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KN Kevin Kane welcomed the participants to the session. Sarah Jepson, Planning Director, subsequently provided introductory remarks on Connect SoCal and the TWG outcome.

1. TWG Draft Charter

Kevin Kane presented the TWG Draft Charter. Discussion participants included Warren Whiteaker (OCTA), Nate Farnsworth (Yorba Linda), Sarah Jepson (SCAG), Nicolle Aube (Huntington Beach), Miles Mitchell (Los Angeles), and Candice Vander Hyde (City of Landcaster). This discussion incorporated topics regarding the focus, responsibilities, meeting time and location, and terms of membership.

2. Introduction to SCAG Regional Data Platform

Tom Vo presented an introduction to the SCAG Regional Data Platform. Discussion participants included Josh Lee (SBCTA), Warren Whiteaker (OCTA), Kevin Kane (SCAG), and Alexander Fung (SGVCOG). This discussion included insights on the RDP process; GIS license availability; and purpose and status of the LIST initiative.

3. SoCal Greenprint Update

Kimberly Clark presented an update of the SoCal Greenprint. Discussion participants included Gail Shiomoto-Lohr (City of Mission Viejo), Warren Whiteaker (OCTA), Helen Campbell (OPR), and Carrie Schloss (Nature Conservancy). This discussion comprised logistics on a review opportunity, background and specifics on data layers, and integration into state tools.

4. Connect SoCal 2020 Priority Growth Areas Recap

Lyle Janicek presented a recap of Connect SoCal’s 2020 Priority Growth Areas. Discussion participants included Deborah Diep (CDR/CSUF), Ed Mendoza (USC), and Helen Campbell (OPR). This discussion included remote work inclusion, GIS data availability, an industry sector breakdown, and 2024 plan updates.
5. Connect SoCal Data Sharing Protocol Discussion

Kimberly Clark initiated an ongoing discussion on Connect SoCal Data Sharing Protocol. Discussion participants included Warren Whiteaker (OCTA). This discussion comprised a comment on growth forecast guiding principles.

6. Connect SoCal 2024 growth forecasting and local jurisdiction input: Preliminary stages and target dates

Kevin Kane presented the Connect SoCal 2024 growth forecast and local jurisdiction input: Preliminary stages and target dates. Discussion participants included Josh Lee (SBCTA) and Deborah Diep (CDR/CSUF). This discussion comprised comments on the growth forecast and Local Input Process, timeline recommendations on projections, and coordination with subregional agencies.

7. Connect SoCal 2024 Subregional SCS Framework and Guidelines

Sarah Dominguez presented the Connect SoCal 2024 Subregional SCS Framework and Guidelines. Discussion participants included Warren Whiteaker (OCTA). This discussion comprised a clarification on MOU applicability and language.

8. TWG Agenda Outlook

Kevin Kane presented an outlook on the TWG agenda. Discussion participants included Deborah Diep (CDR/CSUF), Warren Whiteaker (OCTA), and Gail Shiomoto-Lohr (City of Mission Viejo). This discussion comprised of an update on Local Profiles, items related to the Racial Equity Action Plan, and understanding carbon neutrality with the SoCal Greenprint and future SCAG goals.
## 1. Land Use Authorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization Affiliation</th>
<th>7/15 Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Susan</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
<td>City of Anaheim</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Christina</td>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>City of Beaumont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung, Chris</td>
<td>Urban Planner</td>
<td>City of Garden Grove</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Lisa</td>
<td>Assistant City Manager</td>
<td>City of Garden Grove</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marino, Lee</td>
<td>Planning Services Manager</td>
<td>City of Garden Grove</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aube, Nicolle</td>
<td>Senior Analyst</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poynter, Marika</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
<td>City of Irvine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brindley, Karen</td>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>City of Lake Elsinore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De La Cruz, Larissa</td>
<td>Senior Manager Community Development</td>
<td>City of Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vander Hyde, Candice</td>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>City of Lancaster</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gable, Emily</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
<td>City of Los Angeles</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitzerow, Cheryl</td>
<td>Community Development Director</td>
<td>City of Mission Viejo</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimoto-Lohr, Gail</td>
<td>Interim Community Development Director/Planning Manager</td>
<td>City of Moorpark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez, Patrick</td>
<td>Director of Development Services</td>
<td>City of Needles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiva, Alberto</td>
<td>City Engineer</td>
<td>City of Needles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taggart, Megan</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>City of Palmdale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siques, Joaquin</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Transportation</td>
<td>City of Pasadena, Transportation Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzalez, Julia</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>City of Pico Rivera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champion, Siri</td>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td>City of Rialto Community Development Dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, David</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
<td>City of Riverside</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espinoza, Marco</td>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td>City of San Dimas</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquez, Gerardo</td>
<td>Associate Planner</td>
<td>City of San Fernando</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCann, Melanie</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
<td>City of Santa Ana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minh, Thai</td>
<td>Executive Director, PBA</td>
<td>City of Santa Ana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrell, Wayne</td>
<td>Director of Planning</td>
<td>City of Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Jimmy</td>
<td>Associate Planner</td>
<td>City of Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson, Sean</td>
<td>Deputy Environmental Services Director/City Planner</td>
<td>City of Simi Valley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnsworth, Nate</td>
<td>Planning Manager</td>
<td>City of Yorba Linda</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matlock, Benjamin</td>
<td>City Planner</td>
<td>City of Yucaipa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palacios, Aksel</td>
<td>Planning and Economic Development Deputy</td>
<td>Council District 15, City of LA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikstrom, Alexander</td>
<td>Transportation Planning Associate 2</td>
<td>LA DOT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glesne, Matt</td>
<td>Senior City Planning</td>
<td>Los Angeles City Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallini-Tipton, Conni</td>
<td>Senior City Planner</td>
<td>Los Angeles Department of City Planning</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, Miles</td>
<td>Sr. Management Analyst</td>
<td>Los Angeles Department of Transportation</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage, Jennifer</td>
<td>Assistant to the City Manager</td>
<td>San Clemente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Regional Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huddleston, Lori</td>
<td>Transportation Planning Manager</td>
<td>LA Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin, Nina</td>
<td>Tech Lead</td>
<td>LA Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti, Mike</td>
<td>Tech Lead</td>
<td>MWD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiteaker, Warren</td>
<td>Principal Transportation Analyst</td>
<td>OCTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Josh</td>
<td>Chief of Planning</td>
<td>SBCTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fung, Alexander</td>
<td>Senior Management Analyst</td>
<td>SGVCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fagan, Amanda</td>
<td>Director of Planning &amp; Sustainability</td>
<td>Ventura County Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Chris</td>
<td>Deputy Executive Director</td>
<td>WRCOG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Regulatory and Coordinating Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, Helen</td>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td>California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San, Tina</td>
<td>Associate Transportation Planner</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struhl, Mine</td>
<td>Office Chief, Complete Streets and Climate Change</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuerpe, Michael</td>
<td>Senior Analyst</td>
<td>San Bernardino LAFCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, Sang-Mi</td>
<td>Program Supervisor</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. Field Experts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diep, Deborah</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>CDR/CSUF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaman, Ruby</td>
<td>Center for Demographic Research</td>
<td>CSUF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodnyanskys, Seva</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Occidental College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendoza, Eduardo</td>
<td>Population Dynamics RG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karpman, Jason</td>
<td>UCLA Luskin Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Neill, Moira</td>
<td>Associate Research Scientist</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Martha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2024 Regional Growth Forecast and Expert Panel Update

Beth Jarosz, Population Reference Bureau

Kevin Kane, PhD, SCAG

September 30, 2021
Purpose and Overview

- Recent and past demographic and economic trends
- Key future assumptions
- Reflect local, regional, state, and national policy

- 2024 RTP/SCS
- Roughly 30-year forecast
- Input to travel demand models
- Underpinning of many regional performance measures

Must forecast reasonably foreseeable future growth, and reflect ambitious yet achievable plan strategies.
Four key forecast scales

**SCAG Region**
(19 million people, 38,000 square miles)

**6 SCAG Counties**
(Average size: 3.1 million people, 6,400 square miles)

**197 SCAG Jurisdictions**
(Average size: 85,000 people, 196 square miles)

**Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ)-level growth**
(Median: 1,200 people, 0.22 square miles)

Source: Connect SoCal, 2016. Area includes non-urbanized land.
Key steps to a forecasted regional development pattern

1. Preliminary Regional Growth Forecast
2. Local Data Exchange & Small Area Growth Forecast
3. Forecasted Regional Development Pattern
4. Regional Stakeholder Outreach, Strategy, & Policy Development
SCAG’s Regional Economic-Demographic Forecast Process

- Base year population
- Domestic (+) in-migration (-) out-migration
- (+) Net international migration
- (+) Natural Increase (births – deaths)
- Residential Population
- (+) Group quarters population
- Total population

Adjustment

Total Employment Projection
- Labor force demand
- Labor force supply
- Labor force participation rate

Total Households
- Household formation (headship) rate
Trends Affecting the Forecast for the SCAG Region
Panel of Experts

- Experts in economics, demography, and housing
- Pre-meeting survey
- Two 3-hour discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billy Leung</td>
<td>Regional Economic Models, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hamilton</td>
<td>California Lutheran University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Diep</td>
<td>Cal State Fullerton, Center for Demographic Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowell Myers</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Nickelsburg</td>
<td>UCLA Anderson Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Husing</td>
<td>Economics &amp; Politics, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weeks</td>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Schniepp</td>
<td>California Economic Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bracken</td>
<td>Development Management Group, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richelle Winkler</td>
<td>Michigan Technological University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Choi</td>
<td>Chung-Ang University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somjita Mitra</td>
<td>California Dept. of Finance, Economics Research Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Walrod</td>
<td>Orange County Business Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Schwarm</td>
<td>California Dept. of Finance, Demographic Research Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results: Over the next 30 years what trend do you expect for SCAG region jobs, population, and households...

...relative to historical SCAG region trends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Slower</th>
<th>Equal/No Change</th>
<th>Faster</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results: Over the next 30 years what trend do you expect for SCAG region jobs, population, and households…

...relative to national trends?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Slower</th>
<th>Equal/No Change</th>
<th>Faster</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCAG Region Share of U.S. Jobs

Source: CCSCE
Population growth rates have been falling, dipped below zero in SCAG region.

Percent Change in Population from Prior Year

Sources: California Department of Finance, U.S. Census Bureau
What will population growth rates be in the future? CA DOF and U.S. Census Bureau projections show slowing growth.

