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The Energy & Environment Committee (EEC) may consider and act upon any of the items listed on the agenda regardless of whether they are listed as Information or Action Items.

CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
(The Honorable Carmen Ramirez, Chair)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD – Members of the public desiring to speak on items on the agenda, or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Committee, must fill out and present a Public Comment Card to the Assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes per speaker. The Chair has the discretion to reduce the time limit based upon the number of speakers and may limit the total time for all public comments to twenty (20) minutes.
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ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE
AGENDA
SEPTEMBER 7, 2017

INFORMATION ITEMS

6. Los Angeles Regional Collaborative
   (Laurel Hunt, Executive Director, Los Angeles Regional Collaborative - LARC)
   Attachment 20 mins. 57

7. California Data Collaborative
   (Patrick Atwater, Founder of ARGO Labs - Advanced Research in Government Operations)
   Attachment 30 mins. 65

8. Los Angeles County Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) Program
   (Gary Gero, Chief Sustainability Officer for Los Angeles County)
   Attachment 20 mins. 74

9. SCAG Green Region Initiative Sustainability Indicators Map
   (CivicSpark Fellows: Adrienne Garcia; Catherine Saint; and Monica Dorsey)
   Attachment 20 mins. 84

CHAIR’S REPORT
(The Honorable Carmen Ramirez, Chair)

STAFF REPORT
(Grieg Asher, SCAG Staff)

FUTURE AGENDA ITEM/S

ANNOUNCEMENT/S

ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the EEC is scheduled for Thursday, October 5, 2017 at the SCAG Los Angeles Office.
THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE. AN AUDIO RECORDING OF THE MEETING IS AVAILABLE AT SCAG, 818 W. 7TH STREET, 12TH FLOOR, LOS ANGELES, CA 90017.

The Energy and Environment Committee (EEC) held its meeting at the SCAG Los Angeles Office. A quorum was present.
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CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Carmen Ramirez, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. and asked Joseph Briglio, SCAG Public Affairs Specialists III, Ventura, to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Dr. David Bliss, Charge Bliss, stated that within the City of Carson’s Advanced Energy Community (AEC) project is a very robust system for EV charging, car sharing, and car hailing. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is taking public comment until July 15, 2017 on the Volkswagen (VW) consent decree related to diesel cars. CARB is asking Electrify America to give more detailed information about what they plan to do and in particular emphasizing disadvantaged communities. The City of Carson would like to encourage the Southern California community to support the release of the VW funds so those projects can get done but more importantly, to emphasize the importance of disadvantaged communities in this process. Mr. Bliss offered to make a presentation to the EEC on the topic if there is an interest.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

Agenda Item #11 was brought forward to follow Agenda Item #7.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

1. Minutes of the June 1, 2017 Meeting

Receive and File

2. Final Update on State Route (SR) 241 Extension Transportation Control Measure (TCM) Substitution by Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA)

3. 2017 Meeting Schedule of the Regional Council and Policy Committees

4. 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) Growth Forecast Development: Summary of Panel of Experts Meeting and Draft Preliminary Ganges of Regional and County Growth Projections

5. Update on First Meetings of Five Facility-Based/Indirect Mobile Source Measure Working Groups of South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)

6. 2017 Active Transportation Program Augmentation Guidelines and Sustainability Planning Grants: 2017 Active Transportation Call for Proposals

A MOTION was made (Wilson) to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion was SECONDED (Ehrenkranz) and passed by the following votes:
INFORMATION ITEMS

7. UCLA Advanced Energy Community (AEC) Project Update

Jason Greenspan, SCAG Staff, explained that SCAG has been participating on UCLA’s AEC project technical advisory committee, and introduced Dr. Felicia Federico, Executive Director, and Dr. Stephanie Pincetl, Director, Professor-in-Residence, California Center for Sustainable Communities, UCLA. Dr. Pincetl and Dr. Federico provided an overview of the AEC goals and an update on the project’s status within Los Angeles County.

Dr. Pincetl stated that UCLA has been working on the AEC project for almost two years. The project is a $1.5M planning grant from the California Energy Commission (CEC) to accelerate the deployment of “Advanced Energy Communities”. The disadvantaged community category was chosen because Los Angeles County and the region has a number of such communities, which are often harder to reach for a transition to greater sustainability and are the greatest challenges. The desired characteristics of the AEC is affordable access to renewable energy generation, energy savings and Green House Gas (GHG) emissions reductions all of which will lead to improved health, comfort, and standard of living. Other characteristics are improved reliability and resiliency, minimized grid impacts and support for grid reliability that make it a financially attractive package.

Dr. Federico stated that the technical overview of the preliminary design includes a combination of Energy Efficiency (EE) upgrades to voluntary participant’s homes, a community solar installation that would encompass multiple community locations, battery storage and energy management technologies. The goal is zero net electricity. The overview of the business case component of the project clarified that a net reduction in a user’s monthly bill would result from EE upgrades and community solar reduced rates. The community components include outreach and education, workforce development, demonstration hub, and long term in-community support of home EE. The project will benefit residential participants and the school district within the community.

UCLA has created an “Energy Atlas” which is the first of its kind interactive web Atlas which provides access to the largest and most disaggregated building energy data available in the nation. The Atlas is the hub of the project site data analysis and energy assessments, energy efficiency program effectiveness, and the county-scale prioritization tool. UCLA has mapped 27+ million raw utility addresses to the parcel level. This allows for energy consumption to be analyzed by parcel data, census characteristics and any geographic aggregation beyond parcel level. The Atlas is in the process of being extended to include other counties aside from Los Angeles County. More information can be found at: www.energyatlas.ucla.edu

UCLA is in the process of creating a Spatial Prioritization Tool specifically designed to support local governments and municipalities in understanding how to put together data within their areas
to identify places that are most critical for investments in order to support disadvantaged communities. The tool will integrating data sets that include grid capacity Distributed Energy Resource Interconnection Map (DERiM), net solar potential, CalEnviro-Screen, and census demographics.

8. **Mobility Innovations: Modeling Challenges and Future Transportation Technologies**

Marco Anderson, SCAG Staff, stated that transportation technology is one of the themes of the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Mobility innovations, as referred to in the 2016 RTP/SCS, have the potential to make existing transportation choices more widely available and easier to use throughout the region. However, the region will face challenges and modeling uncertainty regarding the adoption rate of a wide range of public and private sector innovations. Uncertainty of innovation adoption and modeling challenges will have an impact on SCAG’s ability to meet Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets proposed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

SCAG, along with the other three (3) major MPOs in California, collaborated and each conducted a technical “Stress Test” aimed to test GHG reduction strategies that would yield the most ambitious yet achievable GHG emission reductions. The purpose of the Stress Test was to quantify potential GHG emission reductions that would result from deployment of various land use and transportation strategies, such as accelerated deployment of zero emission vehicles and mobility innovations. The technical analysis and off-model assessment of potential additional GHG emission reductions from strategies included in the Stress Test were the technical basis for SCAG’s 2035 target recommendations to CARB.

Clean vehicle and fuel efficiency programs are the most effective strategies to reducing GHG emissions, but also make driving more economical and thereby generate additional Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). With the anticipated impact from this VMT rebound effect and other factors, the same level of resolve will likely not reach the last plan’s 18% GHG reduction level of achievement for year 2035. To reach the last plan’s 18% achievement for the upcoming 2020 RTP/SCS, SCAG will need to conduct additional research in GHG reduction strategies and promote innovation and collaboration with regional stakeholders. Reaching CARBs proposed target of 21% GHG reduction for year 2035 underscores this pressing need.

Hon. Shari Horne, La Palma, suggested that golf carts be included in the mobility innovation research as they relate to retirement communities.


Sarah Jepson, SCAG Staff, stated that water is a key policy priority for SCAG’s new Regional Council (RC) President, Honorable Margaret Finlay, who highlighted water related issues among her top priorities for the year. President Finlay has indicated that the region needs access to clean water, to balance water resources with the growth of the region and to explore alternatives to make the region less dependent on imported water resources and a more sustainable water future. Staff has received feedback that this is a good time for SCAG to play a leadership role in facilitating greater collaboration.
Currently, there is work being done throughout the SCAG region on watershed and ground water management plans. There are new guidelines being disseminated for jurisdictions’ General Plan development and how to incorporate water into the plan. There is new transportation funding in which the region can think about ways water can be integrated into the funds. Additionally, SCAG has produced data related to growth forecasting and the transportation system that is useful to water agencies. As SCAG is looking to enhance its collaboration it should start with its data and talk about ways in which its data can be used in these different planning agencies. SCAG has also had feedback that it should play a strong role in education and information sharing. SCAG needs to engage more stakeholders in conversation as there is a need to identify more opportunities and work toward common goals in the region.

As staff moves forward this year it will focus its efforts in three primary areas: 1) host more regional conversations with other agencies on specific water related issues, 2) engage water stakeholders as part of the Open Data/Big Data committee and initiatives to better integrate water data and analysis into planning tools and resources, and 3) continue to use the Energy and Environment Committee (EEC) and other SCAG forums to inform local elected officials about water planning and policy issues related to sustainability.

Hon. David Pollock, Moorpark, suggested that Staff help the members of the EEC understand the nexus between land use planning and water.

