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Meeting Summary

The following is a summary of discussions of the Technical Working Group meeting of September 18, 2014.

Receive and File

1. Meeting Summary 7-17-14

Discussion Items

2. Role and Scope of TWG
   Hasan Ikhrata, Executive Director, addressed concerns regarding the role and scope of the Technical Working Group. Mr. Ikhrata emphasized that he and his staff will continue to support and collaborate with the group; however, the process which is outlined in the group’s charter will remain unchanged.

   Mr. Ikhrata shared with the group that SB 1077 is on the Governor’s desk awaiting his signature. If the bill is approved, it will launch a pilot program to study a mileage based user fee in California.

   Darin Chidsey, Director of Strategy, Policy & Public Affairs, provided information on a working group formed by Secretary Kelly, known as the California Transportation Investment Priorities Working Group. The group has brought together stakeholders from various areas of transportation to develop a strategy to assist in the implementation of the Secretary’s vision.

3. 2016 RTP/SCS Agenda Outlook
   Naresh Amatya, Transportation Planning Manager, provided an overview of the 2016 RTP/SCS Agenda Outlook. Mr. Amatya emphasized that it is a living document and revisions will be made as the project moves forward. A request was made that the Agenda Outlook and the 6-Month Agenda Outlook be combined into one document, in the interest of clarity.

4. Status on Local input for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS; Growth Forecast
   Dr. Simon Choi, Chief of Research and Forecasting, provided a status report on local input for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS growth Forecast. Dr. Choi noted that as of September 11, 2014, 81% of 197 jurisdictions have provided input on SCAG’s preliminary growth forecasts. Dr. Choi’s slide presentation provided the regional totals of local input on
population, household, and employment figures along a draft preliminary range of growth forecasts in 2012, 2020, 2035, and 2040. Dr. Choi stated that the next steps are to continue working with the Technical Working Group (TWG), subregions, and local jurisdictions in the SCAG region to develop the complete local input growth forecasts, and move forward to refine the city and Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) level dataset as a basis for the development of 2016-2040 RTP/SCS.

Dr. Frank Wen, Manager of Research and Analysis, cited an analysis of the socioeconomic characteristics of the two (2) largest generations, the Millennials and the Baby Boomers. There will be a presentation to CEHD on October 2, 2014 and at a future TWG meeting to further address this topic.

5. **Modeling Updates**

Sarah Jepson, Active Transportation Manager, outlined the goals for modeling the Active Transportation Investments for the 2016 RTP/SCS. Ms. Jepson stated that currently her staff is in the process of developing the needs assessment and the draft strategies. Once these are in place, staff will have a clearer focus on the process and how to improve their modeling abilities.

Guoxiong Huang, Manager of Modeling and Forecasting, provided a summary of the key components of the Modeling Post-Processing.

Naresh Amatya, Transportation Planning Manager, provided an overview of the transportation projects for the 2016 RTP/SCS. Mr. Amatya stated that staff is seeking input from the county transportation commissions regarding the projects. A spreadsheet was sent to them for the purpose of noting any changes to the projects. A November 30, 2014 deadline has been set for the commissions to submit their information.

6. **CALOTS**

Ping Chang, Program Manager of Land Use and Environmental Planning, stated that CALOTS is a web-based tool, which originally was developed between 2002 and 2007. There is also a current CALOTS Upgrade Project, which will build on the historical investment and extend the functionality to not only identify infill opportunities, but also track the changing conditions and performance, as related to the Sustainable Communities Strategy. The schedule for completion of the tool is December 2015. Mr. Chang noted that the purpose of CALOTS is to provide an information tool to the local jurisdictions and subregions to assist in tracking changes and progress at a small geographical area.

The next meeting of the TWG will be Thursday, October 16, 2014.
Agenda Outlook for the Development of the 2016 RTP/SCS
(Note: Revised to put the outlook in chronological order as suggested at the Sept. 2014 TWG)
(Updated 10/13/14)

June 2013
- Potential approach/process, coordination between various technical working groups and policy committees, and updated overall schedule for the development of the 2016 RTP/SCS

January 2014
- System Preservation and system operation focus in the 2012 RTP/SCS and our current efforts on Pavement and Bridge condition database/management

February 2014
- System Performance Measures and MAP-21 requirements under Performance Based Planning and implications of MAP-21
- Local Input Process for Growth Forecast/Land Use (Scenario Planning) for 2016 RTP/SCS, including growth forecast and technology

March 2014
- Performance Based Planning and implications of MAP-21: Safety Performance Measures
- Overview of baseline and innovative funding sources adopted in the 2012 RTP/SCS including underlying technical assumptions/methodology/analysis under Transportation Finance
- Overview of cost assumptions/cost modal for the 2012 RTP/SCS under Transportation Finance
- Model and Tools and Datasets to be used in the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Overview of Aviation program in the 2012 RTP/SCS with a focus on ground transportation improvements

May 2014
- OCTA Draft Long Range Plan Update
- System Preservation Update
- Draft Paper on TOD benefits, challenges and best practices
- Active Transportation Program Update
- Local Input Survey Update
- MAP-21 Safety NPRM Update
- CalEnviro Screen Tool

June 2014
- SCAG Active Transportation Results from the 2011 Household Travel Survey
- 2016 RTP/SCS Modeling variables matrix
- Statewide and MPO Planning Rules NPRM Update
- California Active Transportation Program Update

July 2014
- 2016 RTP/SCS Modeling Variables Matrix
September 2014
- 2016 RTP/SCS Development Agenda Outlook
- Status of Local Input for the 2016 RTP/SCS; Growth Forecast Update
- Modeling Update
- CAL LOTS Update

October 2014
- Overview of SCS in the 2012 RTP/SCS
- Current status of SCS implementation (Local Implementation survey)
- Environmental Justice (First EJ Workshop will be held on 10/23)
- Map Collaborator Database (A web based tool to collect data and develop open space plan.)

November 2014
- Discussion on existing and proposed Performance Measures
- Role of Technology in the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Development of alternative scenarios (Scenario Planning) for 2016 RTP/SCS, including growth forecast, technology
- Emerging issues/themes that could influence 2016 SCS
- Zero/Near Zero/Clean Technology Applications, including Slow Speed/ Electric Vehicle programs (Nov. 2014)
- Emerging New Technology Applications

December 2014
- Technical assumptions/methodology/data/analysis in the 2012 RTP/SCS
- Potential changes in the 2016 RTP/SCS to technical assumptions/methodology/data/analysis
- Updated forecast/land use distribution for 2016 RTP/SCS
- Updated SCS for 2016 RTP/SCS
- Overview of Active Transportation Strategy in the 2012 RTP/SCS
- Progress update on Active Transportation Strategy and emerging issues and their implications to the 2016 RTP/SCS

January 2015
- Asset Management and Infrastructure Performance Measures
- Overview of Goods Movement (GM) Strategy in the 2012 RTP/SCS with a focus on technical assumptions (including technology assumptions)/data/analysis
- Progress update on the GM Strategy with focus on emerging issues and implications on the 2016 RTP/SCS

February 2015
- Program EIR
- Public Participation Plan
- Overview of Transit Strategy in the 2012 RTP/SCS
- Progress update on the Transit Strategy and emerging issues/challenges that could influence the 2016 RTP/SCS
March 2015

- Overview of Highway/HOV/HOT/Toll Roads/Express Lanes proposed in the 2012 RTP/SCS with a focus on technical assumptions/analysis
- Progress update and emerging issues related to highways/HOV/HOT/Toll Roads/Express Lanes

May 2015

- Progress update on the current status of the Aviation component of the 2012 RTP/SCS and emerging issues that may influence the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Overview of TDM/TSM in the 2012 RTP/SCS, including underlying assumptions
- Progress status of TDM/TSM and emerging issues

June 2015

- Progress update on 2012 RTP/SCS revenue/cost
- Potential changes/focus areas and emerging issues in the 2016 RTP/SCS

July 2015

- Transportation Conformity

August 2015

- Finance Plan for 2016 RTP/SCS
- Updated GM Strategy for the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Updated Transit Strategy for the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Updated Active Transportation Strategy for the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Highways Improvement Element in the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Updated Aviation Element of the 2016 RTP/SCS
- Updated TDM/TSM Element for the 2016 RTP/SCS

Note: The Agenda Outlook is intended as a reference for TWG and is subject to change as needed and appropriate as things progress.
Item 3: Bullet No. 1 - Overview of SCS in the 2012 RTP/SCS
No Attachment
Item 3: Bullet No. 2 - Local Jurisdiction Implementation Survey - Attachment
SUMMARY:
SCAG staff conducted a survey earlier this year to better understand the initial implementation of the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) by local jurisdictions, and to serve as important input for the development of the 2016 RTP/SCS. SCAG staff appreciates the efforts of local jurisdictions and assistance from subregions for completing the survey. To date, 149 jurisdictions have returned surveys, for a response rate of over 75%. Findings of the survey show that local jurisdictions have increasingly been pursuing activities contributing to SCS implementation through various mechanisms such as general plan updates, development of specific plans, bicycle/pedestrian plans, transportation demand management policies, and environmental sustainability programs (e.g., energy efficiency and Green Building). While SCAG’s Sustainability Program (and the previous Compass Blueprint Program) has been providing financial incentives and technical assistance to local jurisdictions in conducting SCS implementation supportive activities, local efforts in SCS implementation activities will also provide the foundation to compete for state and federal grants such as the upcoming state Cap-and-Trade funding opportunities.

BACKGROUND:
Objectives of the Survey
The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS was adopted in April 2012 through an extensive bottom-up collaborative planning process. The regional SCS focuses on integrating land use and transportation to achieve and exceed the regional greenhouse emissions reduction targets for 2020 and 2035. A significant portion of the regional SCS is dependent on local governments for implementation through their land use authority. To understand the initial implementation of the regional SCS strategies by local jurisdictions, SCAG staff conducted a survey earlier this year. The survey is also intended to provide input for the development of the 2016 RTP/SCS.