Sources: California Department of Finance, U.S. Census Bureau
Population growth has been slower than predicted in the 2020 RTP

Sources: SCAG, California Department of Finance, U.S. Census Bureau
But number of households is closer to projection (implying smaller households, on average)

SCAG Region Households

- 2020 RTP
  6,333,458
- 2020 Census
  6,257,617

Sources: SCAG, California Department of Finance, U.S. Census Bureau
SCAG region population is aging.

SCAG Population Age Structure, 2010 and 2020

Most population growth 2010-2020 is at ages 55 and older.

Population under age 25 has been shrinking.

Source: PRB analysis of California Department of Finance Estimates and Projections
Household formation changes through the life course...

Household Headship Rates, SCAG Region, 2015-2019

Source: PRB analysis of American Community Survey data from IPUMS
... and also with economic and social trends.

Household Headship Rates, SCAG Region, 2005-09, 2015-19

2 takeaways:
- There’s a backlog of unmet demand for housing.
- An aging population may shift demand and offset stable or declining population.

Source: PRB analysis of American Community Survey data from IPUMS
Memorandum

Date: August 16, 2021
From: Beth Jarosz, PRB
To: SCAG Community, Economic, and Human Development Committee
Subject: Considerations in Projecting SCAG Region Employment, Population, and Households to 2050 as informed by the Demographic Panel of Experts

In two sessions held on August 5, 2021 and August 11, 2021, SCAG convened a forecast Panel of Experts to review trend predictions and assumptions for the regional growth forecast. Panelists included economists and demographers representing industry, academia, and government. (See Table 1.) The panel also included expertise across each of the six SCAG counties. Two outside experts, Beth Jarosz of the Population Reference Bureau and Steve Levy of the Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy, moderated along with SCAG staff.

Table 1: List of Panelists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billy Leung</td>
<td>Regional Economic Models, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hamilton</td>
<td>California Lutheran University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Diep</td>
<td>Cal State Fullerton, Center for Demographic Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowell Myers</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Nickelsburg</td>
<td>UCLA Anderson Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Husing</td>
<td>Economics &amp; Politics, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Weeks</td>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Schniepp</td>
<td>California Economic Forecast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bracken</td>
<td>Development Management Group, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richelle Winkler</td>
<td>Michigan Technological University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Choi</td>
<td>Chung-Ang University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somjita Mitra</td>
<td>California Department of Finance, Economics Research Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Walrod</td>
<td>Orange County Business Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Schwarm</td>
<td>California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the panel meetings, panelists participated in a pre-meeting survey to solicit expectations about future growth. Results from both the survey and meeting discussions are summarized below.
What follows is a brief summary of key themes on jobs, households, and population growth. More detailed panelist responses regarding input assumptions will be included alongside the preliminary growth forecast as it is developed.

Background Data
Before the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the rate of population growth had been slowing in the SCAG Region, reflecting broader demographic trends statewide, nationwide, and globally. (See Figure 1.) Looking ahead, projections from the U.S. Census Bureau and California Department of Finance (DOF) suggest that population growth will continue slowing in the coming three decades, with DOF showing that SCAG region population may peak before 2050.

Figure 1: Slowing Rate of Population Growth in SCAG Region, California, and U.S.

![Graph showing percent change in population from prior year from 1990 to 2020 for SCAG, California, and United States.]

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Projections (Vintage 2017); California Department of Finance, Population Projections (Vintage 2017 and 2021).

The panel of experts expect the SCAG region population to age considerably in coming decades. Figure 2 shows the age structure in 2020 (black outline bars) compared to the age structure in 2010 (gray bars). The shrinking bars at the bottom of the population pyramid reflect a declining child population. For example, the population ages 0-4 in 2020 is smaller than it was in 2010. This changing age structure is consistent with more than a decade of falling birth rates regionally and nationally. The region’s age structure will be an important factor for migration, mortality, labor force participation, and household formation in the coming decades.
Figure 2: SCAG Region Population Age Structure Suggests Continued Population Aging

Source: California Department of Finance, Population Projections (Vintage 2021).

While population growth has slowed steadily, housing production has typically been cyclical. (See Figure 3.) Housing permits peaked at just over 160,000 per year in the 1980s, fell dramatically in the wake of the Great Recession, and have rebounded to 40,000-50,000 per year in recent years.
Figure 3: Housing Permits Peaked at 160,000 in the 1980s and Are Considerably Lower in Recent Years

Source: SCAG analysis of CIRB Building Permit Data

While population growth has slowed in the SCAG region, high labor force participation rates have allowed for robust job growth to continue. The region has maintained a stable share of jobs relative to the nation. (See Figure 4.)
What effects will slower population growth and population aging have on the labor force and job growth? How might housing supply affect migration into or out of the SCAG region? Will job growth continue to attract migrants to the region from other parts of the U.S. and worldwide, or will housing cost concerns lead people to move elsewhere? These questions formed the basis of discussion at the Panel of Experts meetings.

**Job Growth**

In the pre-meeting survey, panelists were divided in their expectations about future job growth. When asked, “Over the next 30 years, what trend do you expect for SCAG region jobs, population, and households...” relative to SCAG region trends and national trends, panelists leaned toward slower growth, but there was no clear consensus for the expected direction.

When asked to discuss the region’s competitive advantages and disadvantages, the panel listed numerous advantages, including being a hub of innovation—as evidenced by the region’s considerable share of national venture capital funding, growth in high-tech sectors, and world-class institutions of higher education. They also noted the region’s quality of life, amenities, and welcoming culture as a draw for both population and jobs. In addition, panelists noted that the port and proximity to the Pacific Rim will continue to be advantages for the region. The region
also enjoys size advantages: a large labor market and consumer market as well as diversity across economic sectors.

Among disadvantages, panelists noted the region’s high cost of housing/cost of living, regulations and taxation, and other regions’ efforts to lure away California companies and workers. Panelists also noted some skills and education mismatches between workers and jobs as well as an increasing bifurcation of the workforce, and that it would be important for the region to invest in education to help reduce those gaps.

Regarding industry-specific predictions, panelists were optimistic about high tech and innovation sectors (especially artificial intelligence, automation, and space travel), fulfillment and distribution, and skilled manufacturing. They were pessimistic about retail.

We asked panelists about their expectations for labor force participation rates (LFPR). The general consensus among the panelists was that total labor force participation will continue to be higher in the SCAG region relative to the U.S. as a whole. Reasons for this include the need for multiple incomes within a household to support a relatively high cost of living. In addition, the region has a relatively high share of immigrants, who tend to have higher LFPR. A combination of better health and (for some) low savings is likely to increase LFPR at older ages. Panelists expect women’s labor force participation to increase, especially at older ages, and women’s LFPR could increase further with childcare-supportive policies. Panelists also thought that automation, including automated transportation, was more likely to cause shifts across industries rather than overall decreases in jobs or the labor force.

**Housing and Household Growth**

In the pre-meeting survey, most panelists reported that they anticipate slower household growth. When asked “Over the next 30 years what trend do you expect for SCAG region jobs, population, and households...” relative to SCAG region trends and relative to national trends, panelists leaned strongly toward slower growth. But panelists noted that household formation is both a demographic and economic process. Housing production could rise to address latent demand—and thus increase the rate of household formation, or could remain low—and thus constrain household formation. Panelists also noted that water resources could be a constraint to future housing production, but that there are innovations (such as reuse and desalination) that could meet future demand.

At several points throughout the discussion, panelists noted that the region’s high housing costs could be a drag on future growth. The overall sentiment was that if the region does not build enough housing, price differentials relative to the U.S. will worsen, which will reduce population growth—through lower net domestic and international migration as well as lower birth rates. If that trend occurs, it could reduce the region’s economic growth.

Several panelists expected that statewide housing policies or innovations would eventually change the trend, resulting in more housing production. Experts did not reach consensus on an
expected future level of growth—expectations ranged from 40,000-100,000 units per year. But all agreed that a level of housing production equivalent with that of the most recent decade (thought to not be keeping pace with demand) could help staff frame a “low” forecast scenario.

**Population Growth**

In the pre-meeting survey, panelists reported strong expectations of slowing population growth. When asked “Over the next 30 years what trend do you expect for SCAG region jobs, population, and households...” relative to SCAG region trends and relative to national trends, panelists were unanimous in expecting population growth slower than the region’s historical average. In addition, most panelists expected growth slower than the national average.

Population change occurs through three processes: births, deaths, and migration. We asked panelists to provide their expectations on each factor.

Panelists expect birth rates to be very low through 2022 and expect the region’s total fertility rates to eventually stabilize between 1.5-2.0 births per woman. Those rates would be higher than other high-income countries but considerably lower than historical levels. Some panelists noted that future state or federal policies to support childcare might impact family formation and labor force participation, however, the overall effect on population growth was not clear.

Panelists were generally pessimistic about future improvements in life expectancy, suggesting that the wave of increased mortality that has been occurring nationwide is “just getting started” in California. Panelists also indicated that divergent outcomes by socioeconomic status remain a challenge for the region, state, and nation.

Panelists generally expect that international migration is likely to remain fairly robust. Despite policy uncertainty at the federal level, the SCAG region is a historically strong landing point for immigrants with a strong and diverse job base—including the reliance on immigration for the region’s labor force. These factors suggest that international migration to the region will continue to be strong.

Within the international migration discussion, panelists noted that the mix of origin countries is changing and will continue to change. Panelists expect considerably less migration from Mexico and more from China and India as well as continued flows from Central and South America. Panelists also noted that countries in Africa (Kenya, South Sudan, Eritrea, Nigeria) may account for a bigger flow of migrants—but east coast destinations may be more likely initial destinations for those migrants. Shifts in international migration may also affect birth rates.

Panelists suggested that housing cost and job growth will play a leading role in net domestic migration but did not agree on expected future levels.
2024 Forecasted Regional Development Pattern and Local Data Exchange

Process and Timeline

Kevin Kane, PhD
Department of Sustainability
September 30, 2021
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Outline

• Statute and purpose
• Previous, Connect SoCal 2020 cycle
• A Proposed Update
• Discussion questions
• Possible data layers
• Next steps
Statute and Purpose

- California Government Code 65080(b)(vii)

“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 (viii) allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7506).”

- Regional goals:
  - Technically sound
  - US EPA – Air quality conformity
  - CA ARB – Greenhouse gas emissions
Key steps to a forecasted regional development pattern (September 2021 CEHD)

1. Preliminary Regional Growth Forecast
2. Local Data Exchange (LDX) & Small Area Growth Forecast
3. Forecasted Regional Development Pattern
4. Regional Stakeholder Outreach, Strategy, & Policy Development
Connect SoCal 2020 – Key Steps

Regional and County Growth Forecast (July 2017)

Includes land use data, additional data, and preliminary small area growth forecast. Met one-on-one with all 197 local jurisdictions. Resulted in reduced household growth and increased employment growth, but within initial ranges.

