide other planning services to our cities and counties. SCAG must put together an application package to HCD and apply for these funds. HCD is anticipated to produce guidelines for the application process over the next six months positioning SCAG to apply for funding in Spring 2020. Pending HCD approval, the proposed programs and grant resources would be incorporated into SCAG’s Fiscal Year 2020-2021 Overall Work Program.

**FY 20 Work Program**

With AB 101 resources, SCAG has the opportunity to foster housing production and preservation through regional planning and by providing technical and financial assistance to subregions and cities for housing and infrastructure planning activities and process improvements. Staff will pursue activities in the current fiscal year to establish the foundation for a robust housing program, including preparing a funding proposal to be provided to HCD no later than January 31, 2021 per state law. To undertake this work, SCAG needs to enhance internal capacity and procure, through staff or consultants, additional expertise in housing planning. These resources will be directed toward helping SCAG leadership better understand the housing landscape and opportunities to align new resources to address gaps. In the short-term, staff is also leveraging Sustainable Communities Program partnerships and Housing Monitoring funds programmed through SB 1 to conduct research and case-studies for aligning housing planning with the implementation of Connect SoCal by promoting development priority growth areas.

Staff will provide ongoing updates on this work with the ultimate goal of returning to the Regional Council in Spring 2020 with a program proposal and preliminary expenditure plan for AB 101 resources starting in July 1, 2020, pending HCD approval.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Funding for staff work is included in FY 19-20 Overall Work Program: 810.0120.16
RECOMMENDED CEHD ACTION:
For Information Only – No Action Required

RECOMMENDED EEC AND TC ACTION:
Receive and File

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Connect SoCal will coordinate future transportation investments with a regional development pattern that can achieve the ambitious greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target set forth by the California Air Resource Board (ARB) - a 19 percent reduction in per capita GHG emissions by 2035 from 2005 levels. One of Connect SoCal’s approaches in addressing regional challenges is identifying employment rich Job Centers as targets for future employment as well as household growth, i.e., encouraging people to live where current and future jobs are. To maximize the effectiveness of this strategy, SCAG developed a suite of land use and transportation measures that promote increased connectivity between future employment opportunities and residential growth, lessen commute distances and transportation cost burdens, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Ultimately, Connect SoCal’s preferred scenario will illustrate how Southern California can achieve certain regional outcomes and goals if strategies for Job Centers are embraced and implemented by local jurisdictions and transportation partners.

BACKGROUND:
The size and diversity of the SCAG region precludes the use of a “one size fits all” approach to achieving sustainability outcomes. Accordingly, Connect SoCal will incorporate a range of best practices for increasing transportation choices; reducing dependence on personal automobiles;
encouraging growth in walkable, mixed-use communities with ready access to transit infrastructure and employment opportunities; and further improving air quality.

A longstanding concern in the region is the imbalance between the location of employment and housing—especially affordable housing. While there are some policy mechanisms to promote future household growth at the jurisdictional-level, promoting both job growth and household growth together has been a challenge. Accordingly, Connect SoCal features a new approach which can also encourage regional economic prosperity and global competitiveness.

Job Centers, which have been identified in all six counties in the SCAG region through a data driven methodology (Kane, Hipp, and Kim 2018), represent areas with significantly higher employment density than their surrounding areas. SCAG applied this methodology and identified over 70 Job Centers throughout the region (See Attachment 1). Identified Job Centers represent local employment peaks rather than simply areas in the region with the most jobs, with many resembling “suburban downtowns.” Importantly, Job Centers are present in over 60 percent of the region’s 197 local jurisdictions and characterize locations where regional strategies that support economic prosperity can be deployed in catalytic ways. Specifically, these areas have the built-in advantage of existing employment density; when future growth is concentrated in Job Centers, the length of vehicle trips for residents will likely be reduced.

Connect SoCal emphasizes Job Centers for four key strategies:

1.) **Focused Growth:** Connect SoCal will include a strategy to focus future employment and household growth into over 90% of the region’s Job Centers (specifically those with a high potential for travel demand benefits were they to experience additional growth). Allocation of additional growth into job centers followed two key principles: (a) it did not change a local jurisdiction’s local input totals for household and population growth, and (b) each jurisdiction’s general plan densities were respected.

2.) **Co-working Spaces:** During 2019, SCAG undertook survey research of the users of increasingly popular shared workspaces, referred to as “co-working” sites. Well-known examples include WeWork, Regus, and DeskPass. Survey results indicated that a small but important subset of co-working site users substitute long-distance single-occupant vehicle commutes to fixed offices by using co-working spaces closer to their homes. By identifying residential areas near job centers in which likely co-work space users live, Connect SoCal proposes a strategy of working with local partners to identify sites, supporting, and developing co-working spaces in over 50% of Job Centers. While targeting co-working areas resembles previous efforts at so-called “telework centers,” this strategy takes advantage of the rapidly increasing market demand for chic, urbane spaces where predominantly information technology and consulting employees enjoy working. This strategy has the
added benefit of linking economic opportunities usually found in the densest urban cores to residents of more remote areas.

3.) **Increased Average Vehicle Ridership (AVR):** Recent efforts focus on expanding Travel Demand Management (TDM), including SCAG’s 2018 TDM strategic plan. Additionally in 2018, AB 2548 authorized the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (“Metro”) to require employers with 50 or more workers to offer employee commute benefits, including transit passes and vanpool charges. This law extended existing TDM requirements to a large portion of the region that had previously only applied to employers of 250 workers or more. Connect SoCal will add an additional layer of TDM investment in approximately 30% of Job Centers that are amongst the most dense in the region and implement a performance goal of 1.5 average riders per vehicle. This intensification may also involve the development of additional local TDM ordinances and Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) beyond the handful that currently exist. As an additional mechanism to achieve higher AVR to reduce single-occupant vehicles, incentivize carpooling, and increase transit use (where available), parking pricing would be implemented in this Job Center subset.

