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Discussion Items
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2. SCAG’s RHNA Regional Determination Consultation Package
   Kevin Kane, Ph.D.  Attachment

3. Update on the Bottom –Up Local Input and Envisioning Process
   Kimberly Clark  Attachment

   Kimberly Clark
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Agenda Item 1
At the July 6, 2017 CEHD meeting, staff presented a preliminary forecast of the region’s employment, population, and household growth for the 2020 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal) to be used for small area disaggregation and as a starting point for the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process. In addition to a baseline forecast for 2045, low and high growth forecasts were also presented.

Between October 2017 and January 2019, 81% of 197 jurisdictions provided input on SCAG’s preliminary growth forecasts. The figures in the attached presentation provide the regional totals of local input employment, population, and household figures alongside the low, baseline, and high series from the preliminary forecast, referred to herein as the local input forecast. Key findings from staff’s comparison of the local input forecast versus the preliminary forecast include:

1) The 2045 local input forecast figures for employment, population, and households are all within the preliminary forecast’s range;

2) The local input forecast projects slightly higher employment growth than the preliminary forecast’s baseline, but the value is below the “high” scenario established by the preliminary forecast;

3) The local input forecast projects slightly lower population and household growth than the preliminary forecast’s baseline, but these values are above the “low” scenario established by the preliminary forecast.

In addition to checking whether the local input forecast is within the range established by the preliminary forecast, staff conducted two additional checks to judge whether the forecast can be considered technically sound. First, the local input forecast generates a 2045 regional unemployment rate of 4.7% which is reasonable based on past trends. Second, the 2045 population to household ratio of 2.9 generated by the local input forecast is consistent with the preliminary growth forecast and the expectation for future household size in the region.
### Background

- **July 6, 2017:** Staff presented a draft preliminary range of growth forecasts for 2020 RTP/SCS – Connect SoCal at the CEHD meeting.

- **October 2017 – January 31 2019:** Staff collected local input on the preliminary growth forecasts.

- **As of January 31, 2019:** Staff received input on the preliminary growth forecasts from 81% of 197 jurisdictions in the region.
Key Findings from Input Data

- All three growth figures are within the preliminary range of growth forecasts.
- The growth figures of population and households from local jurisdictions are lower than the preliminary forecasts and higher than the low forecasts, in 2045. However, the growth figures of employment from local jurisdictions are slightly higher than the preliminary forecasts.
- 2045 regional unemployment rate would be measured at a normal rate of 4.7% for the SCAG region.
- Population to household (P/H) ratio is 2.9 and consistent with that of the preliminary growth forecasts.
- The local input growth forecast at the regional level is found to be technically sound.
Population Projection

Population (in Millions)

- Actual
- Low
- Preliminary
- High
- Local Input

1990: 14.7
1995: 15.5
2000: 16.6
2005: 17.6
2010: 18.1
2015: 18.8
2020: 
2025: 
2030: 
2035: 
2040: 
2045: 23.0
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Agenda Item 2
Regional Housing Needs Determination – Initial Approach toward Consultation with HCD

SCAG Technical Working Group (TWG)

February 21, 2019

On February 4, 2019, staff presented the attached report to SCAG’s RHNA Subcommittee to provide a starting point for the consultation package that SCAG will, in the coming months, prepare and provide to the Department of Housing and Community Development as part of the RHNA process.

Following the conclusion of the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process and the finalization of SCAG’s region-level growth forecast, staff now have the starting point needed to provide an approach toward a regional housing needs estimate, consistent with RHNA law.

This item is being presented to the Technical Working Group to allow for additional discussion on the technical and conceptual details in the original February 4th report.

To: Regional Housing Needs Assessment Subcommittee (RHNA)

From: Kevin Kane, Associate Regional Planner, Planning Division, (213) 236-1878, kane@scag.ca.gov

Subject: An Initial Framework for Developing SCAG’s RHNA Regional Determination Consultation Package with HCD

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only - No Action Required

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:
This report provides an overview of SCAG’s past practice and proposes an initial framework for the consultation process with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and the Department of Finance (DOF), which is a required element of the RHNA process’ determination of the region’s housing needs. Analysis is also provided regarding changes to housing law in 2017 and 2018 and their potential impacts on the regional determination. Given past practices in the 5th cycle of RHNA, staff review of legislative changes, and preliminary analysis of data, an initial framework is presented for the Subcommittee’s review and discussion prior to staff’s formal development of regional housing needs consultation package which will be presented to both RHNA and CEHD Committees, and afterwards, engaging in consultation process and discussions with HCD staff regarding the regional determination.