10. ARB SB 375 Regional GHG Target Draft Recommendations for the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2020 RTP/SCS) and Beyond

Ping Chang, SCAG Staff, informed the EEC that on June 13, 2017, CARB released their Staff Report on the “Proposed Update to the SB 375 Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Targets” which included a 21% per capita reduction target for 2035 for the SCAG region. This is significantly higher than the SCAG recommendation of 18% for 2035 approved by SCAG’s Regional Council (RC) on April 6, 2017. This recommendation would apply to our upcoming 2020 RTP/SCS and is conditioned upon a combination of actions or alternative equivalent measures.

SCAG’s last RTP/SCS, completed in 2016, achieved an 18% per capita GHG reduction for 2035, exceeding ARB’s target of 13%. The 2020 RTP/SCS will be challenged to maintain the 18% level of per capita GHG reduction as in the 2016 RTP/SCS. Part of the reason is from what is called the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) rebound effect (i.e. better fuel efficiency will lead to more driving - more VMT). The rebound effect will leave a 5% point gap to fill to achieve the 18% level. SCAG’s Stress Test shows that Mobility Innovation and other new strategies may fill 2.5% of the gap. This will leave a 2.5% gap to reach the 18% level.

Staff does not believe the new 21% target is achievable unless there are significant additional state investments and state-led strategies to reduce VMT. SCAG’s 2016 RTP/SCS also has largely accounted for the $12-cents-per-gallon gas tax increase contained in SB 1 beginning in November 2017. The SCAG region has not received its fair share of funding from the GHG Reduction Fund, despite having almost half of the state’s population and 67% of the state’s disadvantaged community’s population. Altogether, this will be likely set SCAG for failure to develop an SCS that meets the target for 2035.
It was noted that there is a joint Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) recommendation of 18% among the four (4) major MPOs.

11. Air Resources Board (ARB) Technical Advisory Regarding Strategies to Reduce Air Pollution Exposure Near High-Volume Roadways

Rye Baerg, SCAG Staff, informed the EEC that in April 2017 the ARB released a Technical Advisory related to Strategies to Reduce Air Pollution Exposure near High-Volume Roadways (Advisory). The Advisory provides updated guidance to the 2005 Handbook based on new scientific research related to the benefits of “infill” development. SCAG considered ARB’s 2005 guidance during development of the 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and will consider ARB’s 2017 guidance as work begins around the public health analysis and policies for the 2020 RTP/SCS. Mr. Baerg then introduced Maggie Witt, Air Pollution Specialist, California Air Resources Board (ARB), Research Division, who provided a presentation on the Technical Advisory and implications for regional and local land-use planning.

Ms. Witt stated that the Advisory is a guide of strategies that have been shown in research literature to be effective at reducing exposure to pollution in communities or environments that are close to high-volume roadways. High-volume roadways are defined as roadways with 100,000 vehicles per-day in an urban area or 50,000 vehicles per-day in a rural area. This definition is consistent with the California Public Resources Code. Of key importance was the recommendation that such roadways be sited a minimum distance from specific land uses. Strategies included in the Advisory fall into three categories: 1) reduce traffic emissions, 2) reduce the concentration of traffic pollution, and 3) remove pollution from indoor air.

The Advisory updates previous guidance issued in 2005 and provides strategies for planners tasked with developing local policies aimed at reducing exposure to traffic emissions when weighing multiple options, to reduce emissions and/or exposure at a specific site. The Advisory was developed in response to new research that shows the benefits of infill development on public health, climate, economic, and other outcomes.

CHAIR’S REPORT

Hon. Carmen Ramirez announced SCAG’s November 9, 2017, Housing and Economic Summit and recommended that the members take a look at what the California Energy Commission’s process is for approving or changing an Oxnard Gas Fired Power Plant less than a hundred feet from the shore. Additionally, Governor Brown is going to host a global summit on Climate Change in the next few months. Staff will keep elected officials informed. Lastly, congratulations to the Ventura County Board of Supervisors majority for supporting the Paris Climate Accords.

STAFF REPORT

None.
FUTURE AGENDA ITEM/S

None.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT

The Honorable Carmen Ramirez adjourned the meeting at 12:01 p.m.

The next regular meeting of the EEC will be held on Thursday, September 7, 2017 at the SCAG Los Angeles office.

[MINUTES ARE UNOFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY THE ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE] //
| Member (including Ex-Officio) | Date Appointed If after 1/1/17 | Representing | Imperial | Los Angeles | Orange | Riverside | San Bernardino | Ventura | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sept | Oct | Nov | Dec | Total Mtgs Attended |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|----------|------------|--------|-----------|----------------|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------------|
| Beltran, Ana                 | 2/17                            | ICTC         | X        | X          | X      | X         | G              | X       | X  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 2                |
| Clark, Margaret              |                                 | Rosenead     | X        | X          | X      | X         | X              | E       | X  | A   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5                |
| Davis, Ned                   | 1/17                            | LVMCOG       | X        | X          | N      | X         | R              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 2                |
| Devine, Paula                | 2/17                            | Arroyo Verdugo Cities | X | X | E | X | K | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| Ehrenkranz, Jordan           |                                 | WRCOG        | X        | X          | X      | X         | R              | X       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5                |
| Englander, Mitchell          |                                 | Los Angeles  | X        |           |         |           | A              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5                |
| Forester, Larry              |                                 | Gateway Cities | X        | X          | X      | X         | L              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 4                |
| Gardner, Mike                |                                 | WRCOG        | X        | X          | X      |           |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 4                |
| Genis, Sandra                |                                 | OCCOG        | X        | X          | X      | X         | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5                |
| Graham, Ed                   |                                 | SBCTA/SANBAG | X        |           |         |           | A              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 1                |
| Harrison, John               |                                 | SBCTA/SANBAG | X        | X          | X      | S         | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3                |
| Horne, Shari                 |                                 | OCCOG        | X        | X          | X      | S         | X              | X       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5                |
| Hwangbo, Steve               |                                 | La Palma     | X        | X          | E      | X         |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3                |
| Mahmud, Diana                |                                 | SGVCOG       | X        |           |         |           | M              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3                |
| Mitchell, Judy               |                                 | SBCCOG       | X        | X          | B      | X         |           |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 4                |
| Nelson, Judy                 | 6/17                            | SGVCOG       | X        |           |         | L         |               |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                   |
| Osborne, Jim                 |                                 | SBCCOG       | X        |           |         | X         | Y              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 4                |
| Parks, Linda                 |                                 | Ventura      | X        | X          | X      | X         | X              | X       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 6                |
| Plancarte, Luis              |                                 | ICTC         | X        |           |         |           | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 4                |
| Pollock, David               |                                 | VCOG         | X        | X          | X      | X         | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5                |
| Ramirez, Carmen              |                                 | Oxnard       | X        | X          | X      | X         | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 6                |
| Robertson, Deborah           |                                 | District 8   | X        |           |         |           | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3                |
| Rosenthal, Laura             | 1/17                            | Malibu       | X        | X          | X      | X         | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5                |
| Sahil-Wells, Meghan          |                                 | WCCOG        | X        | X          | X      | X         | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5                |
| Sanchez, Betty               |                                 | CVAG         | X        |           |         |           | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 4                |
| Schuyler, Steve              |                                 | BIASC        | X        | X          | X      | X         | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 6                |
| Sharif, Emma                 | 5/17                            | GCCOG        | X        |           |         |           | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 2                |
| Williams, Diane              |                                 | SBCTA/SANBAG | X        | X          | X      | X         | X              | X       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 6                |
| Wilson, Edward               |                                 | Signal Hill  | X        | X          | X      | X         | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 5                |
| Wright, Bonnie               |                                 | WRCOG        | X        |           |         |           | X              |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | 3                |
| **TOTALS**                   |                                 |              | 2        | 14         | 4       | 4         | 3              | 3       |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |                  |
DATE: September 7, 2017

TO: Community, Economic, and Human Development (CEHD) Committee
    Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)
    Transportation Committee (TC)

FROM: Mike Gainor, Senior Regional Planner, 213-236-1822, gainor@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: MAP-21 Performance Measures

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S APPROVAL: 

RECOMMENDED ACTION: For Information Only - No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
MAP-21, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (P.L. 112-141), was signed into law by President Obama on July 6, 2012. The MAP-21 federal transportation authorization bill provided for a performance-based transportation planning process through the setting of performance measures and performance targets to achieve specific national transportation goals. Performance measures provide a standardized metric for evaluating progress toward meeting each of the national goals. Performance targets provide a numeric threshold by which the performance measures can be interpreted as having made acceptable progress toward achieving a specific performance goal. The performance-based planning program as defined by MAP-21 was continued in the subsequent federal transportation authorization legislation, the ‘FAST’ Act.

Recently finalized federal rule-making has established a set of national performance measures and guidelines to be used for setting state and regional performance targets. MAP-21 establishes a 4-year performance target setting and reporting cycle, with a 2-year mid-term progress evaluation point. SCAG will coordinate with Caltrans on the establishment of specific performance targets for our region.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan; Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective A: Create and facilitate a collaborative and cooperative environment to produce forward thinking regional plans.

BACKGROUND:
In July 2012, performance monitoring became a federally mandated activity with the enactment of the MAP-21 federal transportation authorization bill. A defining feature of MAP-21 was the establishment of a performance-based transportation planning program, with the objective of ensuring that federally funded transportation system investments are directed toward the achievement of national transportation goals including transportation safety, infrastructure condition, congestion reduction, system reliability,
freight movement and economic vitality, environmental sustainability, and reduced project delivery delay.

