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Meeting Summary

1. CONNECT SOCAL 2024: JOINT POLICY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION PREVIEW

Sarah Dominguez presented a preview of the Connect SoCal 2024 discussion to be facilitated during the March 2nd Joint Policy Committee (JPC). The preview included a general update on plan development, requirements and outreach, a critical update to the Policy Development Framework and a preview of the Special Connect SoCal 2024 Subcommittee recommendations. Gail Shiomoto-Lohr (City of Mission Viejo), Cesar Aranguri (Indigenous Ark Urban Technologies) and Marnie Primmer (OCCOG) provided comments and questions.

2. REGIONAL RESILIENCE FRAMEWORK: DRAFT SHOCKS AND STRESSORS MATRIX

Anna Van, Kim Clark, and Emily Schwimmer (AECOM) presented on the Regional Resilience Framework, specifically seeking feedback from the TWG on the Draft Shocks and Stressors Matrix and the resilience indicators developed to measure each shock and stressor. Deborah Diep (CRD/CSUF) and Gail Shiomoto-Lohr partook in discussion.

3. REGIONAL ADVANCE MITIGATION POLICY FRAMEWORK & GREENPRINT TAC

India Brookover presented an update on the establishment of the SoCal Greenprint Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as part of the approval of the Regional Advance Mitigation Policy Framework. The update included information on the timeline and the solicitation/application process.
SUMMARY

Among the first steps in Connect SoCal 2024 is the development of growth projections for population, households, and employment in the region and six counties. With the help of an expert panel and consultants, staff developed a methodology and forecasted high, medium, and low regional growth ranges in Fall 2021. In February 2022, staff presented the preliminary regional and county growth forecast for 2019-2050 to the Joint Policy Committee. Staff then conducted a comprehensive outreach effort to all 197 local jurisdictions called the Local Data Exchange (LDX). SCAG asked local jurisdictions to review and provide feedback on the preliminary household and employment growth forecasts as well as several other Connect SoCal data layers by December 2, 2022.

This report presents staff’s assessment of the locally-reviewed forecast, which projects 2.3 percent higher household growth, 1.8 percent higher population growth, and 1.0 percent higher employment growth than the preliminary forecast. This indicates that upon integrating the growth outlook of the region’s local plans (in aggregate), Southern California is likely to grow more than was projected based on principally demographic and economic drivers as assessed in late 2021. Staff finds this forecast to be technically sound. Staff continue to assess and analyze the city and neighborhood-level edits provided by local jurisdictions.

BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Government Code 65080(b)(2)(B) et seq., Connect SoCal 2024 is required to:

“set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the state board and will allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C Sec. 7506).”

With the help of an expert panel and consultants, staff developed a methodology and forecasted high, medium, and low regional growth ranges in Fall 2021. Panelists were asked to consider the most likely, and also reasonable higher and lower levels of seven key inputs to SCAG’s long-range forecast: births, deaths, immigration, domestic migration, labor force participation, and household formation. Rather than simply taking the highest and lowest of each input, the purpose of this exercise was to develop a coherent baseline as well as an understanding of where high and low future values might fall based on an assessment of these demographic and economic factors. The three scenarios included:
- Baseline (mid): *Slower Growth, Steady Improvement*
- Low: *Secular Stagnation*
- High: *Robust and Equitable Future Growth supported by Policy and Technology*

Importantly, each scenario must be reasonably balanced across population, households, and employment. Put differently, are there enough workers for the projected jobs and is there enough housing for them (Figure 1)?

![Figure 1](image-url)

Even before the COVID-19 pandemic, emerging data suggested that the population growth trajectory forecasted in Connect SoCal 2020 would require a downward revision. Fewer births, more deaths, and the temporary slowdown of foreign immigration from the pandemic has resulted in zero or negative population growth. While this kind of long-range projection must assess and integrate near-term shocks, its primary objective is to assess the likely growth to 2050 which is more heavily influenced by the strengths of Southern California compared to other US regions. With a favorable mix of industries, strong innovation hubs, a welcoming culture, and desirable natural amenities, it is difficult to foresee Southern California decreasing in jobs compared to the US. As such, the middle growth scenario titled “Slower growth, steady improvement” reflects the overall direction of the preliminary Connect SoCal 2024 projection and was updated and shared with SCAG’s Joint Policy Committee in February 2022.