SCS Scenario Development (2019)
Jurisdiction-level growth from local input maintained. TAZ-level growth reallocated based on priority and constraint areas. Five scenarios: Trend/Baseline, Existing Plans/Local Input, Networked destinations, Dynamic Centers, and Accelerated tomorrow.

Draft Growth Vision (by November 2019)
Hybrid of scenarios used for draft RTP/SCS. Land use yielded 1.3% GHG reduction compared to baseline.

Additional Local Review and Final Growth Vision (by September 2020)
Prior to September 2020 final plan adoption, two additional rounds of local review of TAZ-level growth conducted upon request from local jurisdictions & other stakeholders.
2024 Plan Key Steps – A Proposed Update

Regional and County Growth Forecast (January 2022)

Local Data Exchange (LDX) Soft Launch (January 2022)
- Includes land use data, contextual/other data, and data layers reflecting growth concepts from last plan.
- Uses SCAG Regional Data Platform – trainings, general/subregional outreach.

Preliminary Small Area Growth Forecast
- SCAG allocates household and employment totals to the jurisdiction and TAZ levels.
- Allocation integrates 2020 Connect SoCal priority growth areas; consideration of new trends/requirements.

LDX Complete Launch (May 2022)
- Includes preliminary small area growth forecast
- Complete outreach; one–on–one with each jurisdiction to link local and regional visions
- Target due date: October 31, 2022

Draft Forecasted Regional Development Pattern (2023)
Additional Discussion Questions

• How can we ensure the process is transparent?

• How can we ensure a locally-adjusted regional vision meets regional targets?

• What guardrails or rules should be applied to ensure meaningful input to SCAG processes?
  • How can we ensure general plans, housing elements, and entitlements are assessed equally from one jurisdiction to another?

• Which other data layers may be improved by local review?

• What support might local staff need?
## Discussion of potential Data/Map Book Layers for Local Data Exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Additional Growth Information</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Resource Areas</th>
<th>Geographical Boundaries</th>
<th>Growth (available May 2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For review and update</td>
<td>For review and update</td>
<td>For information only</td>
<td>For information only</td>
<td>For corrections only</td>
<td>For review and update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan</td>
<td>Job Centers</td>
<td>Major Transit Stops and HQTAs (2045, RTP20)</td>
<td>Open space &amp; park</td>
<td>City boundary &amp; sphere of influence</td>
<td>Household forecast (jurisdiction/TAZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Neighborhood Mobility Areas</td>
<td>TPAs (2045, RTP20)</td>
<td>Endangered species &amp; plants</td>
<td>Census tract</td>
<td>Employment forecast (jurisdiction/TAZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan</td>
<td>Green Region Areas</td>
<td>Bikeways</td>
<td>Flood areas &amp; Coastal inundation</td>
<td>Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) boundaries</td>
<td>Population forecast (jurisdiction/TAZ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use</td>
<td>RHNA/Housing element update?</td>
<td>Truck routes</td>
<td>Natural Community &amp; Habitat Conservation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Entitled Projects?</td>
<td>Regionally–significant plan investments?</td>
<td>Regionally–significant plan investments?</td>
<td>Farmland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black – layers used in 2020 Connect SoCal
Red – new layers for discussion or potential consideration – may be deployed as well.
Next Steps

• “Guiding principles” at next TWG
• Regional forecast uncertainties exercise at November CEHD
• RDP platform launch

**We are looking for your feedback beyond this meeting as well. Please feel free to provide via email to kane@scag.ca.gov.**
Introducing the **Regional Data Platform**...

**Project Goals**

1. Facilitate stronger local planning by providing modern tools and best practices to assist with General Plan Updates

2. Streamline the process of collecting and integrating data from member agencies to SCAG to enhance regional planning

Supporting *regionally aware* local planning
And *locally informed* regional planning

For a more cohesive and sustainable region...
Discover, access, request assistance, engage
regionally

Analyze, design, plan, publish

Learn, engage (locally)

Planning Tools

Engagement Tools

External Data Sources (e.g. CPAL, FEMA)

Public, Partners, Stakeholders

Cities & Counties

Developers & Other Data Stakeholders

Data Integration

Regional Hub

Discover, access, request assistance, engage (regionally)

Planning Tools

Analyze, design, plan, publish

Engagement Tools

Learn, engage (locally)

Local Data Exchange

Contribute, review, update, manage data

LEGEND

Geospatial Infrastructure
Planning & Engagement Tools
Data Orchestration
External Systems
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The RDP Delivers Powerful Data and Tools
...Supporting Planning and Data Sharing Workflows Across Jurisdictions

Accessible Data and Information
Regional Hub
SoCal Atlas

SCAG Regional Data Platform (RDP)

Planning & Engagement Tools
HELPR
Parcel Explorer

General Plan Update Initiative Templates

Data Sharing Tools & Workflows
Local Data Exchange

Empowering planners and residents... To create more sustainable communities
**Regional Hub**

Provides one-stop access to data, tools, and information as well as a platform for two-way engagement. Features and capabilities include:

- Rich content catalogue with data, maps, apps, policy resources, and more
- “Planner’s Corner” full of planning-specific resources
- Public and private access
- Collaboration workspace for regional programs and initiatives *(coming soon)*
- Ability to request one-on-one technical assistance from SCAG

**SoCal Atlas**

A web-based experience allowing member agencies, other regional stakeholders, and the general public to explore data, statistics, and maps across topics and geographies.
HELPR
Provides the ability to evaluate which parcels within a jurisdiction may have potential for residential development based on parcel attribute information and recommended filters.

Parcel Locator
A self-service resource for planners, residents, or other stakeholders (such as developers) to find and discover rich information about specific parcels.

Local General Plan Update Site (template)
A ready-to-use template for web-based General Plans for use by Member Agencies to communicate and engage with residents around their General Plan update.

Off-the-Shelf Planning & Engagement Tools
Esri products, provided to member agencies, along with resources, templates, and best practices to support a broad range of common planning and resident engagement workflows. This includes Business Analyst Web, ArcGIS Urban, and ArcGIS Pro.
Local Data Exchange (LDX) Tools

Available January 2022

LDX Website
A central location for member agencies and other stakeholders to access data sharing tools and related Local Data Exchange resources, view information and statistics on the state of data in the region and request technical assistance from SCAG.

Data Editor
A web-based application for jurisdictions and other key stakeholders to explore, review, and update/comment on data shared with SCAG through the Local Data Exchange process for their jurisdiction.

Data Sharing
Additional mechanisms for member agencies to provide data to SCAG as part of the Local Data Exchange process, including GIS data file upload and sharing an approved plan in ArcGIS Urban.

Data Reviewer
A workflow allowing member agencies to review and approve edits to data within their jurisdiction before edits are sent to SCAG and incorporated to the regional layers.
What's next?

**LAUNCH**

Available November 2021
- Regional Hub
- SoCal Atlas
- HELPR
- Parcel Locator
- Local General Plan Initiative Templates
- Off-the-shelf Planning & Engagement Tools

Available January 2022
- LDX Website
- LDX Data Editor
- LDX Data Sharing
- LDX Reviewer

User Testing with Pilot Jurisdictions
- Incorporate testing feedback
- Finalize and deploy

Pilot Jurisdictions
- City of Barstow
- City of Fullerton
- City of Long Beach
- City of Los Angeles
- City of Pico Rivera
- City of Ventura
- County of San Bernardino
- County of Imperial

- Ongoing pilot testing for Local Data Exchange Rollout
- Training resources for RDP users
- One-on-one technical assistance for member agencies through SCAG LIST program
THANK YOU

Javier Aguilar, SCAG RDP Project Manager: aguilarg@scag.ca.gov
Tom Vo, SCAG RDP Business Lead: vo@scag.ca.gov
Jonathan Holt, SCAG RDP Tech Lead: holt@scag.ca.gov

Caitlin Smith, Esri RDP Project Manager: csmith@esri.com
Witt Mathot, Esri RDP Tech Lead: wmathot@esri.com
Maddie Haynes, Esri RDP Deputy Tech Lead: mhaynes@esri.com
Priority Development Areas (PDAs)
Formerly Priority Growth Areas (PGAs)

Lyle Janicek
Associate Regional Planner, Sustainability
9/30/2021
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• Areas within one half mile of an existing or planned fixed guideway transit stop or a bus transit corridor where buses pick up passengers at a frequency of every 15 minutes (or less) during peak commuting hours.

• A high-quality transit corridor (HQTC) is defined as a corridor with fixed route bus service containing service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours (based on CA Public Resources Code Section 21155(b)).
NMAs are defined by 4 measures at the Tier 2 TAZ level:

- Intersection density
  - number of intersections per square mile
- Low-speed streets,
  - length of < 32mph streets per TAZ area
- Land use entropy, mixing measure of residential, “destinations,” and amenities/open space in each TAZ
- Accessibility, number of (1) apparel retailing (2) restaurants and (3) grocery stores within 1-mile using street-network distances

Monrovia/Duarte Parcels within Neighborhood Mobility Areas as identified in SCAG’s HELPR tool.
Past Concepts to Consider for 2024 Connect SoCal: Job Centers

- 2016 Data (for 2020 Plan)
- Areas with significantly higher employment density than surrounding areas.

- These were identified at the following scales:
  - fine (1/2 km)
  - medium (1 km)
  - coarse (2 km)

- to capture locally significant job centers. In total, over 70 subareas throughout the region are identified as having peak job density.
Past Concepts to Consider for 2024 Connect SoCal: Spheres of Influence

- Existing or planned service areas within the planning boundary outside of an agency’s legal boundary, and outside of absolute or variable constrained areas
- Data for these areas was accessed by SCAG from each county’s Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) in 2016.
New Concepts: 15 Minute City

- Similar to NMAs, 15-Minute Communities focus on ideal geographies where most human needs and many desires are located within a travel distance of 15 minutes.

- Geospatial based assessment of parcels that are within 5 minute walking distance, 15 minute walking distance, and 15 minute bike distances of everyday necessities.
Mobility Hubs are whole communities that feature a convenient mix of travel choices, safer streets, and supporting amenities. Mobility Hubs help people get to and from transit services while making it easier to make shorter trips without relying on a car.

A fully connected network of regional Mobility Hubs ensures seamless connections to major work, school, shopping, and leisure destinations using transit and other methods of transportation.