BACKGROUND:
The RHNA process as prescribed by Government Code Section 65584 et. seq., requires a consultation process between SCAG and HCD/DOF before HCD issues its final determination of total housing need for the SCAG region. SCAG staff intends to begin this formal consultation process with HCD/DOF in spring 2019 and provides herein for the RHNA Subcommittee a discussion of an initial framework which is based on past practices and adapted for recent changes in state housing law.

Staff anticipates the Draft regional and county-level 2020 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal) integrated growth forecasts covering employment, population and households to be completed and presented to CEHD Committee at their March 7, 2019 meeting. Since a component of the RHNA consultation package involves this forecast, a more detailed consultation package based on the initial framework will be forthcoming.
Legislative changes in 2017 and 2018, as well as legislatively-enabled increases in the level of discretion afforded to HCD in applying those changes in determining the SCAG region’s total housing need, may lead to a much higher regional RHNA determination than previous cycles that were developed with different interpretations of the law and methodology.

In April 2018, SANDAG received its 6th cycle regional determination from HCD, which provided an indicator of HCD practice, taking into account 2017 but not 2018 legislative changes. SCAG staff reviewed HCD’s methodology for calculating SANDAG’s regional determination, which was accepted by that agency without further consultation or negotiation. SANDAG’s assessment of 177,685 units over 8.8 years is a 32% increase in annual housing needs compared to the previous cycle. However, given (1) additional changes to the regional determination’s treatment in state housing law since SANDAG’s determination, and (2) the differences in socioeconomic characteristics between SANDAG and SCAG discussed during the December 3, 2018 RHNA Subcommittee meeting, staff’s assessment is that if HCD were to apply a similar methodology to the SCAG region, the RHNA determination for the 6th cycle could be far more than 32% above SCAG’s 5th cycle total of 412,137 units.

Much of the difference lies in the fact that the regional determination in prior cycles of RHNA was roughly consistent with SCAG and the DOF forecasts for population and household growth over the projection period, while the expectation for the 6th cycle is that HCD’s determination of housing need will consider not only projected growth, but will add units based on various ways to measure “existing need”, any “backlog” in housing production, unmet housing demand, and similar factors. SCAG staff is not aware of available studies, or the existence of widespread consensus on the measurement of these components of “existing housing need.” For example, a 2015 Legislative Analysts’ Office report estimates the statewide housing shortfall to be 4.2 million units over 1980-2010 (https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2015/finance/housing-costs/housing-costs.pdf) while a highly-publicized 2016 McKinsey report floats the notion of a 3.5 million unit gap (https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/urbanization/closing-californias-housing-gap).

However, estimates vary widely, and are not subject to the legal and technical rigor required in state housing law. In addition, many non-site and zoning related socioeconomic, demographic and technology trends and challenges have contributed most to those outcomes of existing “housing needs—overcrowding, over payment and others,” including but not limited to income distribution, educational attainment, quality of jobs, global investors, monetary policy, demography and life style, technology/innovative platform for share economy.

During the 5th cycle of RHNA, SCAG presented its 2012 RTP/SCS integrated growth forecast, associated data, and recommended regional housing needs determination for HCD’s consideration. At that time, major items for discussions included difference in projected populations with DOF, headship rates, housing needs on tribal land, a methodology to estimate replacement housing allowance, and an alternative method of using Census data to determine the existing vacant housing stock.
As described above, following the anticipated review of the Draft 2020 RTP/SCS (Connect SoCal) regional level growth forecast by CEHD on March 7, 2019, SCAG will begin to develop the HCD consultation package. SCAG intends to develop the regional housing needs consultation package with HCD following the initial framework, to reflect the best interpretation of the new housing law for the region, building upon past practices in previous RHNA cycles. The objectives are:

- Follow the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS (Connect So Cal) Integrated Growth Forecasting process, procedure, methodology, and results through bottom-up local review, comment and input.
- Provide the best outcomes for the SCAG region housing needs assessment and determination, meet the requirements of law and with best available data and technical methodology.
- Research the appropriate factors/causes associated with “existing housing needs.”
- Develop policy responses for long term robust and stable supply of sites and zoning for housing constructions.