Prior to MAP-21 becoming federal law, SCAG had been a pioneer in the development and use of performance metrics to evaluate progress toward achieving our regional goals, a practice that has only gained momentum over the years. Starting with the 1998 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), SCAG has been using quantitative performance measures to evaluate how well the RTP performs toward achieving the regional goals established in the Plan.

The 2012 RTP/SCS was the first time the provisions of Senate Bill 375 (the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008) were incorporated into the regional plan. SB 375 requires California’s MPOs, including SCAG, to prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) every four years, to be included within the RTP. The SCS serves to establish a foundation for an improved linkage between transportation and land use planning in the region, with the goal of fostering more efficient and sustainable regional land use patterns, thereby reducing the greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change. The success of the SCS is dependent upon its implementation at the local level throughout the SCAG region, for which a regional performance monitoring program is essential.

Regional performance monitoring provides a critical foundation for the development and refinement of SCAG’s planning priorities to help ensure our region stays on track toward achieving the goals outlined in the 2016 RTP/SCS. Performance monitoring provides tools to evaluate both progress and setbacks toward achieving our regional goals. It also serves to identify emerging trends in the region to inform development of the next RTP/SCS.

MAP-21 requires the establishment of rules for implementing transportation system performance management planning at a national level. Recent federal rulemaking has provided performance monitoring guidance in seven general transportation planning focus areas: 1) National Highway System Performance, 2) Freight Movement, 3) Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program, 4) Highway Safety, 5) Pavement and Bridge Condition, 6) Transit Asset Management, and 7) Public Transportation Safety. Only the Public Transportation Safety focus area awaits final federal rule-making. Attachment 1 provides details regarding the MAP-21 performance measures.

On May 20, 2017, federal rule-making was finalized for the majority of MAP-21 focus areas, establishing a set of national performance measures and guidelines to be used for setting performance targets in the six planning focus areas that have been finalized to date. The rule-making establishes a four-year performance target setting and reporting cycle. SCAG is coordinating closely with Caltrans on the setting of appropriate performance targets in the SCAG region. A two year mid-term progress evaluation is also established to allow states and MPOs the opportunity to re-evaluate their initial targets to ensure progress is being made toward the four year performance goals. During the mid-term progress evaluation, Caltrans and SCAG are permitted the opportunity to adjust their four year performance targets, if necessary. The final rule and related information may be found at the link provided below.

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/rule.cfm

At the conclusion of each four-year performance reporting period, Caltrans is required to file a performance report to the FHWA describing the progress that has been made toward meeting the initial targets for each of the planning focus areas. SCAG will coordinate with Caltrans on the development of these reports. For purposes of this reporting, any progress made toward achieving each of the targets within most of the planning focus areas is considered to be significant progress. If the report does not
demonstrate that significant progress has been made toward achievement of any of the performance targets, a separate report must be filed by Caltrans to FHWA detailing why significant progress was not made during the performance period and what steps are being implemented to improve performance over the subsequent reporting cycle.

Of the seven planning focus areas defined by MAP-21, only the Highway Safety element includes penalties for not achieving progress toward performance targets. If significant progress toward meeting highway safety targets is not demonstrated, the State is required to use an amount of its formula obligation limitation equal to its prior year Highway Safety Improvement Plan (HSIP) apportionment only for obligation of its HSIP funding, and to also submit an annual implementation plan on how progress will be made toward meeting highway safety performance targets.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with this item is included in the Fiscal Year 2017-2018 Overall Work Program (WBS Number 17-080.SC00153.04: Regional Assessment).

ATTACHMENTS:
1. MAP-21 Performance Measures Table
2. PowerPoint Presentation: MAP-21 Performance Measures Overview
## Attachment 1: MAP-21 Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Caltrans Target Set Date</th>
<th>MPO Target Set Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Reliability</td>
<td>% of interstate system with reliable person-mile travel times</td>
<td>Interstate system</td>
<td>NPMRDS</td>
<td>Level of travel time reliability (LOTTR)</td>
<td>Percent of interstate directional mileage with ratio between 80th percentile and 50th percentile travel times less than 1.5</td>
<td>5/20/17</td>
<td>5/20/18</td>
<td>11/16/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of non-interstate NHS with reliable person-mile travel times</td>
<td>Non-interstate NHS</td>
<td>NPMRDS</td>
<td>Level of travel time reliability (LOTTR)</td>
<td>Percent of non-interstate directional mileage with ratio between 80th percentile and 50th percentile travel times less than 1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Movement</td>
<td>% of interstate system mileage reporting reliable truck travel times</td>
<td>Interstate system</td>
<td>NPMRDS; INRIX</td>
<td>Truck travel time reliability index (TTTR)</td>
<td>Percent of interstate directional mileage with ratio between 95th percentile and 50th percentile truck travel time less than 1.5</td>
<td>5/20/17</td>
<td>5/20/18</td>
<td>11/16/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 1: MAP-21 Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Caltrans Target Set Date</th>
<th>MPO Target Set Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMAQ:</strong> Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>Annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita</td>
<td>NHS in urbanized areas (population over 1 million) that are also nonattainment or maintenance areas for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (PM10 &amp; PM2.5)</td>
<td>NPMRDS traffic/vehicle data (or equivalent 15 minute interval dataset); HPMS bus, car, &amp; truck volumes; FHWA published occupancy factors</td>
<td>Total peak hour excessive delay (TPHED) in person-hours</td>
<td>Annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita = TPHED person-hours/total population in applicable area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) travel</td>
<td>NHS in urbanized areas (population over 1 million) that are also nonattainment or maintenance areas for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (PM10 &amp; PM2.5)</td>
<td>ACS, local survey, or local counts (includes bike/pedestrian counts)</td>
<td>Non-SOV mode share</td>
<td>Three options: (1) ACS: Subtract estimated SOV percentage from 100 percent; (2) Local survey data: Report percentage of non-SOV travel; (3) System use data: Divide non-SOV volume by total volume, where non-SOV includes travel modes other than driving alone in a motorized vehicle, including travel avoided by teleworking</td>
<td>5/20/17</td>
<td>5/20/18</td>
<td>11/16/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 1: MAP-21 Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Caltrans Target Set Date</th>
<th>MPO Target Set Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMAQ: On-Road Mobile Source Emissions</strong></td>
<td>Total emissions reductions</td>
<td>All projects financed with CMAQ funds in areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance for ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO), or particulate matter (PM10 &amp; PM2.5)</td>
<td>CMAQ Public Access System</td>
<td>Total emissions reductions</td>
<td>Sum of annual tons of emissions reduced by CMAQ projects, using the 2 &amp; 4 years of available data from the Public Access System by criteria pollutant or precursor</td>
<td>5/20/17</td>
<td>5/20/18</td>
<td>11/16/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Condition</strong></td>
<td>% of interstate pavement in ‘Good’ condition</td>
<td>Interstate system</td>
<td>State DOT; HPMS</td>
<td>Share of interstate pavement in ‘Good’ condition</td>
<td>Interstate system mileage in ‘Good’ condition based on IRI or PSR rating</td>
<td>5/20/17</td>
<td>5/20/18</td>
<td>11/16/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of interstate pavement in ‘Poor’ condition</td>
<td>Interstate system</td>
<td>State DOT; HPMS</td>
<td>Share of interstate pavement in ‘Poor’ condition</td>
<td>No more than 5% of interstate system mileage in ‘Poor’ condition based on IRI or PSR rating</td>
<td>5/20/17</td>
<td>5/20/18</td>
<td>11/16/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of non-interstate NHS pavement in ‘Good’ condition</td>
<td>Non-interstate NHS</td>
<td>State DOT; HPMS</td>
<td>Share of non-interstate NHS pavement in ‘Good’ condition</td>
<td>Non-interstate NHS mileage in ‘Good’ condition based on IRI or PSR rating</td>
<td>5/20/17</td>
<td>5/20/18</td>
<td>11/16/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of non-interstate NHS pavement in ‘Poor’ condition</td>
<td>Non-interstate NHS</td>
<td>State DOT; HPMS</td>
<td>Share of non-interstate NHS pavement in ‘Poor’ condition</td>
<td>No more than 5% of non-interstate NHS mileage in ‘Poor’ condition based on IRI or PSR rating</td>
<td>5/20/17</td>
<td>5/20/18</td>
<td>11/16/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachement 1: MAP-21 Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Caltrans Target Set Date</th>
<th>MPO Target Set Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bridge Condition</strong></td>
<td>% of NHS bridges in ‘Good’ condition</td>
<td>All NHS bridges</td>
<td>State DOT; National Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>Share of NHS bridges with National Bridge Inventory (NBI) rating of ‘Good’</td>
<td>Share of NHS bridges with National Bridge Inventory (NBI) rating of ‘Good’</td>
<td>5/20/17</td>
<td>5/20/18</td>
<td>11/16/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of NHS bridges in ‘Poor’ condition</td>
<td>All NHS bridges</td>
<td>State DOT; National Bridge Inventory</td>
<td>Share of NHS bridges with NBI rating of ‘Poor’</td>
<td>Share of NHS bridges with NBI rating of ‘Poor’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Safety</strong></td>
<td>Serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>All public roadways</td>
<td>Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS); HPMS</td>
<td>Rate of motor vehicle collisions involving serious injuries on public roadways</td>
<td>Number of serious injuries incurred divided by total vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>4/14/16</td>
<td>8/31/17</td>
<td>2/27/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>All public roadways</td>
<td>Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS); HPMS</td>
<td>Rate of motor vehicle collisions involving fatalities on public roadways</td>
<td>Number of fatalities incurred divided by total vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of serious injuries</td>
<td>All public roadways</td>
<td>SWITRS</td>
<td>Number of serious injuries incurred on public roadways</td>
<td>Total number of serious injuries incurred on all public roadways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of fatalities</td>
<td>All public roadways</td>
<td>FARS</td>
<td>Number of fatalities incurred on public roadways</td>
<td>Total number of fatalities incurred on all public roadways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of non-motorized fatalities &amp; serious injuries</td>
<td>All public roadways</td>
<td>FARS; SWITRS</td>
<td>Number of non-motorized fatalities &amp; serious injuries incurred on public roadways</td>
<td>Total number of non-motorized fatalities &amp; serious injuries incurred on all public roadways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 1: MAP-21 Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Caltrans Target Set Date</th>
<th>MPO Target Set Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Asset Management</strong></td>
<td><strong>Equipment:</strong> Non-revenue support-service &amp; maintenance vehicles</td>
<td>All recipients &amp; subrecipients of Federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 that own, operate, or manage capital assets used for providing public transportation</td>
<td>Transit service providers</td>
<td>% of non-revenue vehicles that meet or exceed Useful Life Benchmark</td>
<td>Share of non-revenue vehicles that meet or exceed Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rolling Stock:</strong> Revenue vehicles by mode</td>
<td>Same as Above</td>
<td>Transit service providers</td>
<td>% of revenue vehicles that meet or exceed Useful Life Benchmark</td>
<td>Share of revenue vehicles that meet or exceed Useful Life Benchmark (ULB)</td>
<td>10/1/16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure:</strong> Rail, fixed-guideway, track, signals, &amp; systems</td>
<td>Same as Above</td>
<td>Transit service providers</td>
<td>% of track segments with performance restrictions</td>
<td>Share of track segments with performance restrictions</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facilities:</strong> Maintenance &amp; administrative facilities; passenger stations; parking facilities</td>
<td>Same as Above</td>
<td>Transit service providers</td>
<td>% of assets with condition rating below 3.0 on FTA TERM Scale</td>
<td>Share of transit facilities with condition rating below 3.0 on FTA TERM Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 1: MAP-21 Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Applicability</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Caltrans Target Set Date</th>
<th>MPO Target Set Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Safety</td>
<td>Total number &amp; rate of fatalities</td>
<td>Any state or local governmental authority or any other operator of a public transportation system that receives Federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53</td>
<td>Transit service providers</td>
<td>Number &amp; rate of transit system fatalities by vehicle revenue miles</td>
<td>Total number of reportable fatalities &amp; fatality rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number &amp; rate of injuries</td>
<td>Same as Above</td>
<td>Transit service providers</td>
<td>Number &amp; rate of transit system injuries by vehicle revenue miles</td>
<td>Total number of reportable injuries &amp; injury rate per total vehicle revenue miles by mode</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety events</td>
<td>Same as Above</td>
<td>Transit service providers</td>
<td>Number &amp; rate of transit safety events by vehicle revenue miles</td>
<td>Total number of reportable events &amp; rate of events per total vehicle revenue miles by mode</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>System reliability</td>
<td>Same as Above</td>
<td>Transit service providers</td>
<td>Rate of service vehicle failure</td>
<td>Mean distance between major mechanical failures: Revenue miles operated divided by number of major mechanical failures</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAP-21 Performance Monitoring