The primary goal of mobility hubs is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT), while achieving these objectives:

- Connected Mobility
- Climate Action
- Equitable Mobility
- Exceptional Experience
- Value
- Safety
Other PDAs to Explore

Other Recommendations from TWG?
Next Steps for 2024 Connect SoCal

- Further investigate current PDA options and other recommendations from TWG
- Prepare recommendations for November TWG Meeting with modified and applicable PDAs
- Prepare timeline to incorporate and analyze data for potential feedback from local jurisdictions
- Continue to review input data, and assess methodology for defining areas that prioritize growth
Any Questions?

Lyle Janicek
Janicek@scag.ca.gov

www.scag.ca.gov
California Public Records Act Requirements

- California Office of the Attorney General: “Access to information about the conduct of the public’s business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in the state”
- Public records in the California Public Records Act are defined as “any writing containing information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used, or retained by any state or local agency regardless of physical form or characteristics”
- Writing is defined as “any means of recording information including paper, audio tape, video tape, compact disc, DVD, computer diskette, computer hard drive, etc”
- SCAG has traditionally viewed final data products as public records
California Public Records Act Requirements (Con’t)

- Sections 6254 and 6255 provide exceptions related to SCAG’s work:
  - Preliminary drafts, notes, or interagency or intra-agency memoranda that are not retained by the public agency in the ordinary course of business, if the public interest in withholding those records clearly outweighs the public interest in disclosure.
  - If withholding records, the agency shall justify that action by demonstrating the record is exempt or that the public interested is served better by not disclosing.
  - Requests for “curated” & original data that need processing can be rejected:
    - If produced and shared, however, this information becomes disclosable.
  - Data with personal identifiable information (PII).
- For electronic records, specifically:
  - Records must be provided in electronic format used by the agency if requested.
  - Software developed by the government is not disclosable.
  - Data housed in protected software may still be disclosable.

Source: California Office of the Attorney General
## Public Records Act Practices and Limitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permissible Practices</th>
<th>Impermissible Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing final datasets &amp; modeling inputs from Connect SoCal</td>
<td>Restricting sharing of Connect SoCal final datasets &amp; modeling inputs to certain types of requestors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking information requests, including data elements and volunteered background information from requestors (affiliation, etc.)</td>
<td>Requiring background information from requestors, or denying access to disclosable records based on requester’s intended usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving requests made orally or in writing; it is recommended that agencies confirm oral requests in writing</td>
<td>Requiring that requests be made in writing, including mandatory use of a “data request form”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmatively assisting the public in focusing requests, and helping the public to overcome any physical barriers to access</td>
<td>Rejecting requests if not “specific or focused” enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing guidance on data &amp; use limitations</td>
<td>Requiring user agreements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Office of the Attorney General
Public Records Act Timing

• After a request is made, agencies have 10 days to:
  • Provide the requested records promptly
  • Determine if it will comply with the request
  • Notify the requestor of its determination

• Agencies may extend this period up to 14 days to make a determination:
  • Communicate with field offices
  • Communicate with others who have an interest in the records
  • Construct computer reports
  • Examine voluminous records

• Agencies may recover costs when required to:
  • Print copies (including pro-rata cost of duplication equipment & operation)
  • Extract or compile data
  • Undertake programming to produce data

Source: California Office of the Attorney General
Proposed Data Distribution Protocol for Connect SoCal

- Commonly requested data elements will continue to be posted to SCAG’s Open Data Portal
- SCAG will be evaluating additional data items to include
- Any final data elements not posted will be accessible via public records request (e.g. Connect SoCal TAZ-level Growth Projections)
- SCAG will provide guidance and limitations on usage of data, consistent with the previous model data usage agreement, the Connect SoCal Growth Forecast Principles, etc.
- SCAG will monitor requests and usage of data elements, and will regularly report back on requests to the TWG & impacted jurisdictions
- Requests for “curated” and original data will be evaluated for fulfillment based on resources & other considerations
Connect SoCal Growth Forecast Guiding Principles

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The below guiding principles form the basis for developing the plan growth forecast:

1. Connect SoCal will be adopted at the jurisdictional-level, and directly reflects the population, household and employment growth projections that have been reviewed and refined with feedback from local jurisdictions through SCAG's Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process. The growth forecast maintains these locally informed projected jurisdictional growth totals, meaning future growth is not reallocated from one local jurisdiction to another.

2. Connect SoCal's growth forecast at the Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) level is controlled to not exceed the maximum density of local general plans as conveyed by jurisdictions, except in the case of existing entitlements and development agreements. TAZ-level growth projections are utilized by SCAG for regional modeling purposes and are not adopted as part of Connect SoCal nor included as part of the Forecasted Regional Development Pattern. The Forecasted Regional Development Pattern for Connect SoCal reflects the policies and strategies of the Plan and includes existing entitlements and development agreements conveyed by jurisdictions, as depicted in the Connect SoCal Sustainable Communities Technical Report.

3. For the purpose of determining consistency with Connect SoCal for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), grants or other opportunities, lead agencies such as local jurisdictions have the sole discretion in determining a local project's consistency; SCAG may also evaluate consistency for grants and other resource opportunities; consistency should be evaluated utilizing the goals and policies of Connect SoCal and its associated Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). However, TAZ-level growth projections for households, employment or population reflected in TAZ Maps may not be utilized to determine consistency or inconsistency with Connect SoCal.'

4. TAZ-level data or any data at a geography smaller than the jurisdictional-level has been utilized to conduct required modeling analyses and is therefore advisory only and non-binding, given that sub-jurisdictional forecasts are not adopted as part of Connect SoCal. TAZ-level data may be used by jurisdictions in local planning as they deem appropriate, and Connect SoCal does not supersede or otherwise affect local jurisdiction authority or decisions on future development, including entitlements and development agreements. There is no obligation by a jurisdiction to change its land use policies, General Plan, or regulations to be consistent with Connect SoCal.

5. SCAG will maintain communication with agencies that use SCAG's subjurisdictional-level data to ensure that the "advisory and non-binding" nature of the data is appropriately maintained.
2016 RTP/SCS Model and Forecast Data Request Form

- Requests information on:
  - Requesting entity
  - Organization type
  - Data elements needed
  - Purpose of request & intended usage of data
  - Is this a SCAG Project?
  - Data years needed
  - Preferred method of delivery (hard drive, excel, TransCAD)

(included for reference)
2016 RTP/SCS Model Data Usage Agreement

• Requests information on:
  • Requesting entity
  • Organization type
  • Data elements needed
  • Purpose of request & intended usage of data

• Conveys restrictions on:
  • Access & use
  • Citation requirements
  • Disclaimer of liability and hold harmless agreement

(included for reference)
Thank You

Kimberly Clark
c Clark@scag.ca.gov
What is a Greenprint?

A tool to help users make better land use and transportation infrastructure decisions and support conservation investments based on the best available scientific data.
Goals of the SoCal Greenprint

- Implement Connect SoCal
- Balance growth with conservation
- Accommodate infrastructure while protecting natural resources
- Address the lack of consistent, regional data and tools
- Better prioritize lands for mitigation investments
- Resource for our member agencies and stakeholders
## What a Greenprint is and is not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT IT IS</th>
<th>WHAT IT IS NOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A data tool that can help to advance the pace and scale of voluntary conservation in a region.</td>
<td>An acquisition map or regulatory plan that puts constraints on land use for any public or private entity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A data tool that identifies landscape features that are important to residents and communities, like recreation, habitat, water resources, habitat, climate change resiliency or community.</td>
<td>A complete inventory of everything important within an area or new data set.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A data tool that illustrates how conservation values may work in concert with each other and with other values, like climate resilience.</td>
<td>A comprehensive solution for natural resource protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A resource that helps stakeholders understand factors in a specific area to help facilitate collaboration.</td>
<td>A requirement that stakeholders engage in projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An information tool to support data-driven decision making for infrastructure investments.</td>
<td>An effort to subvert private property rights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Vetting Criteria

• Data must be publicly available, meaning that existing datasets are available online or can be accessed if requested and/or licensed;

• Data was vetted for inclusion by science advisors; and,

• Data would support decision-making from the five key user groups identified through the planning process (planners, infrastructure agencies, developers, community-based organizations, and conservation organizations) based on suggestions and feedback from Science and Strategic Advisors.
Pre-July 1 Outreach Activities - Overview

- Steering committee includes outside experts
- 60+ advisors/4 interactive workshops
  - Multiple sectors and diverse geographies
  - Public agencies and municipalities
  - Building and development community
- Ongoing conversations and small working groups
- 8 Rapid assessment interviews
- Developed 6 user profiles
- Consultation with SCAG's Regional Planning Working Groups
On July 1st, 2021 the Regional Council voted to pause implementation on the SoCal Greenprint for at least 30 days and to hold a public hearing for further discussion, permitting staff to engage in further outreach with stakeholders.

Outreach since Pause Implementation:
• Proposed Data Layer List Survey
• August 24th Public Hearing
• Presentations to TWG and GLUE Council
• One-on-One Stakeholder meetings
Summary of Proposed Data Layer List Survey

- Stakeholders invited to take survey: 4,200+
- Survey respondents: 33
- Comments on individual data layers: 69
- Data layers commented on: 45
Summary of Proposed Data Layer List Survey:
Data Layer Feedback by Data Theme

- **Agriculture and Working Lands**: 9 comments
- **Built Environment**: 4 comments
- **Environmental Justice, Equity and Inclusion**: 8 comments
- **Habitat and Biodiversity**: 26 comments
- **Vulnerabilities and Resilience**: 12 comments
- **Water Resources**: 4 comments
- **Context**: 6 comments

*n=69 comments

Note: Respondents were invited to submit comments on one or more data layers*
Summary of Proposed Data Layer List Survey:
Data Layer Feedback

Survey Question: "Please provide any comments or feedback you have on this data set."

75% of comments were generally supportive of the data layer(s)

13% of comments offered suggestions to improve the data layer(s) or consider additional data

9% of comments were neutral with respect to the data layer(s)

3% of comments expressed concern over the data layer(s)

0% of comments requested exclusion of the data layer(s)

n=69 comments
Note: Respondents were invited to submit comments on one or more data layers
Summary of Proposed Data Layer List Survey: Sentiment on Project Goal

Survey Question: "... Do you have any questions or concerns about the goal of the SoCal Greenprint?"

- 0% of respondents expressed concern about the goal of the project
- 12% of respondents expressed concern over pausing or not completing the project
- 53% of respondents expressed no concern about the goal of the project
- 18% of respondents expressed other concerns about the project

n=17 respondents
Note: Not all survey respondents provided an answer to this question; n includes 3 null responses
Survey Question: "If you have any concerns about the SoCal Greenprint, please share those concerns."