At this stage, and in order to facilitate in moving this process forward, staff presents below an initial framework for developing SCAG’s RHNA Regional Determination Consultation Package based on SCAG’s past practice and our interpretation of legislative changes to the RHNA process since the 5th cycle for discussion by the Subcommittee:

1. **Making a clear distinction between housing need due to projected growth versus existing need.**

   SCAG will propose to HCD that a clear distinction be made between housing need due to projected regional growth and that due to existing housing need. In this context, projected need refers to housing need due to expected growth during the 6th cycle RHNA projection period, which is from 7/1/2021 through 10/1/2029. This is mostly consistent with past practices and the adopted methodology used for the 5th cycle of RHNA, and includes making adjustments based on vacancy and replacement need.

   This delineation is important for ensuring consistency with SCAG’s RTP/SCS integrated growth forecasting process and results. This process kicked off in summer 2017 with a meeting of several demographic and economic experts (SCAG’s “Panel of Experts” meeting), which provided a basis for draft 2016-2045 growth figures which were approved by CEHD. In fall 2017, these figures were used as the starting point for SCAG’s Bottom-up local input and envisioning process during which SCAG staff reviewed growth forecast data one-on-one with all 197 jurisdictions. Staff emphasized that, consistent with housing law as of 2017, projected growth in population and households between 2020 and 2030 would be a key determinant of housing needs for the 6th cycle of RHNA.

   However, changes to state law in 2017 and 2018 have added several elements to the RHNA determination process including consideration of household overcrowding, overpayment, mandatory vacancy standards, and language clarifying that HCD may make adjustments based on both existing and projected households. Taken as a whole, these changes add several factors
traditionally related to existing housing need to the RHNA determination process, to be applied at the discretion of HCD.

Each of these elements requires careful consideration and extensive research to support its translation into an estimate of new construction need and as HCD has yet to provide their interpretation and methodology on how these new changes will be implemented. In particular, given the inclusion of several new data elements in the consideration of regional housing needs (e.g. overcrowding, vacancy, and overpayment rates), SCAG emphasizes that measures of the same quantity of existing housing need may exist in multiple places in the new legislation. For example, the application of a vacancy adjustment to the projected and total housing stock may measure the same housing undersupply as the proposed adjustment based on household overcrowding. Given this, SCAG will emphasize justification that various calculations are indeed distinct and are not “double counting” housing need. SCAG staff will work with HCD to clarify how the new changes are to be implemented during the consultation process.

2. Determining projected housing need.

Staff recommends first addressing the housing needs over the RHNA projection period building off the approach used by SCAG and HCD during the 5th cycle of RHNA—namely, the delta method, which applies a headship rate and adjustments to projected population growth.

a. Household growth is measured by SCAG’s growth forecast, unless the total regional population forecast for the projection year is not within a range of 1.5 percent of the DOF figure of the same, in which case the DOF figure is used (65584.01(a)). SCAG’s RHNA Reform Subcommittee’s recommendation was to ensure that this tolerance range (which, until the 2017 passage of AB 1086 had been 3%) is applied to the population total rather than the growth over the projection period. This continues to be our interpretation of the law.

b. Headship rates are specified in 65584.01 (b)(1)(D) as “The rate of household formation, or headship rates, based on age, gender, ethnicity, or other established demographic measures.” Consistent with past practice, SCAG staff supports using headship rates by age, sex, and race/ethnicity from the most recent American Community Survey (ACS) data, which currently are 2017 1-year sample data. Upon completion of the RTP/SCS integrated growth forecast, SCAG proposes to multiply estimates of 2029 residential population by 2017 headship rates across 5-year age categories, both sexes, and four race/ethnicity categories.

c. Vacancy adjustment. Past practice has been such that the vacancy adjustment increases the need due to projected growth by a healthy market vacancy rate. The rationale is that in order to truly accommodate the projected growth in households, a slightly higher number of housing units is needed. This rate is typically split between owner and renter households based on the existing owner/renter share in the region, with renter vacancy rates being roughly three times higher than those in the for-sale housing market.
65584.01 (b)(1)(D), a part of SB 828 which passed in 2018, specifies that “the vacancy rate for a healthy rental housing market shall be considered no less than 5 percent.” In order to adjust the projected housing need to account for adequate vacancy, we propose applying 5% to vacant renter households and separate rate to owned households, based on the current owner/renter share. We propose a healthy owned housing market vacancy rate of approximately 1.5%, consistent with past practice and historical market data for owned housing.