SCAG Transportation Committee
September 7, 2017

Mike Gainor, Senior Regional Planner
Compliance & Performance Monitoring

MAP-21 Performance Monitoring

• MAP-21 (2012) established a legislative foundation for a national performance-based transportation planning program.

• The FAST Act (2015) continued the performance monitoring requirements outlined in MAP-21.

• State DOTs & MPOs are required to establish performance targets supportive of national transportation goals.

• On May 20, 2017, federal rule-making was finalized for the remaining MAP-21 focus areas, establishing a set of national performance measures & guidelines for setting performance targets.

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/rule.cfm
MAP-21 Performance Measures

MAP-21 rule-making has established transportation performance measures within (6) planning areas:

1) National Highway System (NHS) Performance
2) Freight Movement
3) CMAQ Program
4) Highway Safety
5) Pavement & Bridge Condition
6) Transit Asset Management

A seventh performance focus area, ‘Public Transportation Safety’ still awaits final federal rule-making.

MAP-21 Performance Measures

Federal performance measures include:

1) **System Performance:** Interstate & non-interstate NHS Travel Time Reliability (% of reliable person miles traveled)

2) **Freight Movement:** Truck Travel Time Reliability on Interstates (average truck reliability index)

3) **CMAQ Program:** Total Peak Hour Excessive Delay; Non-SOV mode share; Total on-road mobile source emissions reduction

4) **Highway Safety:** Total number & rate of serious injuries; Total number & rate of highway fatalities; Total number of non-motorized fatalities & serious injuries
5) **Pavement/Bridge Condition:** Percentage of interstate & non-interstate NHS pavement in 'Good' condition; Percentage of interstate & non-interstate NHS pavement in 'Poor' condition; Percentage of NHS bridges in 'Good' condition; Percentage of NHS bridges in 'Poor' condition

6) **Transit Asset Management:** Quantitative assessment of the service condition of transit system equipment, rolling stock, infrastructure, & facilities

7) **Public Transportation Safety:** Total number & rate of transit system injuries; Total number & rate of transit system fatalities; Total number & rate of transit safety incidents; Transit system reliability

* Federal rule-making not yet finalized

---

**MAP-21 Performance Targets**

- Performance **targets** are quantitatively defined goals for how we envision the functionality & condition of our transportation system within a specified time period.
- For example, a target may be set for Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) mode share to decrease to 70% by 2025.
- Performance **measures** are the metrics used to assess progress made toward the performance targets.
- SCAG is now actively participating in the target setting process in coordination with Caltrans.
MAP-21 Performance Reporting

- MAP-21 establishes a 4-year performance target setting & reporting cycle, beginning (for most performance reporting areas) in October, 2018.

- Caltrans is required to provide the statewide performance targets to FHWA, however SCAG reserves the option to establish its own regional targets within 180 days of the Caltrans submittal.

- SCAG will coordinate closely with Caltrans on the establishment of specific performance targets for our region.

- Caltrans’ initial ‘baseline’ performance period report (for most measures) is due to FHWA on October 1, 2018. The baseline report establishes existing conditions to be assessed over the first 4-year reporting period which ends on January 1, 2022.

MAP-21 Performance Reporting

- After 2 years, a mid-term progress evaluation is to be conducted, allowing states & MPOs to re-evaluate initial targets to ensure progress is being made toward the 4-year performance goals.

- The initial 2-year ‘Mid-term Significant Progress Determination’ will be due to FHWA on October 1, 2020.

- During the mid-term progress evaluation, Caltrans & SCAG are permitted to adjust the initial 4-year performance targets (if necessary).

- MAP-21 performance reporting will be incorporated into the SCAG 2020 RTP/SCS & FTIP.
MAP-21 Performance Reporting

- At the conclusion of each 4-year performance period, Caltrans is required to submit a report to FHWA demonstrating that ‘significant progress’ has been made toward achievement of each of the statewide performance targets.

- ‘Significant progress’ is indicated when either the designated performance target is achieved, OR actual performance is improved over the baseline report (even if the target is not actually achieved).

- If any of the performance target areas fail to demonstrate ‘significant progress’ in the FHWA performance report, Caltrans will be required to submit an additional report indicating why progress has not occurred & what steps are being taken to achieve the targets.

MAP-21 Highway Safety

- Of the seven MAP-21 performance areas, only the ‘Highway Safety’ element includes financial consequences for not achieving significant progress toward performance targets.

- If significant progress is not demonstrated within 2 years, the State will be required to use an amount of its formula obligation limitation equal to its prior year Highway Safety Improvement Plan (HSIP) apportionment only for obligation of its HSIP funding.

- The State would then also be required to submit an annual implementation plan on how progress will be made toward meeting highway safety performance targets.

- Federal rulemaking for Highway Safety was finalized earlier than other MAP-21 areas & operates on a different reporting timeline.
Thank You!

Contact:
Mike Gainor
(213) 236-1822
gainor@scaq.ca.gov
DATE: September 7, 2017

TO: Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee
    Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)
    Transportation Committee (TC)

FROM: Roland Ok, Senior Regional Planner, 213-236-1819, ok@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Draft Local Input Survey for the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S APPROVAL:

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only - No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
As part of the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) Bottom Up Local Input and Envisioning Process, SCAG is developing a Local Input Survey to collect information from local jurisdictions related to the implementation of the 2012 and 2016 RTP/SCS as well as to assist in the development of the 2020 RTP/SCS. Survey questions are wide-ranging in scope, but focused on developing a meaningful summary of where the region currently stands, and where regional sustainability priorities might best be focused in the next RTP/SCS. The draft Survey is included in Attachment 1. Upon finalization the Local Input Survey will be distributed to all local jurisdictions and information collected from the survey will facilitate the Local Input Process and assist in developing a robust 2020 RTP/SCS.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan; Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies; Objective A: Create and facilitate a collaborative and cooperative environment to produce forward thinking regional plans.