While population growth is expected to continue, albeit more slowly, there are two major reasons that the growth rate in households is expected to exceed the population growth rate. First, the population is ageing even more quickly than anticipated, increasing the number of small households. Second, evidence is emerging that continued strength in housing production despite low population growth is beginning to address the previously existing housing shortage.

The Demographic Panel of Experts, which met twice in the Fall of 2021, stressed that the overwhelming impediment to increased employment growth in the region was housing supply and affordability. If this could not be addressed, the region’s growth trajectory might more closely resemble the low scenario. However, if a combination of market and policy factors could yield increases in household formation, the region’s strong economic fundamentals would be realized in strong job growth and a higher projection would be plausible.
Figure 2

Population Projection Comparison, SCAG Region

Figure 3

Household Projection Comparison, SCAG Region
Actual data in Figures 2-4 are from the gyu US Decennial Census, CA DOF, CA EDD, ACS PUMS, and BLS QCEW. Projections are from the final Connect SoCal 2020 and the preliminary and locally-reviewed versions of Connect SoCal 2024.

At the June 2022 CEHD meeting, staff presented the preliminary methodology for allocating this growth to the jurisdictional and neighborhood (i.e., Transportation Analysis Zone, or TAZ) levels to form a preliminary forecasted regional development pattern which followed the following principles:

1. **Rooted in local planning policies.** The forecasted regional development pattern will use available local general plan information as a starting point and local jurisdictions will be asked to update and review the forecast with their expertise of local planning context and ongoing planning work.

2. **Steered by a regional vision.** The forecasted regional development pattern will integrate growth strategies of Connect SoCal 2020 and follow regional and county forecast totals as guided by the Panel of Experts.

3. **Aligned with state policy.** The forecasted regional development pattern will reflect policies including the 6th cycle housing element process and be assessed considering SCAG’s SB 375 greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.
Between February and December 2022, staff conducted the LDX process, formally meeting with 164 jurisdictions, and receiving data inputs from 142 jurisdictions by the December 2, 2022 deadline. Jurisdictions were asked to review total households and employment in 2019, 2035, and 2050. Input from jurisdictions became the *locally-reviewed forecasted regional development pattern*. While staff continues to assess the transportation and other impacts of locally-reviewed growth, this report provides staff’s assessment of *locally-reviewed* county and region-level totals against the preliminary projections reviewed by the Panel of Experts.

Household and employment totals in 2019, 2035, and 2050 were those received from jurisdictions (if input was provided). Intermediate years were generated by SCAG staff based on the trends found in the preliminary projections. Population totals were derived from the household totals provided by local jurisdictions, plus the population-to-household ratio in the preliminary population projections. In some instances, jurisdictions provided comments that additional growth was likely to be concentrated in smaller housing units, thus the increase in population is less than the increase in households.

Compared to the preliminary version, the locally-reviewed forecast projects 2.3 percent higher household growth, 1.0 percent higher employment growth, and 1.8 percent higher population growth by 2050:

![Figure 5: SCAG Region Forecasted Growth, 2019-2050](image-url)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>181,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>186,000</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>203,000</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>10,046,000</td>
<td>10,018,000</td>
<td>10,051,000</td>
<td>10,230,000</td>
<td>10,449,000</td>
<td>10,633,000</td>
<td>10,749,000</td>
<td>10,767,000</td>
<td>721,000</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>3,191,000</td>
<td>3,188,000</td>
<td>3,208,000</td>
<td>3,247,000</td>
<td>3,299,000</td>
<td>3,356,000</td>
<td>3,401,000</td>
<td>3,439,000</td>
<td>248,000</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>2,394,000</td>
<td>2,418,000</td>
<td>2,555,000</td>
<td>2,674,000</td>
<td>2,784,000</td>
<td>2,857,000</td>
<td>2,929,000</td>
<td>2,995,000</td>
<td>601,000</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>2,175,000</td>
<td>2,182,000</td>
<td>2,227,000</td>
<td>2,278,000</td>
<td>2,325,000</td>
<td>2,429,000</td>
<td>2,536,000</td>
<td>2,626,000</td>
<td>451,000</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>846,000</td>
<td>844,000</td>
<td>842,000</td>
<td>848,000</td>
<td>858,000</td>
<td>860,000</td>
<td>858,000</td>
<td>851,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>18,833,000</td>
<td>18,830,000</td>
<td>19,069,000</td>
<td>19,470,000</td>
<td>19,913,000</td>
<td>20,338,000</td>
<td>20,680,000</td>
<td>20,888,000</td>
<td>2,055,000</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Households</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>61,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>72,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>3,393,000</td>
<td>3,420,000</td>
<td>3,595,000</td>
<td>3,788,000</td>
<td>3,948,000</td>
<td>4,049,000</td>
<td>4,114,000</td>
<td>4,138,000</td>
<td>745,000</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>1,069,000</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
<td>1,123,000</td>
<td>1,164,000</td>
<td>1,196,000</td>
<td>1,221,000</td>
<td>1,239,000</td>
<td>1,253,000</td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>744,000</td>
<td>761,000</td>
<td>834,000</td>
<td>903,000</td>
<td>965,000</td>
<td>1,001,000</td>
<td>1,034,000</td>
<td>1,064,000</td>
<td>319,000</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>657,000</td>
<td>668,000</td>
<td>727,000</td>
<td>780,000</td>
<td>816,000</td>
<td>874,000</td>
<td>917,000</td>
<td>953,000</td>
<td>296,000</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>278,000</td>
<td>281,000</td>
<td>294,000</td>
<td>307,000</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>321,000</td>
<td>321,000</td>
<td>318,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>6,193,000</td>
<td>6,262,000</td>
<td>6,629,000</td>
<td>7,003,000</td>
<td>7,307,000</td>
<td>7,534,000</td>
<td>7,695,000</td>
<td>7,798,000</td>
<td>1,605,000</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>5,032,000</td>
<td>4,603,000</td>
<td>5,111,000</td>
<td>5,263,000</td>
<td>5,387,000</td>
<td>5,488,000</td>
<td>5,492,000</td>
<td>5,433,000</td>
<td>401,000</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>1,805,000</td>
<td>1,684,000</td>
<td>1,857,000</td>
<td>1,903,000</td>
<td>1,942,000</td>
<td>1,977,000</td>
<td>1,998,000</td>
<td>2,019,000</td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>847,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>909,000</td>
<td>983,000</td>
<td>1,057,000</td>
<td>1,106,000</td>
<td>1,147,000</td>
<td>1,185,000</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>860,000</td>
<td>838,000</td>
<td>903,000</td>
<td>948,000</td>
<td>992,000</td>
<td>1,060,000</td>
<td>1,108,000</td>
<td>1,145,000</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>363,000</td>
<td>332,000</td>
<td>371,000</td>
<td>379,000</td>
<td>384,000</td>
<td>383,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>376,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>8,977,000</td>
<td>8,326,000</td>
<td>9,224,000</td>
<td>9,553,000</td>
<td>9,843,000</td>
<td>10,099,000</td>
<td>10,215,000</td>
<td>10,248,000</td>
<td>1,273,000</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Projections rounded to the nearest 1000. Population projections based on SCAG's preliminary model plus household totals provided by local jurisdictions.
SCAG demographic and economic staff, with assistance from PRB, conducted a series of robustness checks on the revised regional totals.

1. Locally-reviewed totals are well within the high and low ranges initially developed. While total households, employment, and population are all higher than the preliminary projection, they remain below the high scenario initially envisioned.

2. Following local review, household and employment both moved in the same direction. This contrasts with prior regional plans in which local review typically yields a higher employment projection, but a lower household projection. The result is a more balanced projection in terms of regional jobs and housing than has been done in the past.

3. The Demographic Panel of Experts noted that a higher growth could be possible if a combination of market and policy factors yielded increases in household formation. The locally-reviewed projection’s higher household growth is reflective of a greater amount of upcoming and planned housing development than was reflected in the preliminary projection.