- 27% of respondents expressed concern over the data content.
- 47% of respondents expressed concern over pausing or not completing the project.
- 13% of respondents expressed other concerns.
- 13% of respondents expressed no concern.

n=15 respondents
Note: Not all survey respondents provided an answer to this question.
Survey Question: "... would the SoCal Greenprint be useful to your work?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Respondents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67%</td>
<td>Useful: the SoCal Greenprint would be useful in my workflow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Useful: could be useful to my colleagues and partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Useful: I would not use the SoCal Greenprint, but have no concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Have Concerns: I need to learn more to decide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Have Concerns: I have concerns about the SoCal Greenprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n=30 respondents
Note: Not all survey respondents provided an answer to this question; n includes 2 null responses
Frequently Cited Questions, Comments and Concerns In Survey and Letters Provided to SCAG in lieu of Survey

1. Land use authority & general plans inclusion
2. Data Alignment
3. Intergovernmental Review Program (IGR)
4. Dataset use
5. Specific datasets
6. Inoperable/misdirected links
7. Project timeline
8. Consultant selection
9. Connect SoCal Mitigation Measures
10. Pertinence of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
Proposed Next Steps to Address Stakeholder Concerns

• Consideration of removal and/or replacement of certain data layers

• Consultation with SCAG's Technical Working Group (TWG) on data layers considered to remove/replace

• Scientific and Strategic Advisory Committee Consultation for final Data Layer List

• User Acceptance Testing

• Development & Inclusion of Disclosure Language

• Continued public outreach

• Return to Regional Council and Provide Regular Updates to SCAG's Energy and Environment Policy Committee
Thank you!
California Air Resources Board – SB150 Reporting

September 30, 2021

www.scag.ca.gov
CARB SB150 Reporting – Why & When

- SB150 requires that CARB prepare report for the Legislature every four (4) years reporting on progress implementing SB375
- Last report prepared in 2018
- Next report is due fall 2022
- MPOs to report on progress made, best practices, & challenges
Attachment A

- Data on planned investments (2016 & 2020 RTP/SCS info, FTIP investment totals)
- Usage of SB 375 CEQA provisions in the region
- Confirming modeled data for the current RTP/SCS
CARB SB150 Reporting – What’s included?

Attachment B

- New or revised strategies included Connect SoCal
- Info on implementation of the plan - e.g., SCP and REAP funding programs
- Challenges confronting the region & how we’re addressing
- Describing how the State’s policies and programs could be more supportive of our efforts to implement the SCS

Attachment C

- CARB proposed metrics for the report. Most are carryovers from 2018 report.
- CARB staff have identified external data sources for most & have indicated where they intend to use MPO reporting
Questions? Comments?
2022 SB 150 Report Data Request for MPOs

Attachment A: Data Request

California Air Resources Board (CARB) staff requests that you review and provide information to complete the attached data spreadsheet to support our reporting under SB 150. Your assistance on this data request will help to support indicators CARB staff have identified for its SB 150 work as well as confirm your MPO’s scenario assumptions to which we intend to compare monitoring data. (See Attachment C for the list of metrics CARB staff are working on.)

We ask that you submit this information to SustainableCommunities@arb.ca.gov as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2021.

Data Spreadsheet

Please review the attached spreadsheet and fill in blank cells. Please provide comments if further clarification is needed.

The spreadsheet contains four tabs:

- “READ ME” includes instructions and contact information.
- “Basic Plan Data” serves to confirm basic information such as the base and horizon year of your most recent Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- “Spending Data” addresses the investment portfolio in the RTP and TIP.
- “SCS Adopted Scenario Data” serves to collect your base year and modeled horizon year values.
Attachment B: Interview Sheet

To support our work on SB 150 (Allen, 2017), California Air Resources Board (CARB) staff invites your input on the following questions. We would be happy to receive your input in writing and/or via a virtual interview.

If you would like to submit your answers in writing, we request that you email them to SustainableCommunities@arb.ca.gov by September 30, 2021.

If you would like to schedule a virtual interview with CARB staff, please contact Caitlin Greenway at caitlin.greenway@arb.ca.gov as soon as possible, but no later than September 7, 2021.
Changes to Regional SCSs and Implementation

As you develop responses for the following two questions, please consider strategies under the following categories: *Land Use and Housing; Transportation Infrastructure and Network; Local and Regional Pricing; and Electric Vehicle Support and New Mobility.*

1. Since 2018, has the region adopted, or is it considering changes to, the strategies in its SCS that contribute to meeting its SB 375 greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets? Are changes in the form of new strategies, changes to the intensity of existing strategies, or some combination of both? What have been the main drivers of these changes?

2. Since 2018, has the region changed its approach to supporting its SCS strategies’ implementation (e.g., changes to the region’s policies, funding, technical assistance, land use designations)? If yes, why, and what have been the major drivers?

Challenges and Best Practices for Regional SCS Implementation

3. What would you characterize as the top challenge areas to implementing the strategies in the region’s SCS? Please select all that apply to the region and add under each category other known challenges that are not included in this list.

- **Land Use and Housing**
  - Getting local jurisdictions engaged on the SCS land use vision
  - Getting local jurisdiction plans to align with the SCS land use vision
  - Neighborhood opposition blocking development that aligns with the SCS land use vision
  - Local jurisdictions approved developments that do not align with the SCS land use vision
  - Development barriers (e.g., slow permit processing, high fees, CEQA)
  - Lack of infrastructure (e.g., water, sewer, etc.) to support development in preferred areas identified in the SCS
  - Lack of developer interest in building efficient development types in the region
  - Other:
Transportation Infrastructure and Network

☐ Funding for public transit capital is less than projected
☐ Funding for public transit operations is less than projected
☐ Funding for active transportation is less than projected
☐ Transportation projects in the SCS are not selected for award in competitive funding programs
☐ Funding is limited due to competitive nature around funding requirements
☐ Transportation projects that were not previously prioritized in the SCS are now prioritized for funding ahead of projects that would have resulted in greater GHG reduction benefits
☐ Low success rates or low public interest in incentives offered for use of alternatives to solo driving
☐ Other:

Local and Regional Pricing

☐ Lack of funding for pilots
☐ Local opposition to new transportation pricing fees
☐ Other:

Electric Vehicle Support and New Mobility

☐ Lack of applicable and/or quantitative research on GHG reduction methods
☐ Local/neighborhood opposition to new mobility services
☐ Lack of coordinated contracting with private companies
☐ Lack of funding for pilots
☐ Safety concerns
☐ Other:

4. Are there any solutions or actions that the region has taken to address these challenges that you would characterize as innovative or a best practice? If yes, what are your thoughts about scalability and being able to replicate the practice in other regions of the state?
Effect of State Policies and Funding on Regional SCS Implementation

5. Since 2018 there have been a number of changes to State policy and funding efforts and we want to better understand whether and how these have affected your ability to implement the region’s SCS and attain SB 375 GHG emissions reductions.

For each of the program or policies listed below, please identify how it has impacted your region’s ability to meet SB 375 GHG emission reduction targets.

Please rank each item with:

1. Supportive
2. Somewhat Supportive
3. Not Supportive
   NA - Not Applicable
   Unsure

### Land Use and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Transportation Infrastructure and Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local and Regional Pricing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Electric Vehicle Support and New Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Based on your answers above, tell us more specifically about which State efforts have been most helpful to support the region’s SCS implementation.

7. What could the State consider doing differently through the above policies and/or funding programs to better support SCS implementation?

8. Beyond existing programs, what additional policies, authority, funding availability, or technical assistance would be helpful to address the challenges you have identified? Who do you think would be best positioned to implement them?
Attachment C: Proposed Data Metrics for 2022 SB 150 Report

The following table shows the series of metrics CARB staff anticipate including in the 2022 SB 150 report to the Legislature tracking progress on SCS implementation. CARB staff anticipate reporting these metrics at the statewide and MPO level, and in some cases by California’s priority populations identified by SB 535 and AB 1550. The data sources are listed for each.

Grayed rows indicate new metrics that CARB staff are researching for inclusion in the 2022 report and that were not reported on in the 2018 SB 150 report.

CARB has identified external data sources for most items but is requesting MPO assistance in the items identified below, for which we are intending to use MPO reporting. These are requested as part of Attachment A.

As MPOs review the metrics, please consider the following questions:

Are there metrics for which you would like to provide caveats for interpretation?

Are there other metrics that you can provide data for that would better convey changing regional conditions and the progress made in the region’s SB 375 SCS implementation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have greenhouse gases from personal vehicle travel declined?</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GHG/VMT per Capita</td>
<td>HPMS/BOE/CEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How have other factors influenced personal vehicle travel?</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Prices</td>
<td>OPIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate and Available Jobs</td>
<td>EDD, DOF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Ownership</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How have travel patterns changed?</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commute Mode Share</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute Trip Travel Time by Mode, Including for Low-Income and Unincorporated Areas</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commute Mode Share for Priority Populations</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commute Trip Travel Time for Priority Populations</td>
<td>ACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Transit Ridership per Capita                     | NTD    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What transportation choices are available?</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit service hours per capita</td>
<td>NTD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lane miles built

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are investments shifting toward more sustainable transportation choices?</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in Long-Term Spending Plans by Mode</td>
<td>MPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Short-Term Spending Plans by Mode</td>
<td>MPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Transit Operations Spending</td>
<td>MPO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**California Climate Investments Funding program areas that tie to SCS strategies**

**California Climate Investments Detailed Dataset**

**California Climate Investments Funding program areas that tie to SCS strategies for Priority Populations**

**California Climate Investments Detailed Dataset**

### How has new housing supply changed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Homes Built by Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs-Housing Balance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### What are the impacts of housing costs on California households?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Cost Burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Trends and Displacement Risk within California</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How are local jurisdictions planning and permitting home construction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Jurisdictions with a Certified Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units Permitted Compared to Regional Housing Needs Allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Is growth more compact?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Land Lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Conservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Are we building neighborhoods that are accessible to daily needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commute Mode Share (Walk / bike to work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Access to multiple destinations (park, school / university, hospital, retail, transit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Access to multiple destinations for Priority Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Access to multiple destinations (employment, hospital, retail)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2022 SB 150 Report – MPO Data Request
Attachment C: Proposed SB 150 Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Footprint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Access to multiple destinations for Priority Populations</td>
<td>Urban Footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population within 1/2 mile of transit</td>
<td>Urban Footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Priority Populations communities within 1/2 mile of transit</td>
<td>Urban Footprint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. VMT included in 2018 SB 150 Report, but not at the individual MPO level. State audit requested this information.