BACKGROUND:
The Bottom Up Local Input and Envisioning Process is designed to engage local jurisdictions in establishing base geographic and socioeconomic datasets for the 2020 RTP/SCS. As part of the Bottom Up Local Input and Envisioning Process for the 2020 RTP/SCS, SCAG staff is developing a Local Input Survey to collect information from local jurisdictions related to the implementation of the 2012 and 2016 RTP/SCS as well as to assist in the development of the 2020 RTP/SCS.

The Local Input Survey for the 2020 RTP/SCS is currently in a final draft stage and builds upon the survey that was developed for the 2016 RTP/SCS. SCAG staff has overhauled the 2016 RTP/SCS Local Input Survey, by adding more substantive questions in the 2020 RTP/SCS Local Input Survey. Whereas the 2016 RTP/SCS Local Input Survey focused primarily on land use, transportation and natural lands issues, the 2020 RTP/SCS Local Input Survey expands the questions to include questions related to
housing, goods movement, public safety, environmental compliance, and environmental justice. In addition, during the 2016 RTP/SCS Local Input process, SCAG staff received multiple requests from local jurisdictions to provide clarifications on certain technical terms. As such, SCAG staff has developed a glossary to assist local jurisdictions in completing the Local Input Survey in a timely matter.

SCAG staff requested the review by planning directors from 20 local jurisdictions throughout the entire SCAG region (6 counties and 14 cities). Request for review were sent to planning directors on July 18, 2017 and comments were received by SCAG staff on July 31, 2017. In addition, SCAG staff presented the Draft Local Input Survey to the Technical Working Group (TWG) on July 20, 2017 and also received comments on July 31, 2017. The current version of the Draft 2020 RTP/SCS Local Input Survey and Glossary (See Attachments 1 and 2) encompasses requested revisions from the planning directors, TWG and SCAG staff. Additionally, SCAG will continue to update the Local Input Survey based on comments received by the CEHD and others, as needed.

Tentatively, SCAG will send out the Local Input Survey to all local jurisdictions within the SCAG region on October 2017. Participation in the survey effort will be voluntary but highly encouraged as it will bolster the development of the 2020 RTP/SCS. At this time, SCAG staff is envisioning that the 2020 RTP/SCS Local Input Survey will be distributed via a web-based platform, with the option of an electronic submission via email. In conjunction with the Local Input Survey, SCAG will solicit one-on-one meetings with each local jurisdiction to review the survey elements and to provide and receive clarification from local planning staff, as needed. Upon completion of the Local Input Survey, SCAG staff will present the findings to the CEHD.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with this item is included in the Fiscal Year 2017-2018 Overall Work Program (080.0153.04: Regional Assessment).

ATTACHMENTS:
1. Draft Local Input Survey
2. Draft Local Input Survey Glossary
DRAFT SCAG Local Input Survey

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is currently seeking input from local jurisdictions across the six-county area to begin a new long-range plan for the region, the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The 2020 RTP/SCS is a long-range visioning plan containing transportation projects and land use development strategies, that balances future mobility and housing needs with economic, environmental and public health goals. Additionally, per SB 375, land use strategies developed within the SCS will help the region achieve state greenhouse gas emission reduction goals.

SCAG is collecting information from local jurisdictions related to the implementation of the 2012 and 2016 RTP/SCS, as well as to inform development of the 2020 RTP/SCS. A copy of the 2016 RTP/SCS Local Input Survey from your jurisdiction has also been provided to facilitate the response process. Please respond to each question as it pertains to your jurisdiction. Due to the multidisciplinary nature of the questions, we encourage an interdepartmental collaboration to answer questions within the survey. Responses are requested by [Date to be determined].

PART I – LAND USE

General Plan

1. Please enter the year of your jurisdiction’s most recent general plan element update. Add information for any additional elements contained in the General Plan but not listed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Web link</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Element</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Is your jurisdiction currently in the process of updating its General Plan? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, when do you expect to complete the update? Date: [Publish Date]
3. Which elements of the general plan will your jurisdiction plan to update within the next five years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Does the most recently adopted general plan update support or intend to support any of the following Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Intend</th>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit oriented development (TOD)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete communities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-residential mixed use</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill along Livable corridors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form based code</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [Comments]</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Does the circulation element of your General Plan include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans and Guidelines</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for freight movement and heavy duty vehicles</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated truck route system</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck circulation plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A plan for the development of multimodal transportation networks per the California Complete Streets Act (AB 1358)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. When was the zoning code last updated to reflect your most recent amendments?
   Date: [Publish Date] Web link: [Comments]

7. Is your jurisdiction currently in the process of updating its land use designation and zoning code?
   Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, when do you expect to complete the update? Date: [Publish Date]

8. Did your jurisdiction’s most recent land use designation and/or zoning code update include provisions supporting any of these policies?
9. Does your jurisdiction have TOD building standards and design guidelines? Yes ☐ No ☐

10. Does your jurisdiction offer incentives for infill development? Yes ☐ No ☐
    If yes, which of the following apply:

    **Incentives**
    - Fast track permitting
    - Fee Waivers
    - Density bonus
    - Increased floor area ratio
    - Building height waivers
    - Tax subsidies or other benefits
    - Waived or reduced minimum parking requirement
    - Reduced open space requirements
    - Transfer of development rights
    - Other [Comments]

    **Incentives** and **Policies**
    - Fast track permitting

11. Does your jurisdiction overlap with a High Quality Transit Area (HQTA) as included in the 2016 RTP/SCS? (Please refer to the HQTA Map located at SCAG’s Scenario Planning Model (SPM)’s Data Management site at https://spmdm.scag.ca.gov to check out HQTA boundaries in your jurisdiction). Yes ☐ No ☐

12. Does your jurisdiction have policy incentives to encourage development of TODs? Yes ☐ No ☐
    If yes, which of the following apply:

    **Incentives and Policies**
    - Fast track permitting
13. Do any adopted specific plans and/or community plans with certified EIRs overlap with the existing Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)? Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, please list their names and years of adoption below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Are there any other adopted specific plans and/or community plans that do not overlap with the existing Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)? Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, please list their name and years of adoption below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Which of the following parking strategies are included in any of your existing specific plans or general plans?

   Parking strategies
   Right-sized parking
   Park-once districts
   Shared parking
   Unbundled parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Does your jurisdiction have a small lot development policy? Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: [Publish Date] Web link: [Comments]

17. Does your jurisdiction have any policies or programs in place to address residential and industrial or transportation-related land use conflicts? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, please provide name and years of adoption below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies or Programs</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Does your jurisdiction have any design guidelines in place for logistics center, warehouse or distribution facility development? Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: [Publish Date] Web link: [Comments]

19. Does your jurisdiction have any policies or programs in place for the design of industrial neighborhoods? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, please provide name and years of adoption below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies or Programs</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Does your jurisdiction have a development/impact/linkage fee ordinance? Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: [Publish Date] Web link: [Comments]

If yes, which of the following does it fund?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas that receive funding</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking maximums in designated areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative parking design (i.e. Sustainable features)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waived or reduced minimum parking requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [Comments]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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21. Does your jurisdiction participate in the Mills Act in an effort to maintain, preserve or rehabilitate historically significant property? Yes ☐ No ☐

22. Does your jurisdiction use any of the following water management and efficiency strategies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater management best practices</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greywater/reclaimed water (purple pipes)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground water recharge</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low impact development</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green infrastructure</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced impervious surface and/or lot coverage incentives</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [Comments]</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Does your jurisdiction utilize or are considering any of the following zoning or land use strategies for housing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusionary zoning ordinance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is there an in-lieu fee component?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent stabilization ordinance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maximum annual percentage rent increase allowed</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>[Comments]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing preservation ordinance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage down payment assistance program</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special financing district (CRIA, EIFD, Others?)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for affordable housing</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fast track permitting</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fee waivers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Density bonus</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased floor area ratio</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Building height waivers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tax subsidies or other benefits</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Please fill in the number of affordable and non-affordable units permitted for each Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) category since the beginning of the reporting period for the current RHNA cycle (October 2013 - October 2021). Affordable units are defined as affordable for households with incomes of 80% or less of county median income, or the very low and low income RHNA categories. Data can be found in your submitted annual progress report to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). (Please note that your housing permit data will not be used to determine the subsequent RHNA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Affordable Housing (very low and low)</th>
<th>Non-affordable housing (moderate and above moderate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Please indicate if any of the following planning circumstances affect future household growth in your jurisdiction (While this section is not the official local planning survey of the RHNA process, SCAG will use responses to inform the formal local survey as part of the 6th RHNA cycle process, beginning in 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing and projected job housing balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity for sewer or water service due to federal and state laws, regulations or regulatory actions, or supply and distribution decisions made by a sewer or water service provider other than the local jurisdiction that preclude the jurisdiction from providing necessary infrastructure for additional development during the planning period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of land suitable for urban development or for conversion to residential use, the availability of underutilized land, and opportunities for infill development and increased residential densities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands preserved or protected from urban development under existing federal and state programs, or both, designed to protect open space, farmland, environmental habitats and natural resources on a long-term basis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County policies to preserve agricultural land within an unincorporated area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distribution of household growth assumed for purposes of a comparable period of regional transportation plans and opportunities to maximize the use of public transportation and existing transportation infrastructure. Loss of low-income housing units in assisted housing developments due to contract expirations or termination of use restrictions. Market demand for housing Agreements between a county and cities in a county to direct growth toward incorporated areas of the county High housing cost burdens Housing needs of farm workers Housing needs generated by the presence of a private university or a campus of the California State University or the University of California within any member jurisdiction Demand for rural housing Other [Comments]