4. The regional P:E ratio in 2050 increased nominally from 2.02 to 2.04. This is in line with expectations, owing to the higher rise in households than jobs following local review, and the decrease from the 2019 ratio of 2.10 is consistent with the expectations in the preliminary projection. A P:E ratio above 2, which is consistent with the region’s historic average, generally indicates sufficient population growth to fill the additional jobs which are projected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population-to-Employment (P:E) Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Difference from SCAG Region:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019</th>
<th>0.50</th>
<th>-0.10</th>
<th>-0.33</th>
<th>0.73</th>
<th>0.43</th>
<th>0.23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

5. A principle of the preliminary projection at the county level was to ensure that each county’s household growth is commensurate with its employment growth—i.e. will it be possible to house additional workers at least within the same county as where their jobs are anticipated. So long as a county’s P:E ratio doesn’t get further away from the regional value of 2.04, this is achieved—this is the case in all six counties in the region.
a. For example, Los Angeles County currently has an oversupply of jobs compared to the region (suggesting in-commuting). However, by 2050 it is closer to the regional P:E ratio, (difference drops from -0.10 to -0.06 suggesting less future in-commuting).

b. Orange County’s job oversupply increases modestly; however, this is consistent with the regional trend toward fewer people per job and Orange County’s P:E ratio remains -0.33 below the region by 2050.

c. Many LA and Orange county jobs are filled by residents of Riverside County. However, by 2050 Riverside County’s job growth will have exceeded its population growth, meaning that it will have a more balanced relationship with the region.

6. The regional P:H ratio in 2050 decreased nominally from 2.69 to 2.68 after local review. This reflects both the ageing of the population and the expectation that housing production will continue to exceed the housing need derived from population growth. This is the case for every county in the region. In particular, the anticipated household growth by 2050 in Los Angeles county increased by 62,000 and in San Bernardino County by 55,000 following local review. A reasonable expectation from this trend is that household overcrowding rates, an indicator of housing undersupply in past periods, are likely to decline over the projection period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population-to-Household (P:H) Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add'l people per add'l HH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

7. The preliminary employment projection relied upon actual data through 2019. Comparing the preliminary projection with actual 2020-2022 employment, we see that the preliminary projections for the SCAG region closely followed the now-realized level of employment growth over the last three years. As such, we were able to replace 2020-2022 projections with actual data without requiring any additional modification. The post-LDX projection incorporates the input from local jurisdictions and shows 1.0 percent higher employment growth from 2019-2050 than the preliminary projection. The Local Data Exchange process provided valuable local knowledge regarding specific projects which are underway or expected soon and increases the robustness of SCAG’s forecast.

Conclusions

Following local review, staff followed up with several jurisdictions to request clarifications or additional documentation regarding major changes in growth projections. Broadly speaking, changes in growth took place where there was identified capacity to accommodate these changes. Specifically, efforts by Los Angeles County jurisdictions to promote infill or Accessory Dwelling Unit development have shown encouraging increases in recent years and are supported by local housing
elements¹. San Bernardino County growth rates have historically lagged behind neighboring Riverside County, however they nearly achieve parity in the locally-reviewed projection and suggest the county’s land use planning may be able to foster relatively higher growth rates going forward.

Finally, the locally-reviewed projection indicates some distinct differences between the near or mid-term within the forecast horizon versus the long-range. This differs from the projection in Connect SoCal 2020. This projection’s anticipation of higher household formation rates in the coming decade would reflect higher housing growth in the mid-term (particularly during the 6th cycle housing element update) which would accommodate anticipated population and job growth as well as alleviate some of the results of past undersupply. However, increases in age and mortality in the region (and globally) would result in a slower rate of household growth needed to accommodate population & job increases in the late 2030s and 2040s. The population and employment projections envision moderate growth in the mid-term but taper off by the later years of the projection.

Table 4: Annual Household Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-year period</th>
<th>Locally-reviewed Connect SoCal 2024</th>
<th>Final Connect SoCal 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020-2025</td>
<td>73,400</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-2030</td>
<td>74,800</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030-2035</td>
<td>60,800</td>
<td>53,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-2040</td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>46,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040-2045</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>46,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2045-2050</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ For example, in 2021 the City of Los Angeles alone represented 22 percent of the entire state’s increase in multifamily housing, see [https://dof.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/352/Forecasting/Demographics/Documents/E-1_2022PressRelease.pdf](https://dof.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/352/Forecasting/Demographics/Documents/E-1_2022PressRelease.pdf). According to the California Department of Housing and Community Development’s Annual Progress Report data for 2021, 45 percent of the state’s permitted ADUs were in Los Angeles County.
Environmental Justice
The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