2. Priority Populations includes both Low-Income under AB 1550 and Disadvantaged Communities under SB 535)

3. Percentage of Population Living Near a Grocery Store was provided as part of the 2018 SB 150 report. However, since updated data is unavailable this metric will not be included in the 2022 SB 150 report.
**Attachment A: Data Request**

California Air Resources Board (CARB) staff requests that you provide information to complete the attached data spreadsheet to support our reporting under SB 150.

Your assistance on this data request will help to support indicators CARB staff have identified for its SB 150 work, as well as, confirm your MPO's scenario assumptions to which we intend to compare monitoring data.

We ask that you submit this information to SustainableCommunities@arb.ca.gov ASAP, but no later than **September 30, 2021**.

If you have any questions, please email the question or a request for a phone call to SustainableCommunities@arb.ca.gov.

---

**Data Spreadsheet**

Please review the following tabs and fill in blank cells. Please feel free to provide a comments as necessary if further clarification is needed.

The workbook contains these four tabs:

1. **“READ ME”** includes instructions and contact information.
2. **“Basic Plan Data”** serves to collect basic information such as the base and horizon year of your most recent Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
3. **“Spending Data”** addresses the investment portfolio in the RTP and TIP.
4. **“SCS Adopted Scenario Data”** serves to collect your base year and modeled horizon year values.
Please provide the information listed on this sheet. Please note that years provided are only examples and should be tailored to your MPO.

**Basic Plan Information (Indicator 3A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Transportation Plans</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Previous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTP Plan year</td>
<td>2018*</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars (Year of Expenditure, or year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Year (transportation investments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Improvement Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Improvement Programs</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Previous #1</th>
<th>Previous #2 (earlier)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIP year</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollars (Year of Expenditure, or year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SB 375 Incentives and Consistency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB 375 Incentives and Consistency</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have lead agencies in the region utilized SB 375 CEQA incentives?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, how was the project determined to be consistent with the SCS? (standards, criteria, etc.)

* This column should show your current adopted SCS. If you would prefer to use your upcoming draft instead, feel free to update the data.
Please provide the dollar figures on this sheet after reviewing column descriptions. Subtotals will be automatically generated. Where detail is not available, feel free to overwrite subtotal formulas with the appropriate amount. Please also review notes about data sources and interpretation at the bottom of the page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Spending by Mode ($ millions YOE)</th>
<th>RTP Planned Spending</th>
<th>RTP Planned Spending within SB 375 Time Period</th>
<th>Previous RTP Planned Spending</th>
<th>Programmed Spending</th>
<th>Previous Programmed Spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Current RTP</td>
<td>Current RTP (Base year - 2020)</td>
<td>Current RTP (Base year - 2035)</td>
<td>Total Previous RTP</td>
<td>Current TIP including amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Investment</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Highways Total</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Capacity Expansion</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General purpose / Other</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Road Capacity Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and Highway Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Total</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Capital</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Operations²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Total</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike, Pedestrian, and Active Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Total</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Systems Management / Transportation Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Support Focused Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicle Infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Mobility (TNCs, CAVs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Please include any spending that will occur during the TIP time period that was planned in the RTP but was not included in the TIP (e.g., locally-funded road maintenance).
2. Please define Operations as defined by the National Transit Database.

We are planning to include these notes related to the assignment of your plan into these spending categories. Please correct them if necessary and add any additional notes that we should include.
Please confirm or correct the modeled information listed on this sheet for your currently adopted SCS. This information will serve as a point of comparison for the observed metrics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Plan Base Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GHG per capita (lb/person/day)¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT per capita (mi/person/day)²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Boarding (passenger-ridership/year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household vehicle ownership (# of vehicles/HH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total developed acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential developed acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial developed acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rate (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units (DU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family housing units (DU)³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family housing percentage (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family housing units (DU)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family housing percentage (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transit Network**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Plan Base Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All transit stations and stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units within 1/4 mile of transit stations and stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units within 1/2 mile of transit stations and stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employment within 1/4 mile of transit stations and stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employment within 1/2 mile of transit stations and stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transit stations and stops in TPA⁴**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>Plan Base Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total households within 1/4 mile of transit stations and stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households within 1/2 mile of transit stations and stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employment within 1/4 mile of transit stations and stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employment within 1/2 mile of transit stations and stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. GHG per capita means GHG emissions from SB375 light-duty vehicles per person per day. Unit is lb/day/person. Formula: \[ \text{GHG} = \frac{(\text{Total II & IX/XI GHG})}{(\text{Total Pop- Group quarter})} \times 2000 \text{ (lbs/ton)} \]

2. VMT per capita means vehicle-miles traveled from SB 375 light-duty vehicles per person per day. Unit is mile/day/person. Formula: \[ \text{VMT per capita} = \frac{(\text{Total daily II & IX/XI VMT})}{(\text{Total Pop- Group quarter})} \]

3. Single-family housing units include single-family detached and single-family attached housing

4. "TPA" here refers to areas with transit frequency < 30 minutes; please provide information in this section if possible
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)  
*Revised for use in developing the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2024 RTP/SCS)*
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I. INTRODUCTION

Codified in 2009, California’s Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (referred to as “SB 375”), calls for the integration of transportation, land use, and housing planning, and establishes the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as part of the regional planning process. SCAG, working with the individual County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) and the subregions within the SCAG region, is responsible for complying with SB 375 in the Southern California region. Success in this endeavor is dependent on the collaboration of SCAG with a range of public and private partners throughout the region.

Briefly summarized here, SB 375 requires SCAG as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to:

- Submit to the State every four years, a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The SCS, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve the State-determined regional GHG emission reduction target, if it is feasible to do so.
- Prepare an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) that is not part of the RTP if the SCS is unable to meet the regional GHG emission reduction target.
- Adopt a public participation process involving all required stakeholders.

Unique to the SCAG region, SB 375 provides that “a subregional council of governments and the county transportation commission may work together to propose the sustainable communities strategy and an alternative planning strategy, if one is prepared pursuant to subparagraph (I), for that subregional area.” Govt. Code §65080(b)(2)(D).

In addition, SB 375 provides that SCAG “may adopt a framework for a subregional sustainable communities strategy or a subregional alternative planning strategy to address the intraregional land use, transportation, economic, air quality, and climate policy relationships.” Id.

Finally, SB 375 requires SCAG to “develop overall guidelines, create public participation plan pursuant to subparagraph (F), ensure coordination, resolve conflicts, make sure that the overall plan complies with applicable legal requirements, and adopt the plan for the region.” Id.

The intent of this Subregional Sustainable Communities Strategy Framework and Guidelines (also referred to herein as the “Framework and Guidelines” or the “Subregional Framework and Guidelines”) is to facilitate a subregion’s option to develop the SCS (and potential APS) as described in SB 375. The Framework and
Guidelines offers SCAG’s subregional agencies the highest degree of autonomy, flexibility, and responsibility in developing a program and set of implementation strategies for their subregional areas while still achieving the goals of the regional SCS.

Subregional strategies should address the issues, concerns, and future vision of the region’s collective jurisdictions with the input of the widest range of stakeholders. This Framework and Guidelines establishes guidance to assist in the development of subregional strategies and sets forth SCAG’s role in facilitating and supporting the subregional effort with data, tools, and other assistance. Note that the Framework and Guidelines herein may be administratively amended, at any time, subject to changes in applicable federal and/or state planning laws, regulations, and guidance.

II. ELIGIBILITY AND PARTICIPATION

The option to develop a subregional SCS (and APS, as appropriate) is available to any subregional council of governments.

CTCs play an important and necessary role in the development of a subregional SCS. Any subregion that chooses to develop a subregional strategy will need to work closely with the respective CTC in its subregional area in order to identify and integrate transportation projects and policies. Beyond working with CTCs, SCAG encourages partnership efforts in the development of subregional strategies, including partnerships between and among subregions.

For the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2024 RTP/SCS) cycle, subregional agencies should indicate to SCAG, in writing by Friday, October 29, 2021, if they intend to exercise their option to develop their own subregional SCS (see other major milestones for the 2024 RTP/SCS attached here as Appendix A.)

Subregions that choose to develop an SCS for their subregional area shall do so in a manner consistent with the most current version of this Framework and Guidelines. The subregion’s decision to prepare the subregional SCS for their area must be communicated through formal action of the subregional agency’s governing board or the agency’s designee. Subsequent to receipt of any subregion’s decision to develop and adopt an SCS, SCAG and the subregion will develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The final executed version of the MOU shall be consistent with the Framework and Guidelines, and may be amended during the process, if necessary.

III. FRAMEWORK

The Framework portion of this document covers regional objectives and policy
A. SCAG’s Goals

In complying with SB 375, SCAG's goals include:

- Update the 2024 RTP/SCS with an emphasis on documenting the region’s progress in implementing the strategies and actions described in the 2020-2045 SCS, Connect SoCal.
- Demonstrate continued reasonable progress in implementing the 2020 RTP/SCS.
- Prepare an SCS that will achieve the targets set for cars and light trucks as determined by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).
- Fully integrate SCAG’s planning processes for transportation, growth, land use, housing, and the environment.
- Seek areas of cooperation with the subregions, CTCs, and any local jurisdictions that go beyond the procedural statutory requirements, but that also result in regional plans and strategies that achieve co-benefits.
- Build trust by providing an interactive, participatory, and collaborative process for all stakeholders. Provide for the robust participation of local jurisdictions, subregions, and CTCs in the development of the SCAG regional SCS and facilitate the development of any subregional SCSs and/or APSs.
- Ensure that the SCS adopted by SCAG and submitted to CARB reflects the region’s collective growth strategy and the shared vision for the future.
- Develop strategies that incorporate and are respectful of local and subregional priorities, plans, and projects.
- Incorporate the goals and policies reflected in regional resolutions adopted by the SCAG Regional Council including but not limited to Resolution 20-623-2\(^1\) declaring racism a public health crisis, Resolution 21-628-1 on Climate Change Action\(^2\) and Resolution 21-629-2\(^3\) to bridge the digital divide in underserved communities.

B. Flexibility, Targets and Adoption

Subregions may develop an appropriate strategy to address the region’s GHG goals, the intent of SB 375, and the GHG targets for the SCAG region as established by CARB. Subregions may employ any combination of land use policy change, transportation policy, and transportation investment, within the specific parameters described in the Guidelines.

---

\(^1\) [https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/rcresolution206232_0.pdf?1605039926](https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/rcresolution206232_0.pdf?1605039926)


SCAG will not issue subregional GHG or any other subregional performance targets.

C. Outreach Effort and Principles
In preparing a subregional SCS, subregions are required to conduct an open and participatory process that allows for public and stakeholder input. A more detailed discussion on outreach effort and principles can be found in Section IV.A(3).