PART II – Transportation

26. Has your jurisdiction adopted or plan to adopt any of the following (check I.D., if currently is in development): 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adopted Policies, Plans and Strategies</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I.D.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete streets policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does it include provisions for delivery vehicles or truck access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe routes to school program or plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active transportation plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle master plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian master plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape standards and design guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation master plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation demand management program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation demand management ordinance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking management plan/ordinance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provisions for truck parking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provisions for commercial vehicle access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision zero policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety plan/safety targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial land use ordinance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent transportation systems plan/program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal facility plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Route/Truck prohibit route plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Has your jurisdiction or employers within your jurisdiction adopted or implemented any of the following Travel Demand Management (TDM) Strategies:

| Multimodal performance measures/targets | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Transit overlay district | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| First/Last Mile Strategies | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Scenic Roadway Plan | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

28. Is your jurisdiction currently in the process of or planning to address vehicle miles travelled (VMT) related development impacts? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please list applicable projects and measures taken (or proposed) to mitigate VMT impacts.

| Project Name | Comments |
| Title | |
| Title | |
| Title | |
| Title | |
| Title | |

Adopted TDM strategies

| Ridesharing incentives and rideshare matching | Yes | ☐ | No | ☐ | Year | ☐ | Web link | ☐ |
| Vanpool programs | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Transit pass benefits | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Private employer shuttles or other transportation providers | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Parking cash-out policies | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Preferential parking or parking subsidies for carpoolers | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Intelligent parking programs | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Dynamic pricing for parking | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Programs or mobility services aimed at local tourism travel (e.g. Shuttle bus) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Guaranteed ride home programs | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Incentives for telecommuting | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Designated pick-up/drop-off for ride sourcing or transportation network companies (Lyft or Uber) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Bike share system | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Facilities or incentives for low speed modes (Neighborhood Electric Vehicles) | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Integrated mobility hubs | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Transportation management areas | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
29. Does your jurisdiction provide or plan to provide any of the following Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) infrastructure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRT Infrastructure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus-only land</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal prioritization</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket vending machines on sidewalks for expediting boarding</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First/Last mile connectivity improvements</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [Comments]</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. If applicable, please provide the estimated annual expenditures for the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual expenditures</th>
<th>Annual spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus stops/shelters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayfinding/signage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data/trip planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Does your jurisdiction receive local return funding (from a county transportation tax measure)?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

   If yes, does your jurisdiction have an adopted policy for prioritizing spending of these funds? Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: [Publish Date] Web link: [Comments]

32. Does your jurisdiction use local return revenue to fund any of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair (pavement, potholes)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal synchronization</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed route transit service</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial-a-ride or other demand response service</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi scrip</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool streets</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [Comments]</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Does your jurisdiction have a vehicle idling reduction policy or use communication/signage to reduce idling, particularly in sensitive areas such as near schools or hospitals? Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: [Publish Date] Web link: [Comments]
34. Has your jurisdiction recently budgeted a portion of its municipal funding (from the general fund, capital improvement program, or other sources) for bicycle and/or pedestrian improvements?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: [Publish Date]

PART III – Environmental

CEQA Streamlining

35. Has your jurisdiction approved projects utilizing CEQA streamlining? (SB 743, SB 375, or SB 226)

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please provide projects and approval year below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Natural and Agricultural Lands

36. Does your jurisdiction encourage the use of vegetation native to Southern California? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, which of the following mechanisms does your jurisdiction use to promote native vegetation?

Mechanisms

Through code requirements ☐

Code incentives ☐

In conjunction with development on privately owned land ☐

In conjunction with development on publicly owned land ☐

In conjunction with the development with public infrastructure projects ☐

Other [Comments] ☐

37. Does your jurisdiction participate in any of the following natural lands conservation strategies?

Natural lands conservation strategies

Conservation easement ☐

Development impact fee ☐
38. Does your jurisdiction participate in any of the following agricultural lands conservation strategies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural Lands Conservation Strategies</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation easement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-lieu fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural land mitigation program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster ordinance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [Comments]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. What kinds of funds (from your general fund, special allocations, or voter-approved taxes/bonds) or other funding mechanisms are available to implement natural/agricultural conservation programs? Please select all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development impact fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [Comments]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Do you have any pending or future plans to develop natural/agricultural programs or policies in your jurisdiction in the near future? Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, please provide projects and approval year below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Title]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hillside/steep slope protection ordinance
Transfer of development rights
Mitigation bank
Multiple species habitat conservation program (MSHCP)
Natural community conservation plan (NCCP)
Other [Comments]
41. Do you face any barriers to implementing conservation programs in your jurisdiction? Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, please indicate which barriers from the list below:

   **Barriers**
   - Funding
   - Capacity (staff time)
   - Lack of interest from constituents
   - Other [Comments]

42. Is your jurisdiction interested in applying for conservation grants through the California Greenhouse Reduction Fund (i.e. Cap and Trade)? Yes ☐ No ☐
   If yes, which of the following would be most helpful to your jurisdiction:

   **Grants**
   - Sustainable agricultural lands conservation program
   - Urban greening grant program
   - Wetlands restoration for greenhouse gas reduction program
   - Other [Comments]

43. Are there any additional data, resources, tools or examples you need for considering conservation planning or mitigation? What types of data would be useful to have?
   Please list: [Comments]

44. What other agencies, non-profits, or private entities are particularly active in conservation planning, mitigation and conservation in your jurisdiction? Who else should we talk to?
   Please list: [Comments]

45. Does your jurisdiction take into account disadvantaged areas in planning, when seeking grant funding? Yes ☐ No ☐

46. Does your jurisdiction make use of the CalEnviroScreen tool developed by CalEPA to help identify disadvantaged communities within your jurisdiction? Yes ☐ No ☐

47. Does your jurisdiction have a program to mitigate air quality in environmentally sensitive areas (for example: hospitals, schools, hospices, or daycare facilities located within 500 feet of a freeway)? Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: [Publish Date] Web link:

48. Which of the following strategies does your jurisdiction employ to engage low-income, minority groups and Tribal Governments when pursuing community infrastructure projects?
49. If your jurisdiction leads federally funded infrastructure or transportation programs, how do you identify and resolve potential severe and adverse impacts to low income and minority populations?

**Strategies**

- We host community workshops in targeted locations to solicit feedback from low-income and minority residents
- We regularly engage community groups that have a large membership from low-income and minority residents
- We advertise in media outlets that aim to serve low income and minority residents
- We go out to community events and activities to engage residents who may not be able to attend workshops
- All of the above
- Other [Comments]

50. Does your jurisdiction promote the use of New Markets Tax Credit Benefits to revitalize the community? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐

**Environmental Sustainability**

51. Has your jurisdiction adopted or plan to adopt a Climate Action Plan? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ Date: [Publish Date] Web link: [Comments]
   If **yes**, what is your greenhouse gas reduction target and anticipated horizon year? Target/Horizon Year: [Comments]

52. Does your jurisdiction have plans or policies in place to implement a local version of the State's climate goal of reducing greenhouse gases by 40% below 1990 levels by 2030? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐ Date: [Publish Date] Web link: [Comments]

53. Does your jurisdiction have the capacity (i.e. staffing and resources) to apply for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (cap-and-trade) or other federal, state or local grants? **Yes** ☐ **No** ☐
54. Does your general plan and/or specific plan consider implications resulting from any of the following climate change hazards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought resistance</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat island effect</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea level rise</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [Comments]</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART IV – Public Health and Safety

55. Does your jurisdiction have a ‘Healthy Cities’ resolution or ordinance? Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: [Publish Date] Web link: [Comments]

56. Does your jurisdiction have a Health Element as part of its general plan or has your jurisdiction incorporated health as a consideration into the general plan? Yes ☐ No ☐ Date: [Publish Date] Web link: [Comments]

57. Has your jurisdiction incorporated any of the following planning practices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning practices</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health in all policies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health equity</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of the social determinants of health</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. Does your jurisdiction have any of the following plans to address emergencies caused by natural disasters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency and Natural Disaster Plans</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Web link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seismic safety plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency evacuation plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency response plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard mitigation plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection plan</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [Comments]</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART V – Data
59. Does your jurisdiction have or collect any of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle or pedestrian volume data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic counts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck traffic counts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automated traffic counters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing/distribution centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of manufacturing firms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local road pavement management and performance data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lane mileage data (bike lane, bike path, Class 3 bike routes, separated bike lanes (cycle tracks))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge condition data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement condition index (PCI) or International roughness index (IRI) data for local roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open data portal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Housing starts data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed parking and restricted parking areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Input Survey Glossary

Note: This glossary has been provided to local jurisdictions to facilitate the completion of the Local Input Survey and to provide an understanding of survey results.

AB 744: Assembly Bill 744 allows a developer that is requesting a density bonus and including 100% affordable rental units in the development to also request that the city or county reduce the minimum parking requirements for the development. To qualify, the development would have to be either within half a mile of a major transit stop, a seniors-only development with access to transit, or a development that serves special-needs individuals and has access to transit. For mixed-income developments within a half mile of a major transit stop that include the maximum number of very low- or low-income units under Density Bonus Law, the parking requirement cannot exceed 0.5 per bedroom.