Process of the Survey
In January 2014, the Local Implementation Survey was sent out to all 197 local jurisdictions in the region. The survey was designed to enable completion by local jurisdictions in an hour or less. Local agencies were offered the choice of submitting survey responses online through Survey Monkey or by email to SCAG. Surveys returned to SCAG through email were input to Survey Monkey by SCAG staff to enable analysis of results. In addition to the clarifying information provided as part of the transmission of the survey, SCAG staff explained the survey to local jurisdictions during the one on one meetings that were held in support of the 2016 RTP/SCS Local Input Process. In addition, SCAG
staff has been available and responded to additional questions about the survey. Participation in the survey effort was strictly voluntary; however, local jurisdictions were encouraged to submit their surveys in order to ensure fully representative findings.

**Key Survey Questions**

The Survey questionnaire focuses on SCS implementation activities for which local jurisdictions have the authorities, including primarily the following:

- Survey questions regarding land use policies including General Plan updates, the inclusion of sustainability strategies in local plans and zoning codes, and the development of specific plans for Transit Priority Areas.
- Survey questions related to transportation-related policy, including the existence of programs contributing to SCS implementation such as Complete Streets, Safe Routes to School, bicycle and pedestrian plans, Transportation Demand Management (TDM), and parking policies.
- Survey questions regarding environmental sustainability policies, public health, and CEQA streamlining opportunities.

**Findings of the Survey**

- As of this date, 149 of the 197 local jurisdictions in the SCAG region have provided responses to Part 1 of the survey, for a response rate of 75.6% (see Figure 1). Response rates by subregions are shown in Figure 2. Notably, subregions achieving more than 80% response rates include Arroyo Verdugo, North Los Angeles County, Ventura County and Orange County.

![Figure 1 - Local Implementation Survey Regional Response Rate](image)
Land Use Implementation Related Findings

- Excluding mandatory Housing element updates, just over 38% of the responding jurisdictions have updated at least one element of their General Plan within the last 5 years (since the passage of SB 375), 30% have updated at least two elements, and nearly 21% have updated all six non-housing elements of their General Plan within the last 5 years. In addition to the required Housing Element updates, Land Use is the most frequently updated element, completed by over 33% of responding jurisdictions. Figure 3 shows the recent general plan update by county.

- About one-third of the responding jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their General Plan.

- Just over 79% of the responding jurisdictions reported at least one of the four land use-focused SCS strategies featured in the survey was supported by their currently adopted General Plan, while just under 36% selected all four of the SCS strategies. The SCS strategies featured in the survey included ‘Infill’, ‘TOD’, ‘Concentrated Destinations’, and ‘Complete Communities’.

- Of those jurisdictions currently updating their General Plan, the SCS strategies are more prevalent, with close to 80% reporting ‘Infill Development’ as a strategy to be supported in the updated Plan. ‘Complete Communities’ and ‘Concentrated Destinations’ were each selected by 69% of reporting jurisdictions, and 59% reported ‘TOD’ to be a strategy supported in their General Plan updates. 82% of the respondents currently updating their General Plan selected at least one of the strategies, and 53% selected all four SCS strategies to be supported in the update.
More than 78% of the responding jurisdictions indicate having an RTP/SCS-designated ‘High Quality Transit Area’ (HQTA) within their jurisdiction. Of these, about 40% report having policy incentives in place to encourage development within the HQTA. Additional efforts may be needed to provide local incentives for sustainable and equitable development within HQTAs. It should be noted that HQTA strategy represents a core regional strategy for achieving sustainable communities goals. In addition, the current Cap-and-Trade funding (draft) guidelines (e.g., the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program) also include an emphasis on projects of transit-oriented development (TOD) integrated with affordable housing within HQTAs.

Just over 47% of the responding jurisdictions with an HQTA have adopted at least one specific plan for areas within the Transit Priority Area (TPA), while about 14% have adopted at least three. Approximately 18% of survey respondents have at least one proposed TPA specific plan in process. It is important to note that pursuant to SB 743, selected development within a TPA that is also consistent with a locally adopted specific plan and regional SCS may be eligible for CEQA exemption. Therefore, local agencies are encouraged to adopt specific plans for TPAs within their jurisdictions to facilitate TOD project implementation.

Transportation Implementation Related Findings

- Nearly 20% of responding jurisdictions have adopted a ‘Complete Streets’ policy, with another 20% in the process of doing so. Just over 41% of localities have adopted a ‘Safe Routes to School’ policy, and an additional 14% are planning one.

- 60% of reporting jurisdictions have adopted a Bicycle Plan. Of these, 24% adopted their plan within the last 2 years, while 57% adopted it within the last 5 years. 18% of reporting
jurisdictions are currently planning such a policy. Of these, 86% expect adoption within the next 2 years.

- Approximately 19% of survey respondents have adopted a local Pedestrian Plan. Of these, 29% adopted their plan within the last 2 years, while 54% adopted it within the last 5 years. Another 18% of responding jurisdictions is in the process of developing a local Pedestrian Plan. Of these, 86% expect adoption within the next 2 years.

- 44% of jurisdictions who reported having an existing ‘Safe Routes to School’ program adopted the program within the last two years. 92% adopted the program in the last 5 years, and 100% have done so within the last 10 years.

- 17% of respondents that have an existing ‘Complete Streets’ program adopted the program within the last two years. 57% adopted the program in the last 5 years, and 79% have done so in the last 10 years.

- 23% of jurisdictions who reported having an existing local Bicycle Plan adopted the plan within the last two years. 56% adopted their bike plan in the last 5 years, and 75% have done so in the last 10 years.

- 25% of respondents that have an existing Pedestrian Plan adopted the plan within the last two years. 50% adopted their plan in the last 5 years, and 83% have done so in the last 10 years.

- These active transportation related efforts by local jurisdictions mentioned above have contributed to the region’s success in the statewide competition for Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds awarded in August this year.

- About 57% of the responding jurisdictions have adopted a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policy, with another 5% in the process of doing so. Nearly 20% of respondents have adopted a local parking policy and an additional 6% are planning for one.

- More than two-thirds of the responding jurisdictions have adopted an impact fee policy, with another 5% planning to implement one.

**Environmental Sustainability and Public Health Implementation Related Findings**

- Of the seven featured environmental sustainability policy objectives, ‘Water Efficiency’ and ‘Green Building’ were the two most commonly adopted, with about 63% of jurisdictions reporting either a plan, policy, or ordinance in place for ‘Water Efficiency’, and 61% for ‘Green Building’. 54% of respondents have adopted some type of ‘Energy Efficiency’ strategy, and about one-third have adopted strategies for ‘Solid Waste’, ‘Solar Energy’, and ‘Climate Action Plan’. About 18% of survey respondents report having some type of adopted ‘Electric Vehicle’ strategy in place.

- 51% of jurisdictions who reported having an existing Energy Efficiency program adopted the program within the last two years. 90% adopted the program in the last 5 years, and 98% have done so within the last 10 years.
• 40% of respondents that have an existing Solar Energy program adopted the program within the last two years. 76% adopted the program in the last 5 years, and 91% have done so in the last 10 years.

• 54% of jurisdictions who reported having an existing ‘Green Building’ program adopted the policy within the last two years. 93% adopted the program in the last 5 years, and 100% have done so within the last 10 years.

• 36% of respondents that have an existing Electric Vehicle program adopted the program within the last two years. 84% adopted the program in the last 5 years, and 96% have done so within the last 10 years.

• 20% of jurisdictions who reported having an existing Water Efficiency program adopted the program within the last two years. 57% adopted the program in the last 5 years, and 92% have done so within the last 10 years.

• 17% of respondents that have an existing Solid Waste program adopted the program within the last two years. 48% adopted the program in the last 5 years, and 92% have done so in the last 10 years.

• 36% of jurisdictions who reported having an existing Climate Action Plan adopted the plan within the last two years. 87% adopted the plan in the last 5 years, and 98% have done so in the last 10 years.

• About one-third of responding jurisdictions have adopted a public health policy, and an additional 10% are in the process of developing one. It should be noted that several counties have been actively pursuing Healthy Communities Initiatives, including Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino. Cities within Coachella Valley have also been working together with the Clinton Foundation Global Initiatives on healthy communities.

CEQA Streamlining Related Findings

• 30% of responding jurisdictions report having projects that may qualify for CEQA streamlining.

• 50% of responding jurisdictions commented on potential barriers to CEQA streamlining. Of these, 80% reported concern regarding potential barriers. 32% reported a lack of qualifying projects as the primary obstacle. Other barriers cited included legal uncertainty, lack of program guidance, lack of staff resources, and public perception, each with about 12%.
Subregional Summary

In addition to the regional summary provided in this report, SCAG staff has also prepared selected subregional summaries. Specifically, summaries have been provided for subregions with more than three jurisdictions responding to the survey, including the following nine subregions: Imperial County Transportation Commission, Gateway Cities Council of Governments, South Bay Cities Council of Governments, San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments, Orange County Council of Governments, Coachella Valley Association of Governments, Western Riverside Council of Governments, San Bernardino Association of Governments, and Ventura Council of Governments. The Subregional Summaries is included in Attachment 3.