D. Communication and Coordination
Subregions developing their own SCS are strongly encouraged to maintain regular communication with SCAG staff, the respective CTC, their jurisdictions and other stakeholders, and other subregions if necessary, to review issues as they arise and to assure close coordination. Mechanisms for ongoing communication should be established in the early phases of strategy development.

E. Planning Concepts
SCAG, its subregions, and member cities have established a successful track record on a range of land use and transportation planning approaches up through and including planning approaches that are reflected in Connect SoCal, the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS. The subregional SCS should consider the 2020-2045 RTP/SCS and build off from its policies and concepts, including emphasis on the Core Vision and Key Connections. Statutory requirements are further discussed in Section IV.A(1).

IV. GUIDELINES
These Guidelines describe specific parameters for the subregional SCS/APS effort under SB 375, including process, deliverables, data, documentation, and timelines. As described above, the Guidelines are created to ensure that the SCAG region can successfully incorporate strategies developed by the subregions into the regional SCS, and that the region can comply with its own SB 375 requirements. Failure to proceed in a manner consistent with the Guidelines could result in SCAG not accepting a subregion’s submitted strategy.

A. Subregion Role and Responsibilities
(1) Subregional Sustainable Communities Strategy
Subregions may choose to exercise their option under SB 375 to develop and adopt a subregional Sustainable Communities Strategy. That subregional strategy must contain all required elements, and follow all procedures, as described in SB 375 and outlined below:

(i) identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building
intensities within the subregion;
(ii) identify areas within the subregion sufficient to house all the population of the sub-region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the RTP taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation and employment growth;
(iii) identify areas within the subregion sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the subregion pursuant to Section 655844;
(iv) identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the subregion;
(v) gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the subregion as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 65080.01;
(vi) consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581;
(vii) set forth a forecasted development pattern for the subregion, 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 CARB; and
(viii) allow the RTP to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7506).

[Government Code §65080(b)(2)(B).]

SCAG strongly encourages that the subregion participates and partners in SCAG’s growth forecasting process to ensure that any recommendations or insights are included in the development process. In preparing the subregional SCS, the subregion and respective CTC should consider feasible strategies, including local land use policies, transportation infrastructure investment (e.g., transportation projects), and other transportation policies such as Transportation Demand Management (TDM) (which includes pricing), and Transportation System Management (TSM) strategies. Subregions need not constrain land use strategies considered for the SCS to current General Plans. In other words, the adopted strategy need not be fully consistent with currently adopted local General Plans. If the land use assumptions included in the final subregional SCS depart from General Plans, it is recommended that subregions include a finding as part of their adoption action (e.g., adopting resolution) that concludes that the land uses are feasible and may be implemented. Technological measures may be included if they can be demonstrated to exceed measures captured in other state and federal requirements (e.g., AB 32 Scoping Plan).

Subregions will need to provide additional information to facilitate the CARB

4 Note that the 6th cycle of the regional housing needs assessment (RHNA) (wherein SCAG allocated the regional housing need as determined by the Department of Housing and Community Development) aligned with the 2020 RTP/SCS and that the next RHNA cycle (7th cycle) will align with the 2028 RTP/SCS.
Strategy-Based SCS Evaluation Process as documented in the CARB Final Sustainable Communities Strategy Program and Evaluation Guidelines. The strategy-based SCS Evaluation Process consists of the following four components: Tracking Implementation (SB 150), Policy Commitments, Incremental Progress, and Equity. These four components evaluate RTP/SCS strategies that are classified into four broad categories:

1. Land use and housing;
2. Transportation;
3. Local/regional pricing; and
4. New mobility

The information and data necessary for this evaluation includes land use and transportation system characteristics as well as performance indicators for 2005, the RTP/SCS base year, 2020, 2035 and the RTP/SCS horizon year.

Land Use Characteristics include:

- Residential densities (total regional and by place type or sub-regional geography as defined by the MPO)
- Employment densities (total regional and by place type or sub-regional geography as defined by the MPO)
- Total regional housing product type/mix (single-family/multi-family)
- Total regional developed acres
- Total housing units and employment within ½ mile of a High-Quality Transit Station

Transportation System Characteristics include:

- Lane miles of roadway by functional classification
- Transit headways
- Transit operation miles
- Transit service hours
- Class I, II, and IV bike lane miles
- Average toll rate/congestion pricing per unit

Performance Indicators include:

- Household vehicle ownership
- Mode split
- Average travel time by mode

---


6 See pg. 31-34 of CARB Final Sustainable Communities Strategy Program and Evaluation Guidelines (above link) for further details
• Transit ridership
• Average vehicle trip length
• Seat utilization or Load factor
• Household VMT (external-external [XX] trips excluded)
• per capita VMT (external-external [XX] trips excluded)

(2) Subregional Alternative Planning Strategy

SB 375 provides regions and subregions the option to further develop an APS, according to the procedures and requirements described in SB 375, if the combined regional SCS does not meet GHG emission reduction targets established by CARB. If the regional SCS does not meet the targets, subregions will be involved in the formation of an APS - either through their development of a subregional APS or through their participation and contribution in SCAG’s regional APS. SCAG will not require subregions to complete a subregional APS; delegated subregions opting to complete their own subregional APS must first complete a subregional SCS. Written records reflecting the feedback between local jurisdictions and delegated subregions on the development of a regional or subregional APS must also be submitted to SCAG.

Subregions are encouraged to focus their efforts on feasible measures that can be included in an SCS. Any timing or submission requirements for a subregional APS will be determined based on further discussions. If a subregion opts to prepare an APS, the content of a subregional APS should be consistent with state requirements (See Government Code §65080(b)(2)(I)), as follows:

(i) Shall identify the principal impediments to achieving the subregional sustainable communities strategy.
(ii) May include an alternative development pattern for the subregion pursuant to subparagraphs (B) to (G), inclusive.
(iii) Shall describe how the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets would be achieved by the alternative planning strategy, and why the development pattern, measures, and policies in the alternative planning strategy are the most practicable choices for achievement of the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.
(iv) An alternative development pattern set forth in the alternative planning strategy shall comply with Part 450 of Title 23 of, and Part 93 of Title 40 of, the Code of Federal Regulations, except to the extent that compliance will prevent achievement of the regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the CARB.
(v) For purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (Division 13 (commencing with Section 21000) of the Public Resources Code), an alternative planning strategy shall not constitute a land use plan, policy, or regulation, and the inconsistency of a project with an alternative planning strategy shall not be a consideration in determining whether a project may have an environmental effect.
(3) Subregional SCS Outreach

SCAG shall fulfill all of the statutory outreach requirements under SB 375 for the regional SCS/APS, which will include outreach regarding any subregional SCS/APS. SCAG’s Public Participation Plan will incorporate the outreach requirements of SB 375, integrated with the outreach process for the 2024 RTP/SCS development. See Section IV.C(2) below for more information on SCAG’s public participation plan.

In preparing a subregional SCS, subregions are strongly encouraged to design and adopt their own outreach processes that mirror the requirements imposed on the region under SB 375. Subregional outreach processes should reinforce the regional goal of full and open participation, and engagement of the broadest possible range of stakeholders.

Subregions that elect to prepare their own SCS are encouraged to present their subregional SCS (and potential APS), in coordination with SCAG, at all meetings, workshops and hearings held by SCAG in their respective counties. Additionally, the subregions are encouraged to either provide SCAG with their mailing lists so that public notices and outreach materials may also be posted and sent out by SCAG; or coordinate with SCAG to distribute notices and outreach materials to the subregions’ stakeholders. Additional outreach may be performed by subregions.

(4) Subregional SCS Approval

The governing board of the subregional agency and the respective CTC board (at their option) shall approve the subregional SCS prior to submission to SCAG. SCAG recommends that the governing board of the subregion adopt a resolution approving the subregional SCS with a finding that the land use strategies included in the subregional SCS are feasible and based upon consultation with the local jurisdictions in the respective subregion. Subregions should consult with their legal counsel as to compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In SCAG’s view, the subregional SCS (and potential APS) is not a “project” for the purposes of CEQA because the RTP, which will include the regional SCS is the actual “project” that will be reviewed by SCAG under state law for environmental impacts pursuant to CEQA. As such, the regional SCS, which will include the subregional SCSs and is part of the RTP, will undergo a thorough CEQA review.

In accordance with SB 375, subregions are strongly encouraged to work in partnership with the CTC in their area. SCAG can facilitate these arrangements if needed.

(5) Incorporation of the Subregional SCS into the Regional SCS

The regional RTP/SCS, of which the SCS is a component, is required to be internally consistent. Therefore, for transportation investments included in a subregional SCS to
be valid, they must also be included in the corresponding RTP/SCS. As such, subregions will need to collaborate with the respective CTC in their area to coordinate the subregional SCS with future transportation investments.

SCAG shall include the subregional SCS for the subregion in the regional SCS to the extent consistent with SB 375 and federal law and approve the sustainable subregional alternative planning strategy, if one is prepared for that subregional area to the extent it is consistent with SB 375.

More information on SCAG’s subregional SCS incorporation process is included below in Section IV.C(4)

(6) Data Standards

Subregions will be required to submit subregional SCSs in GIS-based format, with data elements identified in Section IV.A(1) broken down to small area level (in a fashion specified by SCAG for each element, to be established through consultation with the subregion during the MOU process). This will enable SCAG to better integrate subregional submissions with the regional SCS and will allow subregions to prepare alternative scenarios if they so choose. SCAG will provide tools, and necessary training, free of charge for subregions and jurisdictions. Tools and training related to SCAG’s Regional Data Platform (RDP) are available and additional functionality will be released through early 2022. See Section IV.C(10) below for more information.

SCAG will distribute draft data to subregions and local jurisdictions via the region-wide local agency data validation process for the 2024 RTP/SCS. More information regarding the data development process is discussed below in Section IV.C(9).

(7) Documentation

Subregions are expected to maintain full and complete records related to the development of the subregional SCS, and to use the most recent adopted local general plans and other locally approved planning documents. Subregions should also keep records of all electronic, in-person, and written feedback from local jurisdictions on the development of the socioeconomic estimates and projections for the SCS and the base land use data required for consideration in the development of the subregional SCS (and APS as appropriate).

(8) Implementation Monitoring

Delegated subregions for the 2024 RTP/SCS will be required to provide progress reporting on the implementation of policies included in their subregional SCS. SCAG

7 “Base land use data” consists of local general plan land use, zoning, existing land use, planned entitlements, recent demolitions, and other resource areas datasets required for consideration in the development of an SCS as described in section 65080 of SB 375
will, likewise, monitor implementation of the regional SCS. This information will assist SCAG in preparing future plan updates and is consistent with SCAG’s intended approach for developing the 2024 RTP/SCS, which will emphasize progress reporting, monitoring and updating. The intent is for SCAG to ensure that progress and success for our subregions and local jurisdictions are documented and recognized.