4.) **Parking Strategy:** Research on parking indicates that employees with free parking are much more likely to drive to work alone than those who are charged for parking on a daily basis. The provision of free parking to employees represents a cost to employers in the maintenance of existing facilities. Moreover, for new construction the median cost for a new parking structure is $19,700 per space and $59.06 per square foot (Cudney, 2017). Thus “free” parking actually represents a substantial cost for businesses and results in higher vehicles miles traveled for employees. Accordingly, if parking is suitably priced in select Job Centers, communities would experience economic benefits from the reduced costs to businesses, as well as an increase in the use of carpool and transit modes.


**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Costs for this work are included in SCAG’s current Overall Work Program (OWP) in projects 280-483.01 - Future Communities Study and 070-2665.01 - Scenario Planning and Modeling.

---

1. Connect SoCal Job Center Potential Locations
Connect SoCal Job Centers Strategy

Goals

Maximize Infrastructure

Diverse Types of Housing

Robust Economy

Land Conservation

Improved Air Quality

Disaster Resiliency

Climate Change Adaptation

Community

Safe & Healthy Environment

Mobility Choices
Core Regional Strategies

Regional Growth: Priority Growth/Conservation Areas

- Housing Opportunity
- Smart Communities/Virtual Access
- Multi-Modal Infrastructure Investments
- New System Management
- Resilience and System Preservation
- Regional Clean Technology Vision

Relationship between employment and housing is challenging

- Jobs-housing balance
- Jobs-housing fit
- Wage differentials
- Limited mechanisms to plan land use at the regional level, especially non-housing

[Graph showing Connect SoCal Growth Forecast, SCAG Region, 2016-2045 (Thousands) for Household, Population, Employment]

Illustration of Jobs/Housing Balance, UCI Metropolitan Futures initiative
Why Focus On Job Centers?

- Leverages existing advantages
- Density & infrastructure
- One person’s job is another person’s travel destination — it’s not just about the work commute

What Is a Job center?

- Key principle: areas significantly denser than surroundings
- Different than absolute job peaks
- New statistical methodology builds on recent research*
- Systematic approach → equality across a diverse region

Where are the proposed job centers in the SCAG region?

- 72 total centers
- 0.8% of land area
- Over 1/3 of region’s jobs
- Largest: Downtown LA, Westside (~¼ million jobs/each)
- Smallest: Holtville (1,800 jobs)
- Method ensures they’re fairly evenly spaced
- Some places which feel job rich may not be denser than their surroundings

Connect SoCal’s Job Center-related strategies

1. Focused growth
2. Co-working spaces
3. Increased Average Vehicle Ridership (AVR)
4. Parking strategy
Strategy 1: Focusing Growth in Job Centers

- More household and employment growth is placed in job centers.
- Principles for allocating growth:
  - Local input growth totals at the jurisdiction-level were not changed.
  - Local input growth totals at the small area/Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ)-level were changed.
  - Growth does not exceed any local jurisdiction’s general plan density.

- Comparison of annual growth rates in proposed job centers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Household Growth</th>
<th>Employment Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008–2016</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016–2045, Local Input Scenario</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016–2045, Preferred Plan Scenario</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-working spaces

SCAG survey of 273 users of co-working spaces in the region. They tend to be:
- Younger
- Overrepresented in IT and consulting
- Generally work full-time
- Over 3/4 are not freelancers or entrepreneurs
- 32% would’ve gone to the office instead
  - Office trips tend to be further
Are job centers ripe for co-working sites?

- Co-work spaces are businesses responding to market demand
- Could their location patterns be modified to maximize trip reduction benefits?

Prioritize people and place for maximum benefit

Potential Co-work users:

1. Long-distance commuters (> 50 miles one way?)
2. Work in industries ripe for co-working
3. Live in, or very close to job centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Center Name</th>
<th>Potential Co-work Users</th>
<th>Average One-Way Commute Distance (of commutes &gt; 50 mi.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>71.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Irvine-Spectrum</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>68.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ONT-Rancho</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>66.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>69.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moreno Valley</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>61.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>68.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>65.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>San Clemente</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>67.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Strategy 3: Focus on Average Vehicle Ridership (AVR)**

- Efforts to increase Travel Demand Management (TDM)
  - Update of SCAG TDM Toolbox
  - Currently, most comprehensive regional TDM only applies to worksites of 250+ (AQMD Rule 2202)
  - LA Metro now authorized to require commute benefits to worksites of 50-249 (AB 2548)

- Proposed additional TDM investment in 1/3 of proposed job centers
  - Performance goal: 1.5 riders per vehicle
  - Focus on densest centers most likely to achieve target
  - May involve developing more local Transportation Management Associations (TMAs)

**Strategy 4: Parking Pricing**

- Evaluate versus the current cost of free parking in a new parking structure:
  - National median: $19,700/space*
  - Los Angeles: $22,334/space*
  - Higher VMT

- Proposed parking pricing strategy in densest proposed job centers
  - Percentage-based increase in parking cost
  - Densest centers only
  - Places where alternative modes generally more available

Thank you

Kevin Kane
kane@scag.ca.gov
(213) 236-1828
www.scag.ca.gov