In addition, during the 5th cycle, a downward adjustment was made to SCAG’s RHNA determination based on additional housing capacity in the Census Bureau’s “other vacant units” category. While this was understood as a 1-time adjustment due to unique economic and housing market conditions, as affirmed by SCAG’s RHNA Reform Subcommittee, staff will continue to review the longitudinal trend in this data source to ensure the appropriate application of the vacancy adjustment.

d. **Replacement need adjustment.** Consistent with past practice, SCAG plans to estimate future unit losses in the region’s housing stock using a survey question covering past demolitions, natural disasters, and other factors resulting in housing unit loss.

e. **Tribal lands adjustment.** Consistent with past practice, staff proposes to exclude population and household growth identified on Tribal Lands from the rest of the region for SCAG’s RHNA total housing need determination in order to ensure that local jurisdictions can exercise the full responsibility of land use planning. This approach has been previously approved by HCD, and affirmed by SCAG’s RHNA Reform Subcommittee.

While state housing law references housing needs due to household overcrowding and overpayment, we feel that applying a headship rate and income categories to anticipated population growth ensures that the appropriate occupancy and cost per future housing unit.

3. **Determining existing housing need.**

Staff recommends considering housing needs related to overcrowding and overpayment as elements of existing housing need, since they are not directly related to growth over the RHNA projection period. In general terms, staff recommends developing SCAG’s approach using comparable regions as a reference, consistent with new elements in 65584.01. However, SCAG emphasizes that since comparisons versus comparable regions and calculations of existing housing need based on overcrowding or overpayment are new, untested tools, further study by multiple experts is merited, in particular to ensure that “double counting” using similar measures is avoided.

a. **Comparison versus a comparable region.** Perhaps recognizing that Census-derived data on household conditions is reflective of myriad factors in addition to housing market
conditions e.g. demographic composition, unique geography, and cultural and regional preferences, SB 828 added Section 65584.01 (b) (C)(ii): “The term “overcrowded rate for a comparable housing market” means that the overcrowding rate is no more than the average overcrowding rate in comparable regions throughout the nation, as determined by the council of governments.”

However, due to SCAG’s sheer size and unique demographic characteristics, this is a greater challenge than other regions in the state. Specifically, using 2017 American Community Survey data for consolidated statistical areas (CSAs), the combined, five-county area of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura counties leads the nation in the share of households with above 1.0 resident per room in a dwelling, at 9.8%.

Staff will continue to review research on what constitutes similar regions. It is likely that a set of regions based on one or more socioeconomic characteristics might be considered somewhat comparable; however, since the aforementioned Los Angeles-Long Beach CSA is the nation’s second largest – and nearly double the size of the third largest – a true comparable basis for this measure may not exist.

Staff suggests that one promising avenue is to decompose measures by the same age, sex, and race/ethnicity categories used for population projections in order to “net out” differences in overcrowding or overpayment based on demographic composition.

Furthermore, staff proposes investigation of how much of the difference between SCAG and a comparable region or regions should be converted into new housing construction. Naturally, due to unique regional differences, existing housing needs in the SCAG region—particularly those due to market conditions—may be a certain fraction of the difference between SCAG and other regions.

b. Household overcrowding. SCAG suggests continued analysis and further research regarding the manner in which household overcrowding reflects a market-based under-provision of housing. 2017 and 2018 legislative changes have added, and subsequently revised, language related to overcrowding. Current law (65584.01 (b) (C)) proposes a measure similar to the American Community Survey’s measure of overcrowding as more than 1.0 resident per room in a dwelling. In particular, prior research on housing overcrowding emphasizes that demographic, rather than housing market characteristics are the strongest driver of this indicator—specifically a region’s foreign-born population share.¹

c. The relationship between regional need and cost burdened households requires more clarity. Following modifications in 2018, 65584.01 (b)(1)(H) introduces a data measure resembling the ACS’ measure of cost-burdened households, i.e. those paying above 30 percent of income on housing, considered separately at different levels of household income. Similar to the language for overcrowding, a comparison approach is used whereby this statistic can be compared against other regions in the nation.

While adding housing units to ensure that fewer households are overcrowded makes conceptual sense, it is not yet clear how data on the share of income being put toward housing could be directly translated into an estimate of additional housing unit need. In addition, instances of overcrowding and overpayment are highly correlated, making “double-counting” of the same housing unit need a distinct possibility with the data elements specified in 65584.01(b)(1).

d. Vacancy as a measure of existing housing need. SCAG staff recommends that any use of housing vacancy rates to determine existing housing needs should be distinct from those used to calculate projected housing needs. While aforementioned legislative changes have statutorily defined what constitutes a minimum standard for healthy for-rent vacancy at 5%, we feel that long-range data support a far lower healthy market rate for for-sale housing—approximately 1.5%.

4. SCAG’s Initiatives to Support Jurisdictions’ Planning for Housing Supply

The new RHNA process which emerged from legislative changes in 2017 and 2018 requires the integration of a substantially higher number of data elements and approaches, many requiring additional analysis and expert research in order to credibly convert into an estimate of a region’s projected or existing housing need.