To monitor implementation, subregions should track subsequent actions on policies and strategies included in the subregional SCS. Monitoring should be focused on policy actions taken (e.g., General Plan updates) or subsequent planning work performed.

While subregions have substantial discretion within the overall goal of ascertaining progress of adopted plan policies and strategies, reporting should be done at least prior to the end of the four-year planning period. SCAG staff plans to conduct implementation monitoring for the region and will lead the effort for any necessary data-intensive exercise and technical analysis, with assistance from subregions and local jurisdictions.

Further guidance on implementation monitoring including required format and timing will be developed through further discussion and documented in MOUs with delegated subregions.

(9) Timing

An overview schedule of the major milestones of the 2024 RTP/SCS process is attached herein as Appendix A, which may be further delineated or adjusted in MOUs with delegated subregions.

B. County Transportation Commissions’ Roles and Responsibilities

Subregions that develop a subregional SCS will need to work closely with the CTCs in their respective subregional area in order to coordinate and integrate transportation projects and policies as part of the subregional SCS, as it is the role of CTCs to make transportation planning decisions. As discussed above (under “Subregional Sustainable Communities Strategy”), any transportation projects identified in the subregional SCS must also be included in the associated RTP/SCS in order to be considered as a feasible strategy. SCAG can help to facilitate communication between subregions and CTCs.

C. SCAG Roles and Responsibilities

SCAG’s roles in supporting the subregional SCS development process are as follows:
(1) Preparing and adopting the Framework and Guidelines

SCAG will update these Framework and Guidelines for adoption by the SCAG Regional Council each RTP/SCS cycle in order to assure regional consistency and the region’s compliance with law.

(2) Public Participation Plan

SCAG will assist the subregions by developing, adopting and implementing a regional Public Participation Plan and outreach process with stakeholders. This process includes consultation with congestion management agencies, transportation agencies, and transportation commissions; as well as holding public workshops and hearings. SCAG will also conduct informational meetings in each county within the region for local elected officials (members of the board of supervisors and city councils), to present the draft SCS (and APS, as appropriate) and solicit and consider input and recommendations.

(3) Technical Methodology

As required by SB 375, prior to the start of the public participation process, SCAG will prepare and submit to CARB a description of the technical methodology it intends to use to estimate GHG emissions from the SCS. SCAG will work with CARB on this methodology until CARB concludes that the technical methodology operates accurately. Estimated GHG emissions will be analyzed at the regional level.

(4) Incorporation, Modification and Conflict Resolution

SCAG will accept and incorporate the subregional SCS, unless (a) it does not comply with SB 375 (Government Code Section 65080 et seq.), (b) it does not comply with federal law, or (c) it does not comply with SCAG’s Subregional Framework and Guidelines.

For incorporation in the regional RTP/SCS, SCAG may adjust subregional growth totals, jurisdictional totals, and land use data at the sub-jurisdictional level for a number of reasons including compliance with statutory requirements, adherence with SCAG’s expertly-informed growth projections and growth forecast process, compliance with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7506) and assurance that SCAG’s regional SCS meets the regional GHG targets. Specifically, the thresholds for SCAG to adjust subregional SCS data are as follows:

- Jurisdictional growth totals: for purposes of adhering to regional and county level growth projections
- Jurisdictional (within County) or Sub-jurisdictional land use data (within jurisdiction): for purposes of complying with the federal Clean Air Act or meeting SCAG’s regional GHG targets.
The intent of this provision is to allow SCAG to maintain flexibility in preparing the regional SCS to meet federal and/or state requirements. In the event that SCAG indicates the need to alter the location and distribution of population, household, and employment growth for delegated subregions, SCAG staff will work directly with delegated subregions to review any proposed revisions through a collaborative and iterative process. First, SCAG staff will meet with the subregional staff to outline the incorporation issues (jurisdictional, sub-jurisdictional, or both). The subregion will identify and propose solutions to the issue. Feedback will be sought to gauge the availability of growth capacity at the local level, and adjustments will be made to the highest extent possible based on input received, with consideration of the goal to fulfill SCAG’s statutory requirements and GHG emission reduction targets. Delegated subregions will need to seek input from local jurisdictions on any potential revision to sub-jurisdictional growth estimates and projections and will need to keep records of all feedback on these figures or the base land use data for the 2024 RTP/SCS. Delegated subregions, however, will not be required to revise their SCS to reflect any such revisions.

The development of a subregional SCS does not exempt the subregion from other regional GHG emission reduction strategies not directly related to land use included in the regional SCS. All regional measures needed to meet the regional target will be subject to adoption by the SCAG Regional Council.

The draft regional SCS, including incorporated subregional SCSs, is subject to a public review process, potential revisions, and final adoption by the SCAG Regional Council.

SCAG will develop an MOU with each subregion to define a process and timeline whereby subregions would submit a draft subregional SCS to SCAG for review and comments, so that any inconsistencies may be identified and resolved early in the process. SCAG will also establish a conflict resolution process as part of the MOU between SCAG and the subregion to address the potential modification or adjustments that may occur during the incorporation process. This process will be the same for all delegated subregions.

(5) Modeling

SCAG currently uses an Activity Based Model (ABM) and CARB’s Emission Factor (EMFAC) model for emissions purposes. SCAG will compile and disseminate performance information on the preliminary regional SCS and its components in order to facilitate regional dialogue.

(6) Regional Performance Measures.

Below is a general description of the process for developing and finalizing formal Performance Measures.
SCAG is in the process of compiling two complete lists of performance measures and monitoring: one will be used for evaluating regional-level scenarios in support of development of the 2024 RTP/SCS. The other will be used for monitoring implementation of the 2020 RTP/SCS. The monitoring of implementation may include, for example, tracking local general plan updates, specific plan adoption in Transit Priority Areas, active transportation plan adoption, and housing element compliance. Building on the foundation of the performance measures developed in support of the 2020 RTP/SCS, the 2024 RTP/SCS performance measures will also include the set of federally designated MAP-21 performance measures, as well as any other updates adopted by the SCAG Regional Council. Most update related activities for the 2024 RTP/SCS performance measures will be expected to occur between January 2022 and May 2023. These updates will be addressed through discussions with SCAG regional stakeholders, and the SCAG Policy Committees.

(7) Adoption/Submission to State

After the incorporation of subregional strategies, the Regional Council will finalize and adopt the 2024 RTP/SCS. SCAG will submit the regional SCS, including all subregional SCSs, to CARB for review as required in SB 375. The subregion will provide relevant documentation to support SCAG in complying with the CARB Evaluation Guidelines, referenced above in section IV.A(1).

(8) Funding

Funding for subregional SCS/APS activities is not currently available. Any specific parameters for future funding are speculative. While there is no potential future funding at this time, it is advisable for subregions to track and record their expenses and activities associated with these efforts.

(9) Data

SCAG will distribute data to subregions and local jurisdictions for review and input for the 2024 RTP/SCS. This involves a bottom-up approach for developing the base land use data, growth forecast, scenarios, and integrates SCAG’s other efforts (e.g., plan implementation, performance monitoring) to improve local jurisdictions’ competitiveness for funding that helps implement the RTP/SCS.

SCAG will work with delegated subregions during the MOU process, and before prior to the local review and input process, to outline responsibilities for generating and refining the datasets required for consideration under SB 375. It is anticipated that the delegated subregion will take a leadership role in both outreach to local jurisdictions and data development, with SCAG offering support as needed.

(10) Tools

SCAG is in the process of building a comprehensive Regional Data Platform (RDP) to standardize regionally significant datasets, provide opportunities for local partners
to update their data in real-time, and draw insights from local trends. The platform will also feature a data-driven collaboration hub for local jurisdictions to engage with stakeholders for individual projects, such as local and regional land use planning, active transportation planning, greenhouse gas reduction strategies, and development impact assessments. The RDP is intended as a resource for general plan updates as well as two-way data sharing between jurisdictions and SCAG.

Beginning in Fall 2020, the RDP began engaging with ten pilot jurisdictions to fine tune workflows, products, and data requirements and made ESRI licenses available to all local jurisdictions. The first major tool, the Housing Element Parcel Tool (HELP) was released in fall 2020. More tools will continue to be rolled out through 2021 and into 2022. SCAG’s Local Information Services Team (LIST) aims to train local jurisdictions in the use of RDP tools and provide data guidance.

The use of SCAG tools is not mandatory and is advisory only. Use of the tools is at the discretion of subregions and local jurisdictions. SCAG will consider providing guidance and training on additional tools based on further discussions with subregional partners.

(11) Resources and technical assistance

SCAG will assist the subregions by making available technical tools as described above. SCAG staff can participate in subregional workshops, meetings, and other processes at the request of the subregion, and pending funding and availability. Further, SCAG will prepare materials for its own process in developing the regional SCS, and will make these materials available to subregions.

D. Milestones/Schedule

- Deadline for subregions to communicate intent to prepare a subregional SCS – October 29, 2021
- SCAG and Subregional Council of Governments establish Memorandum of Understanding – Early 2022
- Subregional SCS development – Early 2022 through Fall 2022
- Draft dataset delivery to SCAG – Summer 2022
- Final dataset delivery to SCAG – Fall 2022
- Draft subregional SCS to be incorporated into regional SCS – Winter 2023
- Release Draft 2024 RTP/SCS for public review – Fall 2023
- Regional Council adopts 2024 RTP/SCS – Spring 2024

For more context on the process schedule and milestones, refer to the attached Appendix A. Further detailed milestones will be incorporated into the MOU between SCAG and the subregion.
## 2024 RTP/SCS Preliminary Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING</strong></td>
<td><strong>SUMMER</strong></td>
<td><strong>FALL</strong></td>
<td><strong>WINTER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING 2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>SUMMER 2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>FALL 2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>WINTER 2023</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>WINTER 2023</strong></td>
<td><strong>SPRING 2024</strong></td>
<td><strong>SUMMER 2024</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Growth Forecast</td>
<td>Program Environmental Impact Report Notice of Preparation</td>
<td>Draft Plan Policies Discussions</td>
<td>Final Connect SoCal 2024, Transportation Conformity Determination, and PEIR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Milestones Code:
- CODING: DOLO - Action Item
  - MODELING FORECAST
  - OUTREACH
  - PLAN FOUNDATION (GOALS & PERFORMANCE MEASURES)
  - LOCAL AGENCY INPUT PROCESS
  - PLAN ELEMENT (POLICIES, STRATEGIES, TECHNICAL REPORTS)