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU): A room or set of rooms in a single-family home (and in a single-family zone) that has been designated or configured to be used as a separate dwelling unit, and has been established by a permit.

Active Transportation: A mode of transportation that includes walking, running, biking, skateboarding and other human powered forms of transportation. It can also include low-speed electrical devices such as motorized wheel chairs, Segways, electric-assist bicycles and neighborhood electric vehicles, such as golf carts.

Active Transportation Program: Provides state funds for city and county projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters, recreational riders and safe routes to school programs. Replaces the Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA).

Affordable Housing Units: Housing that is affordable to households earning 80% or less of the county median income.

Complete Communities: Suburban communities that provide a mix of land uses in strategic growth areas wherein most daily needs can be met within a short distance of home, providing residents with the opportunity to patronize their local area and run daily errands by walking or cycling rather than traveling by automobile.

Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities (CRIA): Community Revitalization and Investment Authorities (CRIA) were enacted into law by Assembly Bill 2, which authorized the revitalization of disadvantaged communities through planning and financing infrastructure improvements and upgrades; economic development activities; and affordable housing via tax increment financing.

Complete Streets: Streets designed and operated to enable safe access for all roadway users of all ages and abilities, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders.

Conservation Easement: A voluntary legal agreement between a landowner and a land trust or government agency that permanently limits uses of the land in order to protect its conservation values or natural resources.

Cool Streets: Streets that utilize solar reflective surface rather than traditional pavement, in an effort to reduce the heat island effect.
**Development Impact Fee**: A fee imposed by a local government on a new or proposed development project, to pay for the costs of providing public services to the new development.

**Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD)**: Enacted into law by Senate Bill 628, which authorizes the creation of a new governmental entity called an EIFD. One or more of these districts may be created within a city or county and used to finance the construction or rehabilitation of a wide variety of public infrastructure and private facilities. An EIFD may fund these facilities and development with the property tax increment of those taxing agencies (cities, counties, special districts, but not schools) that consent.

**First Mile/Last Mile**: Strategies designed to increase transit usage by making it more convenient and safe to walk or bike to transit stations. Includes strategies like wayfinding, bikeways, sidewalk repair and bike share programs, local shuttles, car-share programs.

**CalEnviroScreen**: A screening tool developed by CalEPA that can be used to help identify California communities that are disproportionately burdened by multiple sources of pollution. CalEPA has used the tool to designate California communities as disadvantaged.

**California Land Conservation Act (Williamson Act)**: Enacted to facilitate orderly growth, offering tax incentives to keep land in agricultural use with conservation agreements of minimum ten years.

**Form based code**: A means of regulating land development to achieve a specific urban form. Form based codes foster predictable built results and a high-quality public realm by using physical form (rather than separation of uses) as the organizing principle, with a lesser focus on land use through municipal regulations.

**Healthy Cities**: A movement that promotes comprehensive, systematic policy and planning for health and emphasizes the need to address inequality in health, urban poverty, participatory governance and addressing the social, economic and environmental determinants of health.

**High Quality Transit Areas (HQTA)**: A walkable transit village or corridor, consistent with the adopted RTP/SCS and situated within half a mile of a well-serviced transit stop or a transit corridor with service frequency interval of 15 minutes or less during peak commute hours. The definition that SCAG has been using for the HQTA is based on the language in SB 375 which defines:

- **Major Transit Stop**: A site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods (CA Public Resource Code Section 21064.3).

- **High-Quality Transit Corridor (HQTC)**: A corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours.

**Infill**: New development on vacant, underutilized or undeveloped land within an existing community that is enclosed by other types of development.

**Inclusionary Zoning**: Municipal or county planning ordinances that require a given share of new construction to be affordable by people with low to moderate incomes.
In-lieu fee (Housing): A fee typically applied when affordable housing cannot be provided “on-site” of a new development. These fees are typically paid into a housing trust fund and used (often along with other local funding sources) to finance affordable housing to be developed “off-site”.

In-lieu fee (Environment): An in-lieu fee is one type of mitigation that can be used to compensate for unavoidable environmental impacts that would affect open space, culturally significant land, agricultural and forestry land, wetlands or other environmentally sensitive areas. Such fees are typically pooled and distributed to build off-site mitigation areas.

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) - Systems that use modern detection, communications and computing technology to collect data on system operations and performance, communicate that information to system managers and users and use that information to manage and adjust the transportation system to respond to changing operating conditions, congestion, or accidents. ITS technology can be applied to arterials, highways, transit, trucks and private vehicles.

Integrated Mobility Hub: A hub within an urban area which provides a multitude of transportation options. For example a hub may combine a secure bicycle parking facility, bike share dock, car share vehicle parking, and/or a designated pick-up/drop space for ridesourcing such as Uber and Lyft. Mobility hubs may or may not be located adjacent to a bus or rail transit stop.

Intermodal Facility Plan: A plan which addresses the linkages, interactions and movements between various modes of transportation. Intermodal facilities is often used to refer to facilities where freight is transferred between modes such as truck and rail.

International Roughness Index (IRI): Commonly obtained from measured longitudinal road profiles, IRI is used worldwide to evaluate and manage road systems. The measurement of IRI is required for data provided to the United States Federal Highway Administration, and is covered in several standards from ASTM International. IRI is also used to evaluate new pavement construction and to determine penalties or bonus payments based on smoothness.

Livable Corridors: Arterial roadways where local jurisdictions may plan for a combination of the following elements: high-quality bus frequency; higher density residential and employment at key intersections; and increased active transportation through dedicated bikeways. Most, but not all Livable Corridors would be located within HQTAs. Livable Corridor land-use strategies include development of mixed use retail centers at key nodes along corridors, increasing neighborhood oriented retail at more intersections, applying a “Complete Streets” approach to roadway improvements and zoning that allows for the replacement of underperforming auto-oriented strip retail between nodes with higher density residential and employment.

Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC): A federal program created under the Tax Reform Act of 1986, which gives incentives for the utilization of private equity in the development of affordable housing.

Low Impact Development (LID): A land planning and engineering design approach to manage stormwater runoff as part of green infrastructure. LID emphasizes conservation and use of on-site natural features to protect water quality.
Mills Act: A state law allowing cities to enter into contracts with the owners of historic structures. Such contracts require a reduction of property taxes in exchange for the continued preservation of the property.

Mitigation Banking: The preservation, enhancement, restoration or creation (PERC) of a wetland, stream, or habitat conservation area which offsets, or compensates for, expected adverse impacts to similar nearby ecosystems.

Mixed Use Development: A type of urban development that blends residential, commercial, cultural, institutional or industrial uses, where those functions are physically and functionally integrated, and that provides pedestrian connections.

Multiple Species Habitat Conservation Program (MSHCP): A program developed to preserve a network of habitat and open space, protecting biodiversity and enhancing the region’s quality of life. MSHCPs are often implemented with the assistance of federal and state wildlife agencies.

Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP): A program that takes a broad-based ecosystem approach to planning for the protection and perpetuation of biological diversity. It is broader in its orientation and objectives than the California and Federal Endangered Species Acts, as these laws are designed to identify and protect individual species that have already declined in number significantly.

New Markets Tax Credit: The New Markets Tax Credit (NMTC) Program incentivizes business and real estate investment in low-income communities via a federal tax credit.

Park-once districts: Areas that encourage walking through the strategic placement and pricing of parking. These districts create a pedestrian-friendly environment through the use of policies, codes, planning and management efforts that design parking facilities and land use so that most visitors to an area are within a comfortable walking distance of their destinations.

Pavement Condition Index (PCI): A numerical index between 0 and 100 which is used to indicate the general condition of a pavement.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA): Quantifies the need for housing within each jurisdiction of the SCAG region based on population growth projections. Communities then address this need through the process of completing the housing elements of their General Plans.

Rent stabilization: A practice which allows landlords a reasonable rate of return on their investments while setting maximum rates for annual rent increases to protect tenants.

Safe Routes to School: Part of a nationwide/region-wide program to increase students walking or biking to school. Includes engineering, educational and enforcement activities. Funded through the State Active Transportation Program (ATP).

Scrip: A form of fare payment transferrable among transportation providers, often issued by Dial-A-Ride transit service providers to be used on taxis.

Senate Bill 375 (Chapter 728, Steinberg): Established to implement the state’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emission-reduction goals, as set forth by Assembly Bill 32, in the sector of cars and light trucks. This mandate requires the California Air Resources Board to determine per capita GHG emission-reduction targets for each metropolitan planning organization (MPO) in the state at two points in the future—2020
and 2035. In turn, each MPO must prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that demonstrates how the region will meet its GHG reduction target through integrated land use, housing and transportation planning.

**Senate Bill 226 (Simitian):** Implements changes to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by authorizing limited CEQA review for urban infill projects, creating a new statutory exemption for rooftop and parking lot solar energy projects and establishing that greenhouse gas emissions at a project or cumulative level do not disqualify the use of categorical exemptions if the project complies with certain regulations and requirements.

**Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013):** Made several changes to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for projects located in areas served by transit. SB 743 proposes to eliminate auto delay, level of services, and other similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion as a basis for determining significant impacts. It also creates a new exemption for certain projects that are consistent with a Specific Plan, and eliminates the need to evaluate aesthetic and parking impacts of a project in some circumstances.