ATTACHMENTS:

ATTACHMENT 1: PowerPoint: “Highlights of Local Implementation Survey for Sustainable Communities”

ATTACHMENT 2: Local Implementation Survey Response Status

ATTACHMENT 3: Subregional Summaries (for subregions with more than three jurisdictions responding to the survey)
2014 Local Implementation Survey
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- Key Survey Questions
- Results
2014 Local Implementation Survey

Survey Objectives:

- Document initial local progress toward implementation of Regional SCS
- Establish basis for outcome-based monitoring
- Establish basis of a database of local activities for SCS implementation
Process:

- Surveys provided to local jurisdictions in January
- Surveys discussed with jurisdictions during Local Input one-on-one meetings
- Local jurisdictions submitted responses
- Multiple follow-ups to encourage submittal for representative findings
Key Survey Questions:

- Land use policies in General Plan/zoning updates & development of TPA specific plans
- Transportation policies: Complete Streets, bike/ped plans, Safe Routes to School, TDM, & parking
- Environmental sustainability policies, public health, & CEQA streamlining
2014 Local Implementation Survey

Survey Results:

- 149 of 197 jurisdictions have responded (76%)
- Jurisdictions increasingly implementing SCS supportive policies through General Plan/zoning code updates, bike/ped plans, & TDM policies
- Specific Plan activities for TPAs have also increased over time
- More jurisdictions adopting ‘green’ energy & resource conservation policies
2014 Local Implementation Survey

Response Rate by Subregion

- Arroyo Vrdgo: 100%
- City of LA: 67%
- CVAG: 60%
- Gateway: 73%
- Imperial Co: 63%
- LV/Malibu: 60%
- NLA County: 100%
- Orange Co: 83%
- SGVCOG: 72%
- SANBAG: 68%
- South Bay: 88%
- Ventura Co: 91%
- Westside: 50%
- WRCOG: 79%
- REGION: 76%
Since 2012, over half (53%) of responding local jurisdictions have been engaged in General Plan update activities:
- 33% (in progress)
- 20% (adopted)

*Excluding required Housing Element updates*
2014 Local Implementation Survey

Recent General Plan Update*

*Excluding the required Housing Element updates
TOD Infill Concentrated Destinations

Plans Adopted Before 2009 Plans Adopted Since 2009

General Plan SCS Strategies
2014 Local Implementation Survey

Zoning Code SCS Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Zoning Codes Updated Before 2009</th>
<th>Zoning Codes Updated Since 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated Destinations</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Communities</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0%  5%  10%  15%  20%  25%  30%  35%  40%  45%  50%

TOD Infill Concentrated Destinations Complete Communities
2014 Local Implementation Survey

Transit Priority Area (TPA) Specific Plans*

*Only among responding jurisdictions with an HQTA

HQTA Policy Incentive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>Number of Specific Plans (adopted + planned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014 Local Implementation Survey

Local Active Transportation Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Last 2 Years</th>
<th>Last 5 Years</th>
<th>Last 10 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Plan</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped Plan</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year Adopted

- Blue: Last 2 Years
- Green: Last 5 Years
- Orange: Last 10 Years
2014 Local Implementation Survey

Transportation Related Policies

Complete Streets: 19% Adopted, 20% Planned, 40% Adopted + Planned
Safe Routes to School: 13% Adopted, 17% Planned, 42% Adopted + Planned
Bike Plan: 55% Adopted, 60% Planned, 78% Adopted + Planned
Ped Plan: 19% Adopted, 18% Planned, 38% Adopted + Planned
TDM: 5% Adopted, 6% Planned, 58% Adopted + Planned
Parking Plan: 20% Adopted, 6% Planned, 26% Adopted + Planned
Impact Fee: 26% Adopted, 5% Planned, 69% Adopted + Planned
Public Health: 4% Adopted, 10% Planned, 34% Adopted + Planned
2014 Local Implementation Survey

Local Environmental Sustainability Policies

- Water Efficiency: 64%
- Green Building: 62%
- Energy Efficiency: 54%
- Solid Waste: 43%
- Solar Energy: 31%
- Climate Action Plan: 31%
- Electric Vehicle: 17%
2014 Local Implementation Survey

Local Environmental Sustainability Policies

- Energy Efficiency
- Solar Energy
- Green Building
- Electric Vehicle
- Water Efficiency
- Solid Waste
- Climate Action Plan

Year Adopted

- Last 2 Years
- Last 5 Years
- Last 10 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Last 2 Years</th>
<th>Last 5 Years</th>
<th>Last 10 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar Energy</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Building</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicle</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Efficiency</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Action Plan</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2014 Local Implementation Survey

CEQA Streamlining

• 40% of responding jurisdictions expressed concern regarding potential barriers, including:
  - Legal uncertainty
  - Lack of program guidance
  - Lack of staff resources
  - Public perception
Thank you!

For additional information:

Ping Chang, Program Manager
Land Use & Environmental Planning
Southern California Association of Governments
chang@scag.ca.gov
### Imperial County (ICTC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brawley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calipatria</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperial County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTC Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Los Angeles County

#### Arroyo Verdugo Subregion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burbank</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Canada Flintridge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Verdugo Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Los Angeles City Subregion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Fernando</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA City Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Westside Cities Council of Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hollywood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCCOG Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Part I: Local Implementation</td>
<td>Part II: Open Space Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellflower</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Habra Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mirada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montebello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pico Rivera</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe Springs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCCCOG Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North LA County Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Status</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Implementation Survey Response Status (10/13/14)

#### South Bay Cities Council of Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermosa Beach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawndale</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Beach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palos Verdes Estates</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redondo Beach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South Bay Cities Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Los Angeles County

#### Las Virgenes-Malibu Council of Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agoura Hills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabasas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malibu</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westlake Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Las Virgenes-Malibu Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Part I: Local Implementation</td>
<td>Part II: Open Space Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Park</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradbury</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendora</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwindale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Puente</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Verne</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monrovia</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Dimas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Gabriel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South El Monte</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pasadena</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Covina</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SGVCOG Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local Implementation Survey Response Status (10/13/14)

### Orange County (OCCOG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aliso Viejo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Mesa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Point</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fountain Valley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Grove</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Habra</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Palma</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Beach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Hills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Niguel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Alamitos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Viejo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange (city)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placentia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santa Margarita</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Clemente</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan Capistrano</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal Beach</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villa Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorba Linda</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCOG Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>82.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>80.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Riverside County
**Coachella Valley Association of Governments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blythe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral City</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachella</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Hot Springs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Wells</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Quinta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Desert</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Springs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Mirage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CVAG Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Riverside County
**Western Riverside Council of Governments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calimesa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corona</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastvale</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemet</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurupa Valley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Elsinore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menifee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreno Valley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrieta</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perris</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jacinto</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temecula</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildomar</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riverside County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WRCOG Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>78.9%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### San Bernardino County (SANBAG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Part I: Local Implementation</th>
<th>Part II: Open Space Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelanto</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Valley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barstow</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bear Lake</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chino Hills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colton</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontana</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Terrace</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cucamonga</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redlands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rialto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twentynine Palms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorville</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucaipa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucca Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino County</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SANBAG Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Part I: Local Implementation</td>
<td>Part II: Open Space Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camarillo</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorpark</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojai</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxnard</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hueneme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Buenaventura</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Paula</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simi Valley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Oaks</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura County</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCOG Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion Rate</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SCAG Regional Total | 149 | 145 |
| Regional Response Status | 75.6% | 73.6% |
2014 Local Implementation Survey: Subregional Summary

Imperial County (ICTC)

- Excluding mandatory updates of the ‘Housing’ element, 40% of Imperial County survey respondents have updated at least (2) elements of their General Plan in the last 5 years, & 20% have updated all (6) non-housing General Plan elements in the last 5 years.

- No responding Imperial County jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their General Plan.

- 80% of jurisdictions have updated the ‘Housing’ element of their General Plan within the last 5 years, by far the most commonly updated single element among respondents. The second most commonly updated General Plan element over the last 5 years is ‘Land Use’, with 40%.

- 80% report that at least two of the (4) featured SCS strategies is supported by their currently adopted General Plan, while 20% selected all (4) strategies as being supported by their adopted General Plan.

- Of the (4) featured SCS strategies, 80% report ‘Infill’ development as a strategy supported by their currently adopted General Plan, the most commonly selected of the (4) options, while ‘TOD’ was selected by 60% of respondents. ‘Complete Communities’ was cited by 40%, & ‘Concentrated Destinations’ was indicated by 20% of reporting jurisdictions.

- One reporting jurisdiction (20% of total) has updated its zoning code within the last 5 years; & 80% have done so within the last 10 years. One jurisdiction is currently in the process of updating its zoning code.

- For the single jurisdiction that has updated its zoning code within the last 5 years, ‘Infill’ development & ‘TOD’ were selected as primary policy objectives.

- 40% of respondents indicated the presence of an RTP-designated ‘High Quality Transit Area’ (HQTA) within their jurisdiction. Of these, none report having policy incentives in place to encourage HQTA development.

- 50% of jurisdictions that have an HQTA have adopted one specific plan for TPAs. None have adopted more than one TPA specific plan. No responding jurisdictions report having any proposed new TPA specific plans.

- One Imperial County jurisdiction (20% of total respondents) reports having an adopted ‘Complete Streets’ policy. No additional jurisdictions report having plans to do so.

- 40% of localities have adopted a ‘Safe Routes to School’ policy, with another 40% planning to develop one.

- 20% of respondents have adopted a local Pedestrian Plan, & an additional 20% are planning to develop one.

- 100% of responding Imperial County jurisdictions report having an adopted Bicycle Plan.
One Imperial County jurisdiction (20% of total respondents) reports having an adopted Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policy. No additional jurisdictions report having plans to do so.

One reporting jurisdiction (20% of total) has an adopted parking policy. No additional jurisdictions report having plans for developing one.

100% of responding Imperial County jurisdictions report having an adopted impact fee policy.

40% of jurisdictions have an adopted public health policy. No additional jurisdictions report having plans to do so.


20% of Imperial County survey respondents report having projects that may qualify for CEQA streamlining.

60% of Imperial County jurisdictions commented on potential barriers to CEQA streamlining. Of these, two-thirds reported concern regarding potential barriers. 100% of those jurisdictions with concerns regarding CEQA streamlining indicated a lack of qualifying projects as the primary obstacle to implementation.