In particular, the RHNA process at this point suited for short-range planning, and we expect certain new elements may present challenges during the subsequent, jurisdictional-level RHNA allocation stage. These include modified standards for the balance between low-wage jobs and affordable housing, the doctrine of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, and the allocation of existing housing needs which are rooted in spatially-varying regional measures of household characteristics. Staff looks forward to additional guidance from HCD and DOF on these challenging issues, in particular since the oversight afforded to state agencies in both the determination and allocation stages of the 6th cycle of RHNA is notably higher.

SCAG is committed to successfully meeting the region’s housing needs. In particular, staff are in various stages of developing a variety of supportive programs which assist local jurisdictions in planning for long-range housing supply:
(1) SCAG’s Data Map Books, produced for the aforementioned Bottom-up local input and envisioning process, proposed a methodology for identifying potential infill land and solicited input from local jurisdictions. It is likely that some of this potentially developable land inventory could fill future housing need and fulfill RHNA allocations.

(2) SCAG’s Regional Data Platform and General Plan Update Tool. A part of SCAG’s Future Communities Initiative, our recent investment in GIS and data aims to provide additional technical assistance to jurisdictions during the next housing element update process and aims to help in the identification of sites and zoning characteristics that would fulfill housing need.

(3) SCAG’s tax increment financing pilot program. In particular, SCAG has funded pilot programs to help jurisdictions navigate the state economic development incentive landscape with a focus on Enhanced Infrastructure Finance Districts (EIFDs), Community Revitalization and Improvement Areas (CRIAs), and federal Opportunity Zones (OZs). Each of these represent mechanisms which have the potential to fund future housing construction.

**FISCAL IMPACT:** Work associated with this item is included in the current FY 18-19 General Fund Budget (800.0160.03:RHNA).

**ATTACHMENT(S):**
1. PowerPoint Presentation: An Initial Framework of SCAG’s RHNA Regional Determination Package
Technical Working Group

Agenda Item 3
Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process

As adopted by SCAG’s Regional Council in October 2017:

• SCAG will engage with jurisdictions one-on-one to establish a regional profile of base land use, population, household employment growth, resource areas, sustainability practices, and local transit-supportive plans and policies. SCAG will also seek input from CTCs on planned transportation infrastructure through the horizon year of the RTP/SCS.

• SCAG will assess the GHG reduction potential of existing plans and policies in the Southern California region, including the establishment of an RTP/SCS “base case” that takes into account local land use policies, planned growth, sustainability practices, resource areas, transit-supportive plans and policies, and anticipated transportation improvements for the RTP/SCS.

• SCAG will develop multiple scenarios that explore a range of land use and transportation strategies. These scenarios will illustrate the impact of distinctive policy and investment choices, and will be examined in relation to the “base case” in order for the Regional Council and Policy Committees to evaluate the merits of regional decisions for the Plan.

• Feedback on potential GHG reduction strategies will be solicited from local jurisdictions, CTCs, and other stakeholders through regional collaboration prior to inclusion in the draft SCS.

• SCAG will also engage with the general public to help inform the draft SCS scenarios, in accordance with SB 375 and SCAG’s updated Public Participation Plan.

• The RHNA will be developed in coordination with the RTP/SCS.

• Input from local jurisdictions throughout the process will be accepted from each jurisdiction’s city manager, community development/planning director; at their option, jurisdictions may elect to have the governing body approve local input.
Data Elements for Local Review

Current and Future Population, Households, Employment

Existing and Planned Land Use, Local Transportation Infrastructure, Resource Areas, Potential Infill Parcels

Sustainability Best Practices, Transit Supportive Measures

San Bernardino County
25 Jurisdictions

Riverside County
29 Jurisdictions

Imperial County
8 Jurisdictions

Orange County
35 Jurisdictions

Los Angeles County
89 Jurisdictions

Ventura County
11 Jurisdictions
Outreach Timeline (June 2017 – December 2017)

June 2017
- SCAG/USC Demographic Workshop & Panel of Experts
  - Technical Consultation with Subregions and SCAG’s Technical Working Group (TWG)

October 2017
- Review of Proposed Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process by SCAG’s Community, Economic and Human Development Committee (CEHD)
- Adoption of Guiding Principles for the Process by SCAG’s Regional Council