Racial Equity
As central to SCAG's work, racial equity describes the actions, policies, and practices that eliminate bias and barriers that have historically and systemically marginalized communities of color, to ensure all people can be healthy, prosperous, and participate fully in civic life.
### Incorporating Equity into Analysis

#### EQUITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title VI</th>
<th>Environmental Justice</th>
<th>Other FHWA &amp; FTA Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Race</td>
<td>• Low Income</td>
<td>• Sex/Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Color</td>
<td>• Minority</td>
<td>• Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• LEP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research and Literature Review

#### Equity Area Definitions

- Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool, Council on Environmental Quality
- Equitable Transportation Community Explorer, US DOT [draft]
- Transportation Disadvantaged Census Tracts, US DOT
- CalEnviroScreen Disadvantaged Communities, OEHHA/Cal EPA
- Transportation Equity Zones, SCAG
- Equity Focus Communities, LA Metro
Research and Literature Review
Data + Mapping Tools

Priority Equity Communities
Priority Equity Communities are census tracts in the SCAG region that have a greater concentration of populations that have been historically marginalized and are susceptible to inequitable outcomes based on several socioeconomic factors.
Priority Equity Communities are census tracts in the SCAG region that have a greater concentration of populations that have been historically marginalized and are susceptible to inequitable outcomes based on several socioeconomic factors.
## Priority Equity Communities

### Priority Population Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUTORILY REQUIRED</th>
<th>PREVIOUSLY ANALYZED</th>
<th>NEW CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>Vulnerable Ages</td>
<td>Female Headed Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Households</td>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td>Cost Burdened Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People with Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People with Limited English Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero- or One- Vehicle Households</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People without a High School Diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW CRITERIA**

- Female Headed Households
- Cost Burdened Households

---
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Priority Equity Communities
Priority Population Criteria

STATUTORILY REQUIRED
- People of Color
- Low-Income Households

PREVIOUSLY ANALYZED
- Vulnerable Ages
- People with Disabilities
- People with Limited English Proficiency
- Zero- or One- Vehicle Households
- People without a High School Diploma

NEW CRITERIA
- Female Headed Households
- Cost Burdened Households

Methodology
Census tracts that have a concentration above county average of:

BOTH people of color and low-income households

EITHER people of color or low-income households
AND 4+ of the 7 other criteria

AND 4+
Pause for Questions

Does the definition of Priority Equity Communities make sense?

Do you understand how Priority Equity Communities are selected?

Are there any criteria missing? Are any of the criteria unclear?

Thoughts on vehicle-deficient or Female-headed households?
Priority Equity Communities

Identification

PERCENT OF POPULATION IN PRIORITY EQUITY COMMUNITIES (PEC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>PEC</th>
<th>Not PEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPERIAL</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERSIDE</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN BERNARDINO</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENTURA</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equity Performance Measures
### Equity Performance Measures

#### Economy
- Geographic Distribution of Transportation Investments
- Investments vs. Benefits
- Revenue Sources In Terms of Tax Burdens
- Impacts from Mileage-Based User Fee

#### Communities
- Jobs-Housing Imbalance
- Neighborhood Change and Displacement
- Rail-Related Impacts

#### Mobility
- Share of Transportation System Usage
- Travel Time and Travel Distance Savings
- Access to Everyday Destinations
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Collisions

#### Environment
- Resilience and Climate Vulnerabilities
- Emissions Impacts Analysis
- Noise Impacts

#### Equity Performance Measures: Access to Everyday Destinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Access Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Jobs accessible within...</td>
<td>15- and 30-minutes during AM Peak via auto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Retail establishments accessible within...</td>
<td>15-minutes during midday via auto and transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of population that can access a Park within...</td>
<td>15- and 30-minutes during midday via auto and transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Health Care centers accessible within...</td>
<td>15- and 30-minutes during AM Peak via auto and transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Schools accessible within...</td>
<td>15- and 30-minutes during AM Peak via auto and transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 0.5-, 0.75-, and 1-mile walking
- 1-, 3-, and 5-miles biking
Next Steps

March/April 2023
Equity Analysis Update to EWG, TWG, and EEC

June 2023
Equity Analysis Update to EEC, TWG, and EWG

Fall 2023
2024 Equity Analysis Report Release

April - June 2023
Connect SoCal/Equity Public Outreach
Presentation Agenda

1 Introduction
2 Objectives
3 Stakeholder Outreach Efforts & Opportunities
4 Highlights of Preliminary Approaches to Major Components
5 Conclusion
Connect SoCal 2024 PEIR and SCAG’s Role