Imperial County Local Implementation Survey, Part 1 Response Rate: 62.5%
2014 Local Implementation Survey: Subregional Summary

Gateway Cities COG

- Excluding mandatory updates of the ‘Housing’ element, just over 26% of respondents have updated at least (1) element of their General Plan in the last 5 years; about 16% have updated at least (3) General Plan elements; & nearly 11% have updated all (6) non-housing General Plan elements in the last 5 years.

- 26% of reporting Gateway Cities jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their General Plan.

- 95% of jurisdictions have updated the ‘Housing’ element of their General Plan within the last 5 years, by far the most commonly updated single element among respondents. The next most frequently updated General Plan elements over the last 5 years were ‘Land Use’ & ‘Circulation’, each with just over 21%.

- More than 68% report that at least one of the (4) featured SCS strategies is supported by their currently adopted General Plan, while just under 32% selected all (4) of the SCS strategies as being supported by their adopted General Plan.

- Of the (4) featured SCS strategies, 63% report ‘Infill’ development as a strategy supported by their currently adopted General Plan, the most commonly selected of the (4) options. ‘TOD’, selected by 42% of respondents, was second; with ‘Concentrated Destinations’ (37%), & ‘Complete Communities’ (32%) not too far behind.

- Of jurisdictions currently updating their General Plan, SCS strategies are much more prevalent, with 100% reporting ‘Infill’, ‘TOD’, & ‘Concentrated Destinations’ to be supported by the new Plan; & 80% reporting ‘Complete Communities’ to be a supported strategy in their updated General Plan.

- 100% of respondents currently updating their General Plan selected at least three of the (4) SCS options, & 80% selected all (4) SCS strategies to be supported in the update.

- 58% of jurisdictions have updated their zoning code within the last 2 years; more than 68% within the last 5 years; and 74% have done so within the last 10 years. Just over 31% are currently in the process of updating their zoning code.

- For jurisdictions that have updated their zoning code within the last 5 years, 54% report ‘Infill’ development as a primary policy objective, while 46% reported ‘Concentrated Destinations’. ‘TOD’ & ‘Complete Communities’ were each selected by 31% of respondents as primary zoning code objectives. 54% selected at least one, & 31% selected all (4) SCS strategies.

- About 84% of respondents indicated the presence of an RTP-designated ‘High Quality Transit Area’ (HQTA) within their jurisdiction. Of these, 25% report having policy incentives in place to encourage HQTA development.

- Just about 44% of jurisdictions that report having an HQTA have adopted at least one Transit Priority Area (TPA) specific plan, while 19% have adopted at least two. Nearly 13% of HQTA respondents have adopted at least six TPA specific plans.
19% of respondents have at least one proposed new TPA specific plan, over 12% have at least two, & 6% have three.

Just over 21% of jurisdictions have adopted a local ‘Complete Streets’ policy.

More than 47% of localities have adopted a ‘Safe Routes to School’ policy, with another 5% planning to do so.

Over 10% of respondents have adopted a local Pedestrian Plan, & an additional 5% are planning to do so.

37% of reporting jurisdictions have adopted a Bicycle Plan, with another 21% planning to do so.

Nearly 74% of jurisdictions have adopted a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policy, & an additional 5% are planning to do so.

Just about 16% of respondents have adopted a local parking policy, with another 5% planning to do so.

42% of reporting jurisdictions have adopted an impact fee policy, & an additional 5% are planning to do so.

About 21% of respondents have adopted a public health policy, with another 16% planning to develop one.

Of the (7) featured sustainable planning policy objectives, ‘Green Building’ was the most commonly adopted, with about 63% of Gateway jurisdictions reporting either a plan, policy, or ordinance in place. ‘Water Efficiency’ (42%), was second; & ‘Energy Efficiency’ (37%) placed third. Nearly 32% of respondents report having an adopted ‘Climate Action Plan’, 26% for ‘Solar Energy’, & 21% for ‘Solid Waste’. 11% report having an adopted ‘Electric Vehicle’ strategy in place.

About 21% of responding Gateway jurisdictions report having projects that may qualify for CEQA streamlining.

Just over 42% of responding jurisdictions commented on potential barriers to CEQA streamlining. Of these, 75% reported concern regarding potential barriers. 50% of these reported a lack of staff resources as the primary obstacle. Legal uncertainty was cited by one-third of respondents, & lack of qualifying projects by about 17%.

Gateway Cities Local Implementation Survey, Part 1 Response Rate: 73.1%
Excluding mandatory updates of the ‘Housing’ element, one-third of respondents have updated at least (1) element of their General Plan in the last 5 years; 29% have updated at least (2) General Plan elements; while 24% have updated all (6) non-housing elements in the last 5 years.

One-third of responding SGVCOG jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their General Plan.

76% of reporting jurisdictions have updated the ‘Housing’ element of their General Plan within the last 5 years, by far the most commonly updated single element among respondents. The second most frequently updated General Plan element over the last 5 years is ‘Land Use’, with just over 33%.

Over 71% report that at least one of the (4) featured SCS strategies is supported by their currently adopted General Plan, while just under 29% selected all (4) of the SCS strategies as being supported by their adopted General Plan.

Of the (4) featured SCS strategies, 71% report ‘Infill’ as a strategy supported by their currently adopted General Plan, the most commonly selected of the (4) options. The next most frequently cited strategy was ‘TOD’, selected by two-thirds of respondents. The two remaining featured SCS strategies were each cited by just over 38% of reporting jurisdictions.

Of jurisdictions currently updating their General Plan, 43% reported ‘Infill’ development as an SCS strategy to be supported by the new Plan, with ‘TOD’, ‘Complete Communities’ & ‘Concentrated Destinations’ each garnering about 29%.

43% of respondents currently updating their General Plan selected at least one of the (4) SCS options, & nearly 29% selected all (4) SCS strategies to be supported in the update.

One-third of jurisdictions have updated their zoning code within the last 2 years; over 52% within the last 5 years; & 62% have done so within the last 10 years. Just over 33% are currently in the process of updating their zoning code.

For jurisdictions that have updated their zoning code within the last 5 years, about 45% reported ‘Infill’, ‘TOD’, & ‘Concentrated Destinations’ as primary policy objectives; while just over 36% selected ‘Complete Communities’. 45% selected at least one, & 36% selected all (4) SCS strategies.

81% of respondents indicated the presence of an RTP-designated ‘High Quality Transit Area’ (HQTA) within their jurisdiction. Of these, about 53% report having policy incentives in place to encourage HQTA development.

Just over 29% of jurisdictions that report having an HQTA have adopted at least one ‘Transit Priority Area’ (TPA) specific plan, while about 6% have adopted at least three.

About 6% of responding HQTA jurisdictions report current planning for a proposed new TPA specific plan.

14% of jurisdictions have adopted a ‘Complete Streets’ policy & another 24% are planning to develop one.
2014 Local Implementation Survey: Subregional Summary
San Gabriel Valley COG (continued)

- 43% of reporting SGVCOG localities have adopted a ‘Safe Routes to School’ policy & another 14% are planning to do so.

- Nearly 10% of respondents have adopted a local Pedestrian Plan & another 24% are planning to do so.

- One-third of reporting jurisdictions have adopted a Bicycle Plan, with an additional 38% planning to do so.

- Two-thirds of reporting SGVCOG jurisdictions have adopted a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policy & another 5% are planning to do so.

- 14% of respondents have adopted a local parking policy, with an additional 10% planning to develop one.

- Nearly 48% of respondents have adopted an impact fee policy & another 10% are planning to develop one.

- On-third of jurisdictions report having an adopted public health policy, with an additional & 5% planning to do so.

- Of the (7) featured sustainable planning policy objectives, ‘Water Efficiency’ was the most commonly adopted, with about 71% of jurisdictions reporting either a plan, policy, or ordinance in place. ‘Energy Efficiency’ & ‘Green Building’ were tied for second, with each selected by 62% of respondents. 57% of jurisdictions report having some type of ‘Solid Waste’ strategy; while ‘Solar Energy’ & ‘Climate Action Plan’ were each selected by one-third of respondents. Only 19% of jurisdictions report having an adopted ‘Electric Vehicle’ strategy in place.

- One-third of respondents report having projects that may qualify for CEQA streamlining.

- 43% of jurisdictions commented on potential barriers to CEQA streamlining. Of these, 89% reported concern regarding potential barriers. About 38% reported a lack of qualifying projects as the primary obstacle. Other potential barriers mentioned included lack of staff resources (25%), regulations (25%), & public perception (12%).

- San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments Local Implementation Survey, Part 1 Response Rate: 72.4%
2014 Local Implementation Survey: Subregional Summary
South Bay Cities COG

- Excluding mandatory updates of the ‘Housing’ element, just over 21% of respondents have updated at least (1) element of their General Plan in the last 5 years; 14% have updated at least (2) elements; & just over 7% have updated all (6) non-housing General Plan elements in the last 5 years.

- 21% of responding South Bay jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their General Plan.

- 93% of jurisdictions have updated the ‘Housing’ element of their General Plan within the last 5 years, by far the most commonly updated single element among respondents. The second most commonly updated General Plan element over the last 5 years is ‘Land Use’, with just over 21%.

- More than 64% report that at least one of the (4) featured SCS strategies is supported by their currently adopted General Plan, while just over 21% selected all (4) of the SCS strategies as being supported by their adopted General Plan.

- Of the (4) featured SCS strategies, 50% report ‘Infill’ development as a strategy supported by their currently adopted General Plan, the most commonly selected of the (4) options. ‘Complete Communities’, with a 43% response rate, came in second. ‘Concentrated Destinations’ was selected by nearly 29% of respondents, & ‘TOD’ was selected by just over 21%.

- Of the (3) responding jurisdictions currently updating their General Plan, only ‘Complete Communities’ & ‘Concentrated Destinations’, each selected by 33% of respondents, were reported as supported strategies in the updated General Plan.