November 2017
- Regional Webinar & Classroom-Style Trainings
- Presentations made at Subregional Boards of Directors and/or Standing City Managers/Planning Directors’ meetings
- Release of Detailed Work Plans & Data Package to City Managers, Community/Planning Directors, Subregional Executive Directors, and Locally Elected Officials. Review of materials by CEHD

December 2017
- Kickoff of One-on-One Meetings with Local Staff
- Release of Scenario Planning Model Data Management Site

Updates on the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process included in SCAG’s Executive Director’s Report
Outreach Timeline (January 2018 – 2018)

- **March 2018**: Progress Report on Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process Delivered to CEHD
- **April 2018**: Updates on the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process included in SCAG’s Executive Director’s Report
- **June 2018**: Kickoff of SCAG’s Regional Planning Working Groups for Plan Envisioning

- **January 2018**: Launch of SCAG’s On-Site Technical Assistance for Local Jurisdictions
- **February 2018**: Continuation of Consultation with SCAG’s TWG and Subregions
- **March 2018**: Continuation of One-on-One Meetings

== Update ==

= Updates on the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process included in SCAG’s Executive Director’s Report
Outreach Timeline (July 2018 – January 2019)

- **July 2018**: Update on SCAG’s Progress to Subregional Executive Directors, City Managers, Community/Planning Directors, Local Staff

- **August 2018**: Additional trainings offered on SCAG’s Scenario Planning Model - Data Management Site

- **September 2018**: Progress Report on Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process Delivered to CEHD

- **October 2018**: Presentations at Subregional Boards of Directors and/or Standing City Managers/Planning Directors’ meetings

- **September 2018**: Deadline for Input from Local Jurisdictions (extensions evaluated upon request)

- **October 2018**: Update on Participation Results from Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process to CEHD

- **Update and refinement of SCAG’s Base Data utilizing input from Local Jurisdictions**

- **Completion of 197 One-on-One Meetings with Jurisdictions**

- **Update on SCAG’s Progress to Subregional Executive Directors, City Managers, Community/Planning Directors, Local Staff**
Outreach: Regional Webinars and Classroom-Style Trainings

- 19 Trainings
- 8 Locations
- 99 Jurisdictions Participated
- 200 Local Staff Attendees

Jurisdictions Participated: 50%

Share of Total Regional Population living within Participating Jurisdictions (as of 2016): 75%
Outreach: On-Site Technical Assistance

46 Jurisdictions Participated

93 Jurisdictions Requested Additional Help

23% Jurisdictions Participated

47% Jurisdictions Offered Additional Help
Outreach: One-on-One Meetings

- 197 Meetings
- 183 Locations
- 197 Jurisdictions Participated
- 457 Local Staff Attendees

Jurisdictions Participated: 100%
Share of Total Regional Population living within Jurisdictions Participating (as of 2016): 100%
Outreach: Subregional Engagements

- 25 Subregional Presentations
- 15 Subregions Visited
- 250 Local Elected Official and Staff Attendees

100% Participation

Share of Total Regional Population living within Participating Subregions (as of 2016)
Input Received by County: One or More Data Elements

- Current and Future Population, Households, Employment: 91%
- Existing and Planned Land Use, Local Transportation Infrastructure, Resource Areas, Potential Infill Parcels: 88%
- Sustainability Best Practices, Transit Supportive Measures: 100%

Jurisdictions Participated: 90%
Input Received by Jurisdiction: One or More Data Elements

- Current and Future Population, Households, Employment
- Existing and Planned Land Use, Local Transportation Infrastructure, Resource Areas, Potential Infill Parcels
- Sustainability Best Practices, Transit Supportive Measures

178 Jurisdictions Participated

Share of Total Regional Population living within Participating Jurisdictions (as of 2016) 94%
Input Received by County: Socioeconomic Estimates and Projections

- 91% of 197 jurisdictions provided input
- 75% provided current and future population
- 100% provided current and future households
- 69% provided current and future employment
- 100% provided current and future
- 37% of jurisdictions participated

Overall participation: 81%
Input Received by Jurisdiction: Socioeconomic Estimates and Projections

Current and Future Population, Households, Employment

89% Share of Total Regional Population living within Participating Jurisdictions (as of 2016)

160 Jurisdictions Participated

Top Growth Constraints For Local Jurisdictions:
1: Available Land Capacity
2: Historical Trends
3: Market Conditions
4: Economic Constraints

Share of Total Regional Population living within Participating Jurisdictions (as of 2016)
Input Received by County: Geographic Data

Existing and Planned Land Use, Local Transportation Infrastructure, Resource Areas, Potential Infill Parcels