- SCAG is the CEQA Lead Agency for the Connect SoCal 2024
- SCAG determined a Program EIR is the appropriate type of CEQA document
- The PEIR will include a region-wide, first-tier, programmatic level environmental assessment

Presentation Objectives

1) Stakeholder outreach efforts and opportunities
2) Highlights of preliminary approach and seek early feedback before release of the 2024 Draft PEIR (anticipated Fall 2023)
Stakeholder Outreach Efforts & Opportunities

Required Public Outreach Pursuant to CEQA

- SCAG released the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft PEIR for Connect SoCal 2024 (State Clearinghouse No.: 2022100337) for a required 30-day public review and comment period: 10/17/2022 – 11/16/2022
- Held two virtual public scoping meetings on November 9 and 10, 2022.
Required Tribal Outreach Pursuant to AB 52

- California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) provided a contact list of tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the SCAG region
- Staff sent Tribal Consultation Initiation letters to 64 tribal government contacts (representing 54 tribes)
- Concluded required AB 52 tribal outreach with no requests for consultation

Additional Stakeholder Outreach

- Beyond state requirements
- Consider SCAG’s existing forums, Plan outreach initiatives, and outreach efforts from previous RTP/SCS PEIRs
- Consists of two components:
  - 1) leveraging existing stakeholder outreach forums
  - 2) targeted outreach
Existing Stakeholder Outreach Forums (Ongoing)

- Technical Advisory Committees
- Regional Planning Working Groups
- SCAG’s Policy Committees

Attendants include representatives from the business/development sector; the environmental sector; local jurisdictions; and the general public.

Targeted Stakeholder Outreach (Ongoing)

- Key stakeholders by topics specific to the PEIR
  - E.g. Air Districts
- Meetings with public agencies and other interested stakeholders, upon request
- Stakeholder engagement opportunities will be ongoing throughout the development of the 2024 Draft PEIR
HIGHLIGHTS OF PRELIMINARY APPROACHES TO MAJOR COMPONENTS

Environmental Setting

• CEQA requirements
  • Typically, date of NOP release
  • CEQA allows Lead Agency discretion
• Proposing to select 2019 as baseline year
• Preliminary Considerations:
  • Stable and appropriate for regionwide environmental analysis
  • Data availability
  • Technical and modeling assumptions
• CEQA baseline year may vary depending on environmental resource areas
Environmental Impacts Analyses by Topics

- Structure and topics consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines
- Environmental Justice is not a CEQA impact area

### Environmental Topics Covered in the 2024 Draft PEIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agriculture &amp; Forestry Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology &amp; Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Service Systems</td>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analytical Themes

- Discuss Plan elements and other environmental-related SCAG work that could co-benefit the environment, where applicable
- Enhance interdisciplinary approach to analyzing environmental impacts
Examples of Interdisciplinary Approach

Mitigation Measures

• CEQA requirements
• SCAG has no authority or jurisdiction to require or implement project-level mitigation
• SCAG Mitigation Measures
  • Implemented by SCAG
• Project-Level Mitigation Measures
  • Implemented by local agencies or developers, as applicable
  • Useful for tiering
• Plan Design Features may also serve to mitigate potential environmental impacts of the Plan
Preliminary Consideration of Alternatives

• CEQA Requirements:
  • No Project Alternative
  • A range of reasonable alternatives
  • Meet most of the basic project objectives (Plan Goals and Objectives)
  • At least one needs to be environmentally superior

• Preliminary Alternatives:
  • No Project Alternative (Quantitative)
  • Intensified Land Use Alternative (Qualitative)

Next Steps

Public Release of NOP
Oct 17, 2022

30-Day Public Comment Period
Oct 17, 2022 - Nov 16, 2022

Preparation of the Draft PEIR
Winter-Fall 2023

Public Release of Draft PEIR
Fall 2023
(Within 30 days after Draft Connect SoCal 2024 release)

Draft PEIR Public Comment Period
Fall/Winter 2023

Public and Stakeholders Outreach and Consultation: Ongoing

Final PEIR
Spring 2024
THANK YOU!