- One-third of respondents currently updating their General Plan selected at least one of the (4) SCS options, & none selected all (4) SCS strategies to be supported in the update.

- 21% of jurisdictions have updated their zoning code within the last 2 years; nearly 36% within the last 5 years; and 43% have done so within the last 10 years. Just over 7% are currently in the process of updating their zoning code.

- For jurisdictions that have updated their zoning code within the last 5 years, ‘Infill’, ‘Concentrated Destinations’, & ‘Complete Communities’ were each selected by 40% of respondents as primary policy objectives; & 20% reported ‘TOD’ as a primary policy objectives. 40% selected at least one, & 20% selected all (4) SCS strategies.

- More than 71% of respondents indicated the presence of an RTP-designated ‘High Quality Transit Area’ (HQTA) within their jurisdiction. Of these, 30% report having policy incentives in place to encourage HQTA development.

- 50% of jurisdictions that have an HQTA have adopted at least one specific plan for TPAs, while 30% have adopted at least two. 10% of HQTA respondents have adopted at least four TPA specific plans.

- 20% of HQTA respondents have at least one proposed new TPA specific plan. 10% have two proposed TPA specific plans.
7% of responding South Bay jurisdictions have adopted a ‘Complete Streets’ policy, with another 14% planning to do so.

Just over 21% of localities have adopted a ‘Safe Routes to School’ policy & an additional 14% are planning to do so.

7% of respondents have adopted a local Pedestrian Plan, & no additional reporting jurisdictions have plans for doing so.

57% of reporting jurisdictions have adopted a Bicycle Plan, & no additional jurisdictions report plans for doing so.

More than 64% of South Bay jurisdictions report having an adopted Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policy, with no additional jurisdictions having plans for doing so.

More than 14% of respondents have adopted a local parking policy, & no additional jurisdictions have plans for doing so.

About 57% of respondents have adopted an impact fee policy, & no additional jurisdictions have plans for doing so.

More than 21% of jurisdictions have adopted a public health policy, with another 7% planning to do so.

Of the (7) featured sustainable planning policy objectives, ‘Water Efficiency’ was the most commonly adopted, with about 71% of jurisdictions reporting either a plan, policy, or ordinance in place. 57% report having an adopted ‘Green Building’ policy; & nearly 29% have adopted some type of ‘Solid Waste’ plan. 21% of jurisdictions have an adopted ‘Climate Action Plan’, & 14% have an ‘Electric Vehicle’ strategy. Only about 7% of respondents report having an adopted ‘Solar Energy’ strategy in place.

Approximately 36% of South Bay respondents report having projects that may qualify for CEQA streamlining.

43% of responding jurisdictions commented on potential barriers to CEQA streamlining. Of these, 100% reported concern regarding potential barriers. 50% reported a lack of qualifying projects as the primary obstacle. Other barriers mentioned included legal uncertainty, lack of program guidance, & public perception, each with about 17% of responses.

South Bay Cities Local Implementation Survey, Part 1 Response Rate: 87.5%
2014 Local Implementation Survey: Subregional Summary

Orange County COG

- Excluding mandatory updates of the ‘Housing’ element, about 45% of Orange County respondents have updated at least (1) element of their General Plan in the last 5 years; 35% have updated at least (3) General Plan elements; 31% updated at least (4) elements; & 24% have updated all (6) non-housing General Plan elements in the last 5 years.

- 45% of responding Orange County jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their General Plan.

- Over 96% of jurisdictions have updated the ‘Housing’ element of their General Plan within the last 5 years, by far the most commonly updated single element among respondents. ‘Land Use’, updated by 38% of respondents, is only slightly ahead of ‘Circulation’, ‘Conservation’, & ‘Open Space’, each with nearly 35% reporting updates in the previous 5 years.

- More than 79% report that at least one of the (4) featured SCS strategies is supported by their currently adopted General Plan, while 48% of jurisdictions selected all (4) of the SCS strategies as being supported by their adopted General Plan.

- Of the (4) featured SCS strategies, 76% report ‘Infill’ development as a strategy supported by their currently adopted General Plan, the most commonly selected of the (4) options. ‘Complete Communities’, with over 65%, came in second, with ‘Concentrated Destinations’ a close third at 62%. ‘TOD’ was cited by about 59% of reporting jurisdictions.

- Of those 45% responding jurisdictions currently updating their General Plan, SCS strategies are much more prevalent, with fully 100% reporting ‘Infill’ development to be supported by the new Plan. ‘Complete Communities’, with 92%, was also quite impressive. ‘Concentrated Destinations’ garnered about 86%, with ‘TOD’ registering a 69% response rate.

- 100% of respondents currently updating their General Plan selected at least two of the (4) SCS options, & nearly 62% selected all (4) SCS strategies to be supported in the update.

- Nearly 35% of jurisdictions have updated their zoning code within the last 2 years; 59% within the last 5 years; & over 65% have done so within the last 10 years. 31% are currently in the process of updating their zoning code.

- Of jurisdictions that have updated their zoning code in the last 5 years, 41% report ‘Infill’ as a primary policy objective, while ‘Concentrated Destinations’ & ‘TOD’ were each reported by 24% of respondents. 18% selected ‘Complete Communities’ as a primary zoning code update objective. 38% selected at least one, & 21% selected all (4) SCS strategies.

- About 83% of Orange County respondents indicated the presence of an RTP-designated ‘High Quality Transit Area’ (HQTA) within their jurisdiction. Of these, 38% report having policy incentives in place to encourage HQTA development.

- Nearly 63% of jurisdictions that have an HQTA have adopted at least one specific plan for TPAs, while one-third have adopted at least three. Over 12% of HQTA respondents have adopted at least five TPA specific plans.
2014 Local Implementation Survey: Subregional Summary
Orange County COG (continued)

- About 17% of respondents have at least one proposed new TPA specific plan, & 4% have at least two proposed plans.

- 24% of jurisdictions have adopted a ‘Complete Streets’ policy & another 31% are planning to develop one.

- 48% of responding localities have adopted a ‘Safe Routes to School’ policy, with an additional 7% planning to do so.

- Nearly 28% of respondents have adopted a local Pedestrian Plan & another 21% are planning to do so.

- 69% of reporting jurisdictions have adopted a Bicycle Plan, with an additional 21% planning to develop one.

- 65% of jurisdictions have adopted a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policy, & 3% are planning to do so.

- 28% of respondents have adopted a local parking policy, with an additional 14% planning to develop one.

- 76% of respondents have adopted an impact fee policy & another 10% are planning to do so.

- Nearly 35% of responding Orange County jurisdictions have adopted a public health policy. While several localities are planning updates to existing policies, none are currently planning new ones.

- Of the (7) featured sustainable planning policy objectives, ‘Water Efficiency’ was the most commonly adopted, with about 79% of jurisdictions reporting either a plan, policy, or ordinance in place. ‘Energy Efficiency’ & ‘Green Building’ tied for second place, with each receiving 62% of responses. ‘Solid Waste’ was selected by 52% of respondents, & ‘Solar Energy’ received a 31% response rate. 24% of jurisdictions report having an adopted ‘Electric Vehicle’ strategy, while only about 17% of respondents indicate having an adopted ‘Climate Action Plan’.

- 31% of responding Orange County jurisdictions report having projects that may qualify for CEQA streamlining.

- 48% commented on potential barriers to CEQA streamlining. Of these, over 71% reported concern regarding potential barriers. Lack of qualifying projects, too narrow thresholds, public perception, & lack of program guidance were each cited as primary obstacles by 20%. Other barriers were legal uncertainty & lack of staff resources, each receiving 10%.

- Orange County Local Implementation Survey, Part 1 Response Rate: 82.9%
Excluding mandatory updates of the ‘Housing’ element, no responding CVAG jurisdictions have updated an additional element of their General Plan in the last 5 years.

Two-thirds of jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their General Plan.

Two-thirds of responding jurisdictions have updated the ‘Housing’ element of their General Plan within the last 5 years.

100% report that at least one of the (4) featured SCS strategies is supported by their currently adopted General Plan, while 50% selected all (4) of the SCS strategies as being supported by their adopted General Plan.

Of the (4) featured SCS strategies, two-thirds of respondents report ‘Infill’ development as a strategy supported by their currently adopted General Plan, the most commonly selected of the (4) options. ‘Concentrated Destinations’ was reported as a supported strategy by 50%, with ‘TOD’ & ‘Complete Communities’ each selected by one-third of responding jurisdictions as supported SCS strategies.

Of jurisdictions currently updating their General Plan, SCS strategies are quite prevalent, with 100% reporting ‘Infill’ development to be supported by the new Plan. ‘TOD’, ‘Concentrated Destinations’, & ‘Complete Communities’ were each selected as supported strategies by 50% of respondents.

100% of respondents currently updating their General Plan selected at least one of the (4) SCS options, & 50% selected all (4) SCS strategies to be supported in the update.

About 17% of jurisdictions have updated their zoning code within the last 2 years; one-third within the last 5 years; & 50% have done so within the last 10 years. Two-thirds of responding jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their zoning code.

For jurisdictions that have updated their zoning code within the last 5 years, 50% report ‘Infill’ development as a primary policy objective, while ‘Concentrated Destinations’ was also selected by 50%. ‘TOD’ & ‘Complete Communities’ were not selected by any of the responding jurisdictions as primary zoning code update policy objectives. 50% selected at least one, & one-third of jurisdictions selected (2) of the featured SCS strategies.

100% of respondents indicated the presence of an RTP-designated ‘High Quality Transit Area’ (HQTA) within their jurisdiction. Of these, about 17% report having policy incentives in place to encourage HQTA development.

About 17% of responding jurisdictions with an HQTA have adopted a specific plan for TPAs.

Approximately 17% of jurisdictions that have an HQTA are currently developing a TPA specific plan.