Jurisdictions Participated: 81%

- 91%
- 79%
- 88%
- 66%
- 97%
- 75%
Input Received by Jurisdiction: Geographic Data

- Share of Total Regional Population living within Participating Jurisdictions (as of 2016): 89%

161 Jurisdictions Participated

Existing and Planned Land Use, Local Transportation Infrastructure, Resource Areas, Potential Infill Parcels

- Vacant Acreage
  - Multi Family Parcels: -10%
  - Single Family Parcels: +5%
  - Total: +1%

Existing Land Use Changes from 2012 to 2016

Share of Total Regional Population living within Participating Jurisdictions (as of 2016)
Input Received by County: Local Input Survey

- Sustainability Best Practices, Transit Supportive Measures
- Jurisdictions Participated: 58%
- Of 197 Jurisdictions provided input
Input Received by Jurisdiction: Local Input Survey

116 Jurisdictions Participated

75% Share of Total Regional Population living within Participating Jurisdictions (as of 2016)

Sustainability Best Practices, Transit Supportive Measures
**Next Steps**

- SCAG is updating “Base Case” datasets for use in the development of Connect SoCal and RHNA.
- Additional findings will be presented at subsequent meetings of the RHNA Subcommittee.
- The “Base Case” will be modeled and utilized as a point of comparison for plan development.
- Geographic data elements will be populated to SCAG’s Scenario Planning Model – Data Management Site for use by local jurisdictions in early spring.
- SCAG will be utilizing “Base Case” datasets in the development of the Regional Data Platform.
Thank you

Kimberly Clark

clark@scag.ca.gov

213-236-1844
TWG Item: Update on SCAG’s Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process

Southern California will be facing new challenges in the development of the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (“Connect SoCal”) - principally transformational technologies in the transportation and employment sectors, increased greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets from the California Air Resources Board (CARB), new Federal Highway Administration planning requirements, MAP 21 performance metrics/goals, and a concurrent Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) cycle. Given these factors, it is important to establish a solid baseline of existing policies and plans to understand how Southern California can accommodate future growth and thrive in the coming decades.

To foster cross-jurisdictional collaboration to that end, SCAG initiated a Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process in fall 2017, which has been guided by the principles evaluated by the Community, Economic, and Human Development Committee in September 2017 and subsequently adopted by Regional Council in October 2017:

**Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process Guiding Principles**

1. SCAG will engage with jurisdictions one-on-one to establish a regional profile of base land use, population, household and employment growth, resource areas, sustainability practices, and local transit-supportive plans and policies. SCAG will also seek input from CTCs on planned transportation infrastructure through the horizon year of the RTP/SCS;
2. SCAG will assess the GHG reduction potential of existing plans and policies in the Southern California region, including the establishment of an RTP/SCS “base case” that takes into account local land use policies, planned growth, sustainability practices, resource areas, transit-supportive plans and policies, and anticipated transportation improvements for the RTP/SCS;
3. SCAG will develop multiple scenarios that explore a range of land use and transportation strategies. These scenarios will illustrate the impact of distinctive policy and investment choices, and will be compared to the “base case” in order for the Regional Council and Policy Committees to evaluate the merits of regional decisions for the Plan;
4. Feedback on potential GHG reduction strategies will be solicited from local jurisdictions, CTCs, and other stakeholders through regional collaboration prior to inclusion in the draft SCS;
5. SCAG will also engage with the general public to help inform the draft SCS scenarios, in accordance with SB 375 and SCAG’s Public Participation Plan;
6. The RHNA will be developed in coordination with the RTP/SCS; and
7. Input from local jurisdictions throughout the process will be accepted from each jurisdiction’s city manager, community development/planning director; at their option, jurisdictions may elect to have the governing body approve local input.
Starting in October 2017, SCAG staff have been engaging with subregions and meeting individually with local jurisdictions to solicit input on base land use, population/household/employment growth, resource areas, sustainability best-practices, and local transit-supportive plans and policies to help decision makers understand how the region will perform under current circumstances to reach Southern California’s new GHG reduction targets from CARB. In conducting this collaborative process, SCAG has been engaging stakeholders in four general phases (described below), and has provided regular updates to the CEHD on progress and feedback received from local jurisdictions during Phase 2.

**Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process Phases and Schedule**

**Phase 1: Regular Technical Consultation**  
(*June 2017 – Spring 2020*)

To ensure transparency and technical veracity during all phases of this process, SCAG has had ongoing engagements with the Technical Working Group (TWG) and has sought guidance from local jurisdictions, subregions, county transportation commissions, and other stakeholders on data methods and potential resource constraints for local jurisdictions to participate in this process.