For more information, please visit: https://scag.ca.gov/peir

For questions, please contact Karen Calderon at: (213) 236-1983 or via e-mail: ConnectSoCalPEIR@scag.ca.gov
RHNA Reform Updates

Ma'Ayn Johnson, AICP
Housing Program Manager

RHNA Reform

• During the 6th RHNA cycle, a number of issues were raised by jurisdictions and stakeholders, including:
  • Calculation of regional determination
  • Factors used to determine housing distribution in the methodology
  • Role of Connect SoCal household projections

• SCAG has committed to review these issues and facilitate conversations with HCD to reform RHNA
State RHNA Reform

• AB 101 (2019) requires the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to “develop a recommended improved RHNA allocation process and methodology that promotes and streamlines housing development and substantially addresses California’s housing shortage”

• Includes statewide stakeholder participation

• Limited to RHNA (Government Code 65584 through 65584.2)
  • Does not include zoning or housing element issues

• HCD must submit a report to the Legislature by December 31, 2023

California’s Housing Future 2040: The Next RHNA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March-May 2023</td>
<td>Public engagement process [<a href="mailto:CAHousingFuture2040@hcd.ca.gov">CAHousingFuture2040@hcd.ca.gov</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>Kickoff webinar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 13-May 5</td>
<td>HCD Online Survey (<a href="#">Link</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sounding Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Meetings/listening sessions with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>HCD update on progress to Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31</td>
<td>Final report due to Legislature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• It is unknown at this time how public comments letters would be considered outside of the March-May engagement period
• SCAG is working with its partners to determine more details so that we can reach out to stakeholders to develop our recommendations for approval by the Regional Council
Establishment of a **Technical Advisory Committee**

Following the February 2\(^{nd}\), 2023 approval of the RAMP Policy Framework by the Regional Council, SCAG will establish a Greenprint Technical Advisory Committee to advise on:

- SoCal Greenprint Tool’s Data Governance Standards
- Data Selection Criteria
- Process to Resolve Potential Divergent Perspectives on SoCal Greenprint Tool Data
- Data Policies & User Guidelines
- Data Parameters
Draft Data Policies for Consideration by TAC

- Data must be publicly available
- Data must be created, funded, used and/or developed in partnership with a government agency
- Data will not be shown as constraints on future development or growth
- Data will not be endorsed or adopted by the Regional Council as official policy of the agency
- Data elements will be regionally comprehensive

Structure of the Greenprint Technical Advisory Committee

TAC
At Least ONE REPRESENTATIVE from each of the following:

Caltrans
Each County Transportation Commission in the SCAG region
Each County Government in the SCAG region
City of Los Angeles and two other cities from each County in the SCAG region
Member of the environmental community with RAMP experience
Member of the business community
Greenprint TAC Solicitation Process

- For city representatives, other than the City of Los Angeles, Subregions will recommend members
- For counties with more than one Subregion, SCAG will ask those entities to come to consensus for their respective recommended members
- SCAG will send formal invitation letters to public agency leads including:
  - Caltrans District Directors
  - County Transportation Commission CEOs
  - Subregional Executive Directors
  - County Administrators
  - City of Los Angeles Planning Director
- Engage with GLUE Council to solicit applicants for Business Rep
- Engage with the Natural and Farm Lands Conservation Regional Planning Working Group to solicit applicants for Environmental Rep

TAC Application (Microsoft Form)

- All potential TAC members will be required to fill out a short application form to help gauge baseline understanding:
  - Experience developing and/or reviewing Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs)
  - Previous work in Regional Advance Mitigation
  - Experience using GIS and analyzing geographic data
- Applicants will be informed of Brown Act consistency actions
Timeline of this Effort

February 2, 2023
Regional Council approved the Regional Advance Mitigation Program (RAMP) Policy Framework and White Paper

EARLY 2023
Formation of the TAC; Procure consultant to complete the Greenprint

SPRING 2023
First convening of the SoCal Greenprint TAC

SPRING – SUMMER 2023
3 half-day TAC workshops on a monthly basis

FALL 2023
EEC/RC Consideration of Greenprint Data Policies

FALL/WINTER 2023
Complete & Release Greenprint Tool

For more information, please visit:
www.scaq.ca.gov/greenprint
www.scaq.ca.gov/ramp-atg

THANK YOU!