While no responding CVAG jurisdictions report having an adopted ‘Complete Streets’ policy, 17% are planning one.
More than 83% of localities have an adopted ‘Safe Routes to School’ policy. While several jurisdictions are planning updates to existing policies, no additional jurisdictions are currently developing new ‘Safe Routes to School’ policies.

About 17% of respondents have an adopted local Pedestrian Plan, with another 17% planning to do so.

100% of reporting Coachella Valley jurisdictions have an adopted Bicycle Plan. Two-thirds of these are currently planning updates to existing bicycle plans.

One-third of jurisdictions have adopted a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policy. No additional jurisdictions report current planning for new TDM policies.

No responding jurisdictions report having an adopted local parking policy & none have current plans for doing so.

Two-thirds of respondents have adopted an impact fee policy. No additional jurisdictions report plans for doing so.

50% of jurisdictions have adopted a public health policy, with another 17% planning to do so.

Of the (7) featured sustainable planning policy objectives, 100% of responding CVAG jurisdictions report having a strategy in place for ‘Energy Efficiency’. More than 83% have an adopted ‘Climate Action Plan’, with the same number reporting a strategy for ‘Water Efficiency’. Two-thirds of respondents have policies in place for ‘Solar Energy’ & ‘Green Building’, with one-third of jurisdictions reporting a plan, policy, or ordinance for ‘Electric Vehicle’ & ‘Solid Waste’.

About 17% of responding Coachella Valley jurisdictions report having projects that may qualify for CEQA streamlining.

50% of jurisdictions commented on potential barriers to CEQA streamlining. Of these, two-thirds reported concern regarding potential barriers. 100% of those with concerns indicated regulatory issues as the primary obstacle.

Coachella Valley Association of Governments Local Implementation Survey, Part 1 Response Rate: 60.0%
Excluding mandatory updates of the ‘Housing’ element, about 69% of respondents have updated at least (1) element of their General Plan in the last 5 years; 44% have updated at least (5) General Plan elements; & just over 37% have updated all (6) non-housing General Plan elements in the last 5 years.

19% of responding Western Riverside County jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their General Plan.

100% of jurisdictions have updated the ‘Housing’ element of their General Plan within the last 5 years, by far the most commonly updated single element among respondents. The second most commonly updated element over the last 5 years is ‘Land Use’, with just over 56%; & 50% reporting recent updates to their ‘Circulation, element. The remaining 4 General Plan elements, ‘Conservation’, ‘Open Space’, ‘Noise’, & ‘Safety’, each registered about 44%.

More than 81% report that at least one of the (4) featured SCS strategies is supported by their currently adopted General Plan, while just over 31% selected all (4) of the SCS strategies as being supported by their adopted General Plan.

Of the (4) featured SCS strategies, 75% report ‘Infill’ development as a strategy supported by their currently adopted General Plan, the most commonly selected of the options, while just over 56% selected ‘TOD’. ‘Concentrated Destinations’ was selected as a strategy by 50% of reporting jurisdictions, while 44% selected ‘Complete Communities’.

Of jurisdictions currently updating their General Plan, 100% reported ‘Infill’ & ‘Complete Communities’ to be supported by the new Plan, while one-third report ‘Concentrated Destinations’ & ‘TOD’ as supported in their updated General Plan.

100% of respondents currently updating their General Plan selected at least two of the (4) SCS options, & 33% selected all (4) SCS strategies to be supported in the update.

50% of jurisdictions have updated their zoning code within the last 2 years; more than 62% within the last 5 years; & about 88% have done so within the last 10 years. Just over 12% are currently in the process of updating their zoning code.

For jurisdictions that have updated their zoning code within the last 5 years, 30% report ‘Infill’ development as a primary policy objective, while 20% reported ‘Concentrated Destinations’. ‘Complete Communities’ ‘TOD’ & were each selected by 10% of respondents as primary policy objectives. 38% selected at least one, & about 12% selected (3) SCS strategies.

About 81% of respondents indicated the presence of an RTP-designated ‘High Quality Transit Area’ (HQTA) within their jurisdiction. Of these, about 31% report having policy incentives in place to encourage HQTA development.

Just over 23% of jurisdictions that report having an HQTA have adopted at least two specific plans for TPAs, while about 8% of HQTA respondents have adopted at least four TPA specific plans.
• Over 15% of respondents report having a proposed new TPA specific plan. None report more than one proposed plan.

• Just over 6% of jurisdictions have adopted a ‘Complete Streets’ policy, with another 12% planning to do so.

• More than 31% of localities have adopted a ‘Safe Routes to School’ policy & an additional 6% are planning to do so.

• Over 12% of respondents have adopted a local Pedestrian Plan, with another 31% planning to develop one.

• 50% of reporting jurisdictions have adopted a Bicycle Plan & an additional 31% are planning to develop one.

• 50% of jurisdictions have adopted a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policy, & another 6% planning to do so.

• More than 12% of respondents have adopted a local parking policy & while one jurisdiction is planning an update to an existing policy, none are currently planning new ones.

• About 69% of respondents have adopted an impact fee policy, with another 6% planning to do so.

• 25% of jurisdictions have adopted a public health policy & an additional 25% are planning to develop one.

• Of the (7) featured sustainable planning policy objectives, ‘Green Building’ was the most commonly adopted, with 69% of jurisdictions reporting either a plan, policy, or ordinance in place. ‘Energy Efficiency’, with 62%, was the second most frequent selection. ‘Water Efficiency’ was selected by 50%, & about 31% have adopted a ‘Climate Action Plan’. 25% of jurisdictions reported having some type of ‘Solar Energy’ strategy, while about 19% of respondents report having adopted ‘Solid Waste’ & ‘Electric Vehicle’ strategies in place.

• 19% of respondents report having projects that may qualify for CEQA streamlining.

• About 44% of jurisdictions commented on potential barriers to CEQA streamlining. Of these, 71% reported concern regarding potential barriers. 40% reported lack of qualifying projects as the primary obstacle. Other barriers included legal uncertainty, excessively narrow thresholds of eligibility, & public perception, each receiving 20% of responses.

• Western Riverside County Local Implementation Survey, Part 1 Response Rate: 78.9%
2014 Local Implementation Survey: Subregional Summary

SANBAG

- Excluding mandatory updates of the ‘Housing’ element, just over 35% of SANBAG survey respondents have updated at least (1) General Plan element in the last 5 years, & 24% have updated (3) non-housing elements in the last 5 years.

- 35% of responding SANBAG jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their General Plan.

- 94% of reporting jurisdictions have updated the ‘Housing’ element of their General Plan within the last 5 years, by far the most commonly updated single element among respondents. The second most commonly updated General Plan element over was ‘Land Use’, with 35%; followed by ‘Circulation’, with a response rate of just over 29%.

- 88% of respondents report that at least one of the (4) featured SCS strategies is supported by their currently adopted General Plan, while 35% selected all (4) of the SCS strategies as being supported by their adopted General Plan.

- Of the (4) featured SCS strategies, more than 82% report ‘Infill’ development as a strategy supported by their currently adopted General Plan, the most commonly selected of the (4) options. ‘Concentrated Destinations’ was second with nearly 71%, followed by ‘Complete Communities’ (59%), & ‘TOD’ (41%).

- Of jurisdictions currently updating their General Plan, SCS strategies are even more prevalent, with 83% of responding jurisdictions reporting ‘Infill’, ‘Complete Communities’, & ‘Concentrated Destinations’ each as strategies to be supported by their new Plan. 50% selected ‘TOD’ as a supported strategy in their updated General Plan.

- 83% of respondents currently updating their General Plan selected at least one of the (4) SCS options, & 50% selected all (4) SCS strategies to be supported in the update.

- 59% of responding jurisdictions have updated their zoning code in the last 2 years; nearly 71% within the last 5 years; and 94% have done so within the last 10 years. 41% are currently in the process of updating their zoning code.

- For jurisdictions that have updated their zoning code within the last 5 years, 42% report ‘Infill’ as a primary policy objective, while ‘Concentrated Destinations’, ‘Complete Communities’, & ‘TOD’ were each selected by 17% of respondents as primary zoning code update objectives. 42% selected at least one, & 17% selected at least three SCS strategies.

- About 59% of respondents indicated the presence of an RTP-designated ‘High Quality Transit Area’ (HQTA) within their jurisdiction. Of these, 50% report having policy incentives in place to encourage HQTA development.

- 40% of reporting jurisdictions that have an HQTA have adopted at least one Transit Priority Area (TPA) specific plan, while 20% have adopted at least two. 10% of HQTA respondents have adopted six TPA specific plans.
2014 Local Implementation Survey: Subregional Summary

SANBAG (continued)

- 10% of responding SANBAG HQTA jurisdictions report current planning for a proposed new TPA specific plan.

- 24% of responding jurisdictions have adopted a ‘Complete Streets’ policy, with another 29% planning to develop one.

- 35% of localities have adopted a ‘Safe Routes to School’ policy, & an additional 24% are planning to do so.

- About 24% of respondents have adopted a local Pedestrian Plan, with another 18% planning to develop one.

- 59% of reporting SANBAG jurisdictions have an adopted Bicycle Plan, & an additional 24% are planning to do so.

- Nearly 18% of responding jurisdictions have adopted a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policy, with another 12% planning to develop one.

- 6% of SANBAG survey respondents have an adopted local parking policy; & another 6% are planning for one.

- 94% of respondents have adopted an impact fee policy, with the remaining 6% planning to develop one.

- 53% of reporting jurisdictions have adopted a public health policy, & an additional 18% are planning to do so.

- Of the (7) featured sustainable planning policy objectives, ‘Water Efficiency’ & ‘Green Building’ were the two most commonly adopted, with about 77% of jurisdictions reporting either a plan, policy, or ordinance in place for ‘Water Efficiency’, & about 65% for ‘Green Building’. 59% of respondents have adopted some type of ‘Solid Waste’ strategy, & 47% have an adopted plan for ‘Energy Efficiency’. ‘Solar Energy’ was cited by 35%, & ‘Climate Action Plan’ was selected by about 29% of jurisdictions. Only about 12% of respondents report having an adopted ‘Electric Vehicle’ strategy in place.