**Phase 2: One-on-One Outreach and Local Input on Planned Growth**  
(*October 2017 – October 1, 2018*)

To ensure that all jurisdictions are fully informed of the planning process and have clear and adequate opportunities to provide input, each jurisdiction was sent a detailed work plan during the first week of December 2017 to explain this process, identify support from subregional organizations and SCAG, outline milestones, and provide instructions on submitting feedback. SCAG staff also made presentations at subregional Boards of Directors’ meetings and/or standing subregional City Managers and Community Development/Planning Directors meetings introducing the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process in Fall 2017, and then again at the end of the process in Fall 2018 throughout the region.

To increase the ease of review for local staff, several trainings have also been hosted throughout the region, and session content is available as webinars on SCAG’s website. These 19 training sessions were attended by 200 staff from 99 jurisdictions. SCAG staff also met individually with all 197 local jurisdictions (and 457 local staff) in the SCAG region to review each dataset, distribute hard copies of local datasets for review (including wall size maps), and answer questions expeditiously. Further, SCAG also offered on-site technical assistance to over 90 agencies requesting additional help and provided services to 46 jurisdictions.

The deadline for submitting input to SCAG was October 1, 2018; prior to this date, SCAG reached out to subregions and jurisdictions to notify these partners that extension requests could be submitted to SCAG and would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. Through this extensive outreach and collaborative endeavor, 178 jurisdictions (90%) have been able to provide feedback on one or more data elements requested for local review. Looking at these jurisdictions collectively, an estimated 94% of the region’s 19
million residents call these towns, cities, and counties home as of 2016. On the forecast of population/households/employment specifically, which has the most relevance to the RHNA, 160 jurisdictions (81%) have submitted input to SCAG and 89% of the region’s total population reside within these jurisdictions (in 2016).

Taking into account SCAG’s hands-on assistance to local jurisdictions, 100% of jurisdictions utilizing SCAG’s on-site technical assistance resources provided feedback to SCAG on one or more data elements; 94% of those participating in SCAG’s regional webinar and class-room style trainings provided feedback to SCAG.

**Phase 3: Regional Collaboration on Scenario Development**  
*(Spring 2018 – Spring 2019)*

In collaboration with local jurisdictions, elected officials, and a broad range of stakeholder groups, SCAG has been evaluating potential region-wide integrated land use and transportation planning strategies for inclusion in the draft Plan. In May 2018, SCAG kicked off a series of Regional Planning Working Groups, which function as a forum for SCAG staff to engage stakeholders in the development and implementation of plans and policies to advance region’s mobility, economy, and sustainability. Multiple sessions are held each month and areas of focus include Active Transportation, Environmental Justice, New Mobility, Natural Lands Conservation, Public Health, Sustainable Communities, and Transportation Safety. To date, there have been nearly 20 meetings of the Regional Planning Working Groups, and involvement in this effort is being solicited from local jurisdictions, county transportation commissions, transit providers, and a wide range of stakeholder groups in accordance with SB 375 (e.g. attainable/workforce housing advocates, affordable housing advocates, transportation advocates, neighborhood and community groups, environmental advocates, home builder representatives, broad-based business organizations, landowners, commercial property interests, and homeowner associations, among others). Utilizing these collaborative engagements and additional consultant supported outreach, SCAG will develop multiple scenarios that explore a range of land use and transportation strategies. These scenarios will illustrate the impact of distinctive policy and investment choices and will be compared to the “base case” to evaluate the merits of certain regional decisions, including the pursuit of a potential Alternative Planning Strategy (APS).

**Phase 4: Engagement with the General Public on Potential Options for the RTP/SCS**  
*(Late Winter 2019 – Spring 2019)*

Also in accordance with SB 375, SCAG will solicit feedback from the general public through public workshops on potential GHG reduction strategies to inform the draft Plan. These workshops will equip the public with information and tools necessary to provide a clear understanding of the issues and policy choices at hand in the development of the draft SCS. At least one workshop will be held in each county in the region; for counties with over 500,000 people, a minimum of three workshops will be held.

**Concurrent Process: Regional Housing Needs Assessment**  
*(June 2017 – Fall 2021)*
The RHNA will be developed concurrently with Connect SoCal, and information refined through the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process will be one factor for consideration in the development of SCAG’s regional housing need, as well as the RHNA allocation methodology. For example, when providing input on the forecast of population/household/employment growth, jurisdictions shared that available land capacity and historic trends were the most often cited reasons for their requested adjustments to SCAG’s draft figures.