- About 29% of SANBAG survey respondents report having projects that may qualify for CEQA streamlining.

- 65% of responding jurisdictions commented on potential barriers to CEQA streamlining. Of these, 82% reported concern regarding potential barriers. One-third reported a lack of qualifying projects as the primary obstacle, while legal uncertainty was cited by 22%. Other potential barriers mentioned were program regulations, lack of staff resources, excessively narrow eligibility thresholds, & political resistance, each receiving about 11% of responses.

- SANBAG Local Implementation Survey, Part 1 Response Rate: 68.0%
2014 Local Implementation Survey: Subregional Summary
Ventura County COG

- Excluding mandatory updates of the ‘Housing’ element, 60% of Ventura County respondents have updated at least (1) element of their General Plan in the last 5 years; 50% have updated at least (2) elements; 30% have updated (3) or more elements; & 20% have updated all (6) non-housing General Plan elements in the last 5 years.

- 40% of reporting Ventura County jurisdictions are currently in the process of updating their General Plan.

- 100% of jurisdictions have updated the ‘Housing’ element of their General Plan within the last 5 years, by far the most commonly updated single element among respondents. The next most frequently updated General Plan elements over the last 5 years were ‘Conservation’, ‘Open Space’, & ‘Safety’, each with 40%. ‘Land Use’ & ‘Circulation’ elements were recently updated by 30% of respondents, & 20% reported an update of the ‘Noise’ element in the previous 5 years.

- 100% of respondents report that at least one of the (4) featured SCS strategies is supported by their currently adopted General Plan, while 30% selected all (4) of the SCS strategies as being supported by their adopted General Plan.

- Of the (4) featured SCS strategies, 90% report ‘Infill’ development as a strategy supported by their currently adopted General Plan, the most commonly selected of the (4) options. ‘TOD’, selected by 60% of respondents, was second; with ‘Concentrated Destinations’ (50%), & ‘Complete Communities’ (40%) also showing promising levels of implementation.

- Of jurisdictions currently updating their General Plan, ‘Infill’, ‘TOD’, & ‘Concentrated Destinations’ each were selected by 50% of respondents as SCS strategies to be supported by the new Plan; with 25% selecting ‘Complete Communities’.

- 50% of respondents currently updating their General Plan selected at least three of the (4) SCS options, & 25% selected all (4) SCS strategies to be supported in the update.

- 50% of jurisdictions have updated their zoning code within the last 2 years; 70% within the last 5 years; & 80% have done so within the last 10 years. 30% are currently in the process of updating their zoning code.

- For jurisdictions that have updated their zoning code within the last 5 years, 43% reported ‘Infill’ development & ‘Concentrated Destinations’ as primary policy objectives. While 29% of respondents selected ‘TOD’, only 14% selected ‘Complete Communities’ as a primary zoning code objective. 70% selected at least one, & 10% selected all (4) SCS strategies as supported by their most recent zoning code update.

- 80% of Ventura County respondents indicated the presence of an RTP-designated ‘High Quality Transit Area’ (HQTA) within their jurisdiction. Of these, nearly 38% report having policy incentives in place to encourage HQTA development.

- 50% of jurisdictions that report having an HQTA have adopted at least one Transit Priority Area (TPA) specific plan, while 10% have adopted at least three. No respondents report any proposed new TPA specific plans.
40% of jurisdictions report having an adopted a local 'Complete Streets' policy, with another 20% planning to do so.

50% of localities have adopted a ‘Safe Routes to School’ policy, with no additional jurisdictions reporting current planning for one.

30% of respondents have adopted a local Pedestrian Plan, & an additional 20% are planning to develop one.

90% of reporting jurisdictions have adopted a Bicycle Plan, with none reporting current planning for one.

60% of jurisdictions have adopted a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policy, with none planning for one.

60% of respondents have adopted a local parking policy, with another 10% planning to do so.

100% of reporting jurisdictions have adopted an impact fee policy.

30% of respondents have adopted a public health policy, with another 10% planning to do so.

Of the (7) featured sustainable planning policy objectives, 'Energy Efficiency' was the most commonly adopted, with 60% of jurisdictions reporting either a plan, policy, or ordinance in place. ‘Green Building’, ‘Water Efficiency’, & ‘Solid Waste’ were each selected by 50% of respondents; while 40% indicated having an adopted ‘Electric Vehicle’ strategy in place. & ‘Solar Energy’ & ‘Climate Action Plan’ were each selected by 30% of Ventura County survey respondents.

40% of responding Ventura County jurisdictions report having projects that may qualify for CEQA streamlining.

60% of jurisdictions commented on potential barriers to CEQA streamlining. Of these, 83% reported concern regarding potential barriers. Lack of qualifying projects & lack of program guidance were each indicated by 40% of respondents as the primary obstacle to streamlining. Regulatory concerns were cited by 20%.

Ventura County Local Implementation Survey, Part 1 Response Rate: 90.9%
Item 3: Bullet No. 3 - Open Space Survey
Attachment
Overview:
Local Survey Part II – Open Space

Technical Working Group
October 16th, 2014
Open Space Policy in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS

- Commits to new Strategic Planning process
- Input for 2016-2040 RTP/SCS
- Survey objective: Assess current state of Open Space programs and policies throughout the SCAG region.
Total Surveys Completed: 145
Response Rate: 74%
Local Survey Part II – Open Space
Input Results

- Most jurisdictions had open space programs in at least one category.
- Many jurisdictions had open space programs in more than one category, so results add up to more than 100%.
Respondents were asked to identify any specific Open Space programs/policies within their jurisdiction. The majority of programs fell into one of three categories:

- **Land Use** – i.e. general plans, parks and recreation master plans, zoning etc.
- **Mitigation** – i.e. MSHCPs, NCCP/HCPs, land banks, etc.
- **Third Party** – i.e. non-profit partnerships, conservation authorities, etc.
- **Other**
Overall Current and Proposed Open Space Programs

- 40% of jurisdictions have plans for open space programs in the future. Nearly 1/3rd (27%) of future plans are related to land use and general plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Survey Part II – Open Space
Input Results

Current and Proposed Open Space Programs by County

- In every county, at least a quarter of responding jurisdictions listed plans for future Open Space Programs.
Thank you!

India Brookover
Assistant Regional Planner, Sustainability
brookover@scag.ca.gov  (213) 236-1919
Item 4: Environmental Justice Analysis and Outreach Attachment
Environmental Justice Analysis for the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)
Overview

- Background on Environmental Justice
- Upcoming EJ Workshop + Outreach
- Overview of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS
Background on Environmental Justice

**Fundamental Principles:**

- To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations.

- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process.

- To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations.

- U.S. Department of Transportation, An Overview of Transportation and Environmental Justice
Background on Environmental Justice

Guiding Documents:

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
- Executive Order 12898 (1994)
- US Department of Transportation Order (1997)
  - Federal Highway Administration Order (1998)
  - Memorandum: Implementing Title VI Requirements in Metropolitan and Statewide Planning (1999)
- FTA Circular Title VI Guidelines (2007 and 2011)
- SCAG’s Public Participation Plan (2014)
Background on Environmental Justice

**SCAG’s Environmental Justice Policy:**

- Committed to being a leader in our analysis of the environmental, health, social, and economic impacts of our programs on minority and low-income populations in the SCAG region.
  - Provides early and meaningful public access to decision making processes for all interested parties, including minority and low-income populations.

- Seeks out and considers the input of traditionally underrepresented groups, such as minority and low-income populations, in the regional transportation planning process.

- When disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations are identified, SCAG takes steps to propose mitigation measures or consider alternative approaches for the SCAG region.

- Continues to evaluate and respond to environmental justice issues that arise during and after the implementation of SCAG’s regional plans.
Upcoming Environmental Justice Workshop + Outreach

- **Upcoming EJ Workshop**
  - November 20, 2014
  - 2:00pm – 4:00pm
  - Location will be SCAG’s Main Office
  - Video conferencing will be available
Outreach

- SCAG will advertise the workshop to EJ Stakeholder Groups and the General Public
- Attendees from last round’s workshop will be notified
- Partner agencies will also be included
- Assistance from TWG members is appreciated
Overview of EJ for the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS

- Outreach
  - Two public workshops were conducted in 2010 and 2011
  - Stakeholders included representatives of environmental and social justice advocacy groups

- Recommendations from Workshops
  - Focus more on bicycling and walking for all ages
  - Identify and quantify the primary environmental justice challenges in the region; identify baseline
  - Bring public health to the forefront
  - Address gentrification and both formal and informal economies
  - Additional analysis needed on impacts related to rail traffic (Federal Government Comment on 2008 RTP EJ Analysis)
Overview of EJ for the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS

Performance Indicators

1. RTP Revenue Sources/Tax Burdens
2. Share of Transportation System Usage
3. RTP Project Investment Share by Income and Ethnicity
4. Impacts from Funding Through VMT Fees (NEW in 2012)
5. Distribution of Travel Time Savings and Travel Distance Savings
6. Jobs-Housing Imbalance or Jobs-Housing Mismatch (NEW in 2012)
7. Accessibility to Work/Shopping Opportunities
8. Accessibility to Parks (NEW in 2008)
9. Gentrification and Displacement (NEW in 2012)
11. Rail-Related Impacts (NEW in 2012)
Environmental Justice Toolbox

• Menu of potential mitigation options for subsequent projects including:
  • Noise Impacts
  • Air Quality Impacts along Heavily Traveled Corridors
  • Rail-Related Impacts
  • Road Pricing Mechanisms
  • Environmental Justice Impacts

• Includes potential resources for gentrification and displacement
Overview of EJ for the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS

- **Demographic & Socioeconomic Data**
  - Baseline: 2000 Census; 2005-09 American Community Survey (ACS)
  - Projected: SCAG’s Integrated Growth Forecast for 2012 RTP
    - EJ Population Groups: Low Income Households, Households/Individuals in Poverty, Racial & Ethnic Minorities, Seniors (Age 65+), Households without Vehicles, Non-English Speakers, Foreign Born Individuals

- **Emissions Data**
  - Baseline: 2004-06 & 2007-09 Ozone and PM 2.5 Data from ARB
  - Projected: Derived from SCAG’s Baseline & Plan Scenarios in 2012 RTP using regional transportation model output, EMFAC, and DTM

- **Health Effects Data**
  - 2005 Respiratory Risk and Cancer Risk from UC Berkeley/USC/Occidental College Study

- **Transportation Data**
  - SCAG’s Travel Demand Model
Overview of EJ for the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS

Summary of Study Areas

- Historic and Projected Population
- Benefits & Burdens
- Travel Time & Person Mile Benefits
- Accessibility to Work and Shopping Opportunities
- Accessibility to Parks
- Gentrification & Displacement
- Regional Emissions
  - Existing & Projected
- Localized Emissions & Noise
Historic and Projected Population

- Hispanic Population will increase dramatically by 2035
- Non-Hispanic White Population will continue to decrease through 2035
- Population gains will also be seen for Non-Hispanic Blacks and Non-Hispanic Asians
The percentage of individuals in Poverty decreased from 2000 to 2005-09.

This percentage will grow slightly faster in proportion to total population by 2035.
Benefits and Burdens

Share of Retail & Gasoline Taxes Paid & RTP Investments by Ethnicity

- Share of investments outpace retail & gasoline taxes paid for Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Black populations.
Benefits and Burdens

Share of Retail & Gasoline Taxes Paid & RTP Investments by Income

- Share of investments outpace retail & gasoline taxes paid for the lowest two income quintiles.
Travel Time and Person Mile Benefits

Share of Travel Time and Person-Mile Savings by Ethnicity

- Share of travel time and person-mile savings are highest for Hispanic and Non-Hispanic White populations.
- This is in line with each ethnic groups’ use of the transportation system.
Travel Time and Person Mile Benefits

Share of Travel Time and Person-Mile Savings by Income

- Share of travel time and person-mile savings are highest for the top two income quintiles.
- This is proportional to the higher usage of autos by higher income groups.
Accessibility to Work

Job Accessibility (45 Minutes of Travel) by Ethnicity

- Accessibility to Jobs by auto is highest for Non-Hispanic White and Non-Hispanic Asian populations.
- Accessibility to Jobs by bus is highest for Hispanic, Non-Hispanic White and Non-Hispanic Asian populations.
Accessibility to Work

Job Accessibility (45 Minutes of Travel) by Income

- Accessibility to Jobs by both auto and bus is highest for income quintiles 3, 4 and 5.
Accessibility to Shopping Opportunities

Improvements to Shopping Accessibility (45 Minutes of Travel) by Income – Plan vs. Baseline

- Accessibility to shopping opportunities improves under the Plan Scenario for all income Quintiles.
Accessibility to Shopping Opportunities

Improvements to Shopping Accessibility (45 Minutes of Travel) by Ethnicity – Plan vs. Baseline

- Accessibility to shopping opportunities improves under the Plan Scenario for all ethnicity groups.
Accessibility to Parks

Park Accessibility (45 Minutes of Travel) by Ethnicity

- Accessibility to Parks by auto and bus is highest for Hispanic, Non-Hispanic Black, and Non-Hispanic Asian populations.
Accessibility to Parks

Park Accessibility (45 Minutes of Travel) by Income

Accessibility to Parks by auto and bus is highest for income quintiles 3, 4, and 5.

- Accessibility to Local Parks by Auto
- Accessibility to Local Parks by Bus
Gentrification and Displacement

Key Demographic Changes in High Quality Transit Areas

- SCAG will continue to monitor demographic changes for indication of displacement of Environmental Justice Communities.
Existing Regional Emissions

- Average Daily Ozone Exposure in Excess of Federal Standards
- Average Annual Concentration of PM 2.5 Exposure
- Cancer Risk over Lifetime per Million Persons
- Respiratory Hazard Risk Index
Ozone Exposure (2004-06)

Average Daily Ozone Exposure in Excess of the National 8 Hour Standard (0.075 ppm)

- Areas Not Measured
- 0.00 - 0.05
- 0.06 - 0.16
- 0.17 - 0.28
- 0.29 - 0.40
- 0.41 - 0.51
- 0.52 - 0.64
- 0.65 - 0.77
- 0.78 - 0.89
- 0.90 - 1.30

Sources: SCAG, ESRI Shaded Relief, Tele Atlas, California Air Resources Board (ARB)
Ozone Exposure (2007-09)

Average Daily Ozone Exposure in Excess of the National 8 Hour Standard (0.075 ppm)

Areas Not Measured:
- 0.00 - 0.05
- 0.06 - 0.16
- 0.17 - 0.28
- 0.29 - 0.40
- 0.41 - 0.51
- 0.52 - 0.64
- 0.65 - 0.77
- 0.78 - 0.89
- 0.90 - 1.30

Sources: SCAG, ESRI Shaded Relief, Telis Atlas
Existing Regional Emissions

Average Daily Ozone Exposure in Excess of the National 8 Hour Standard (0.075 ppm) (2004-06 & 2007-09)

- Minority areas experience a higher ozone exposure than is seen in the region as a whole.
- Areas with large numbers of individuals in poverty tend to have ozone exposure similar to the larger region.
PM 2.5 Exposure (2007-09)

PM 2.5 Exposure (2007-09)
Annual Average Concentration (ug/m3)
Areas Not Measured
0.1 - 7.5
7.6 - 9.5
9.6 - 11.3
11.4 - 12.6
12.7 - 13.6
13.7 - 14.5
14.6 - 15.6
15.7 - 17.7
17.8 - 21.4

Sources: SCAG, ESRI Shaded Relief, Tele Atlas, California Air Resources Board (APB)
Existing Regional Emissions

Average Annual Concentration of PM 2.5 Exposure (ug/m³) (2004-06 & 2007-09)

- Minority areas experience a higher exposure from PM 2.5 than is seen in the region as a whole.
- Areas with large numbers of individuals in poverty tend to have PM 2.5 exposure higher than the larger region.
Existing Regional Emissions

Cancer Risk Over Lifetime Per Million Persons (2005)

- Areas that have high concentrations of both minorities and individuals below poverty experience a higher cancer risk than the region.

Source: UC Berkeley/USC/Occidental College Study based upon EPA’s National Air Toxics Assessment
Respiratory Risk Per Individual

(2005)

- **Below Poverty**: 5.17
- **Minority**: 5.42
- **Region Total**: 4.62

- Respiratory Risk is higher in areas that have concentrations of minorities and individuals in poverty than is seen in the region.

Source: UC Berkeley/USC/Occidental College Study based upon EPA’s National Air Toxics Assessment
Projected Regional Emissions

**Plan vs. Baseline Scenario in 2035**

**Important to Note:**

- Emissions Analysis does not account for Plan improvements in vehicle technology, particularly for truck only corridors.
- Truck only corridors in the Plan are exclusively for zero and/or near-zero emission vehicles.
- The PEIR that accompanies the RTP/SCS includes mitigation measures that would reduce impacts associated with health risk within 500 feet of freeways and high-traffic volume roadways to less than significant.
- As such, emissions and exposure analysis shown in this Appendix is abundantly conservative and demonstrates worst-case scenario outcomes.
PM Emission Change
2035 Baseline to Plan

PM Emission Change
(2035 Baseline to Plan)

- Decreased
- Increased

Sources: SCAQ, ESRI Shaded Relief, Tele Atlas
Projected Regional Emissions

Current and Projected Criteria Pollutant Emissions

Grams per Acre per Day (2008 & 2035)

- Several Criteria Pollutants will be reduced as a result of the plan
- CO emissions will experience the most dramatic decrease, followed by NOx, and ROG
Localized Emissions

- Freeway 500 Foot Buffer Zone
- Emissions Near Rail Roads
- Roadway Noise
- Aviation Noise
The percentage of the region’s total poverty and minority population in the buffer zone is higher than the percentage of the region’s total population that live within the buffer zone.
# Localized Emissions

Current and Projected Emissions within 500 Foot Freeway Buffer Zone (2035)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>Emissions in 500 feet Freeway Buffer (gram per day per acre)</th>
<th>Emissions in the Region (gram per day per acre)</th>
<th>Emissions Gap (Buffer - Region) (gram per day per acre)</th>
<th>Narrowing of the Emission Gap from 2008 to 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>2.145</td>
<td>0.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projected Rail Related Impacts (2035): Percent of Poverty and Minority Population in Areas Near Rail Roads vs. Region

- The percentage of minorities and population below poverty is higher in areas near rail roads than is seen in the greater region.
Localized Emissions

Projected Roadway Noise Impacts (2035):
Percent of Poverty and Minority Population in Affected Areas vs. Region

- The percentage of minorities and population below poverty is higher in roadway noise buffer areas than is seen in the greater region.
Localized Emissions

Projected Aviation Noise Impacts (2035):
Percent of Poverty and Minority Population in Affected Areas vs. Region

- The percentage of minorities and population below poverty is higher in aviation noise contour areas than is seen in the greater region.
Next Steps

SCAG Staff will seek input from the public and various stakeholders on the 2016 RTP/SCS EJ Appendix through upcoming workshops
Questions?

Thanks!

Kimberly Clark
Senior Regional Planner
Land Use & Environmental Planning
clark@scag.ca.gov
Item 5: FHWA/FTA NPRM on NEPA Streamlining
No Attachment
Item 6: SB 743 - No Attachment
Item 7: Cap and Trade Funding
No Attachment