**Shared parking:** A tool in parking management which allows different land uses with different periods of parking demand to share a common parking facility and thereby limit the need to provide additional parking. Shared parking policies do not treat the parking supply as individual units specific to particular businesses or uses, but rather emphasize the efficient use of the parking supply by including as many spaces as possible in a common pool of shared, publicly available spaces.

**Small-lot development:** A practice that allows for the subdivision of lots located within existing multifamily and commercial zones to develop fee simple housing. Typically small lot developments are not required to be part of a homeowner’s association, thus reducing the cost for home buyers.

**Sustainable Agricultural Lands Conservation Program (SALC):** A component of the Strategic Growth Council's Affordable Housing and Sustainability Program (AHSC), which complements investments made in urban areas with the purchase of agricultural conservation easements, development of agricultural land strategy plans and other mechanisms that to reduce GHG emissions and make the agricultural sector more resilient.

**Right-Sized Parking:** An optimal amount of parking which balances between supply and demand. Right-sized parking seeks to avoid an overabundance of parking supply which leads to increased vehicle miles traveled, congestion and housing costs.

**Transit Oriented Development (TOD):** A planning strategy that explicitly links land-use and transportation by focusing mixed housing, employment and commercial growth around bus and rail stations (usually within ½ mile). TODs can reduce the number and length of vehicle trips by encouraging more bicycle/pedestrian and transit use and can support transit investments by creating the density around stations to boost ridership.

**Transit Priority Areas (TPA):** An area within half a mile of a major transit stop that is existing or planned.

**Unbundled parking:** Unbundled parking is the practice of selling or leasing parking spaces separate from the commercial or residential use.
**Urban Heat Island/ Heat Island Effect:** An urban or metropolitan area that is significantly warmer than surrounding rural areas due to human activities. Its main cause is the modification of land surfaces.

**Transportation Demand Management (TDM):** Strategies that result in more efficient use of transportation resources, such as ridesharing, telecommuting, park-and-ride programs, pedestrian improvements and alternative work schedules.

**Transportation Management Areas:** A Transportation Management Area (TMA) is an area designated by the Secretary of Transportation, having an urbanized area population of over 200,000, or upon special request from the Governor and the MPO designated for the area.

**Urban Greening Grant Program:** A grant program that competitively distributes grants statewide to projects that make the built environment more sustainable and effective in creating healthy and vibrant communities. The program funds establishing and enhancing parks and open space, using natural solutions to improving air and water quality and reducing energy consumption, and creating more walkable and bikeable trails.

**Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT):** On highways, a measurement of the total miles traveled by all vehicles in the area for a specified time period. It is calculated by the number of vehicles times the miles traveled in a given area or on a given highway during the time period. In transit, the number of vehicle miles operated on a given route or line or network during a specified time period.

**Vision Zero Policy:** A multi-national road traffic safety project that aims to achieve a highway system with no fatalities or serious injuries in road traffic. The policy was started in Sweden and was approved by their parliament in 1997. Since then, various countries (including the United States) have adopted the policy.

**Unbundled Parking:** A parking strategy in which parking spaces are rented or sold separately, rather than automatically included with the rent or purchase price of a residential or commercial unit. Tenants or owners can purchase only as much parking as they need and are given opportunity to save money and space by using fewer parking stalls.

**Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program:** Funds projects that reduce greenhouse gases and provide co-benefits such as enhancing fish and wildlife habitat, protecting and improving water quality and quantity and helping California adapt to climate change.
DATE: September 7, 2017

TO: Community, Economic & Human Development (CEHD) Committee
    Energy & Environment Committee (EEC)
    Transportation Committee (TC)

FROM: Kimberly Clark, Regional Planner Specialist; 213-236-1844; clark@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Guidelines and Schedule for the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process for the Development of the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S APPROVAL: ____________________________

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR CEHD:
Recommend for Regional Council adoption the proposed Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process Guiding Principles, which will form the basis of SCAG’s outreach and engagement with local jurisdictions in this stage of development for the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

RECOMMENDED ACTION FOR EEC AND TC:
Receive and File

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
In preparation for adoption of SCAG’s next RTP/SCS in Spring 2020, SCAG will be engaging with local jurisdictions, subregions, and other stakeholders to inform development of the upcoming RTP/SCS. This collaborative process will entail four phases, and will be concurrent with the development of SCAG’s Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA): (1) Regular Technical Consultation, (2) One-on-One Outreach and Local Input on Planned Growth (3) Regional Collaboration on Sustainable Communities Scenario Development, and (4) Engagement with the General Public on Potential Options for the SCS. Leading up to Phase 2’s kickoff in Fall 2017, staff has been working with SCAG’s Technical Working Group (TWG) and other stakeholders to refine and finalize the technical methodology for this process. Subregions will also provide essential assistance during the coming months to refine the approach and convene local jurisdictions for discussion and subsequent one-on-one meetings with SCAG staff.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan: Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies, and Objective (a): Create and facilitate a collaborative and cooperative environment to produce forward thinking regional plans; and Goal 4: Develop, Maintain and Promote the Utilization of State of the Art Models, Information Systems and Communication Technologies, and Objective (b): Develop, maintain and enhance data and information to support planning and decision making in a timely and effective manner.
BACKGROUND:
Southern California will be facing new challenges in the development of the 2020 RTP/SCS - principally transformational technologies in the transportation and employment sectors, new greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets from the California Air Resources Board (CARB), new Federal Highway Administration planning requirements, MAP 21 performance metrics/goals, and a concurrent Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) cycle. Given these factors, it will be important to establish a solid baseline of existing policies and plans to understand how Southern California can accommodate future growth and thrive in the coming decades.

Staff proposes that the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process be guided by the principles described here, with initial phases conducted to solicit input from local jurisdictions on base land use, population, household and employment growth, resource areas, sustainability practices, and local transit-supportive plans and policies to help decision makers understand how the region will perform under current circumstances to reach the forthcoming new GHG reduction targets from CARB. SCAG will also engage early with County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) to establish a regional picture of planned transportation infrastructure through the horizon year of the Plan in 2045. This information will then be used to develop potential scenarios for the 2020 RTP/SCS, through a structured and collaborative engagement with local jurisdictions, CTCs, a broad range of stakeholder groups, and the general public.

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. The RHNA will be developed in coordination with the RTP/SCS.
7. Input from local jurisdictions throughout the process will be accepted from each jurisdiction’s city manager, community development/planning director, or their designee.

In conducting this collaborative process, SCAG will engage stakeholders in four phases, and will provide regular updates to Policy Committees on progress and feedback received. The 2020 RHNA will also be completed concurrently and in coordination with the Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process. The projection period for the 6th cycle of the RHNA will likely be from year 2022 to 2029, and will be determined by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).

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

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

To ensure transparency and technical veracity during all phases of this process, SCAG will have regular engagement with the TWG and will seek guidance from local jurisdictions, county transportation commissions, and other stakeholders as well. Initial consultation leading up to Phase 2 will include a review of the survey elements and list of geographic datasets that will undergo revision by local jurisdictions during Phase 2, and an initial overview of the anticipated scenario planning process for Phases 3 and 4.

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

SCAG will engage with subregions to explain the local input process for the 2020 RTP/SCS and will solicit one-on-one on-site meetings with each local jurisdiction to review the survey elements and geographic datasets individually with local staff. Input from this Phase will inform the eventual RHNA and base conditions for the Plan, including the development of an RTP/SCS “base case” that takes into account locally planned growth, land use policies, sustainability practices, local transit-supportive plans and policies, and anticipated transportation improvements through the horizon year of the RTP/SCS. Local jurisdictions will be informed that their input on the forecast of population and housing growth through year 2029 will help to determine SCAG’s RHNA, through negotiations with HCD. SCAG will also provide limited on-site intern resources to support this effort, at the request of local jurisdictions.

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

In collaboration with local jurisdictions, elected officials, and a broad range of stakeholder groups, SCAG will evaluate potential region-wide integrated land use and transportation planning strategies for inclusion in the draft Plan. Involvement in this effort will be solicited from city managers/planning directors (or their designees) and county transportation commissions; input will also be sought from transit providers, affordable housing advocates, transportation advocates, neighborhood and community groups, environmental advocates, home builder representatives, broad-based business organizations, landowners, commercial property interests, and homeowner associations, among others. Based on this collaborative process, SCAG will develop multiple scenarios that explore a range of land use and transportation strategies. These scenarios will illustrate the impact of distinctive policy and investment
choices and will be compared to the “base case” to evaluate the merits of certain regional decisions, including the pursuit of a potential Alternative Planning Strategy (APS).

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

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

**Concurrent Process: Regional Housing Needs Assessment**  
(June 2017 – Fall 2021)

The RHNA will be developed concurrently with the 2020 RTP/SCS. SCAG is engaging with the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to finalize the timeline. As outlined in SB 375, the growth forecast for the RTP/SCS will inform the RHNA and the SCS will identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the housing need for the region.
FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with this item is included in the current FY 2017-2018 Overall Work Program (150-4069.04, Outreach and Technical Collaboration).

ATTACHMENT:
PowerPoint Presentation: Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process for the Development of the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)
Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process for the 2020 RTP/SCS

September 7, 2017

2020 RTP/SCS Plan Development Process

- Input from Local Jurisdictions
- Input from Partner Agencies (e.g. CTCs)
- Input from Other Stakeholders

Regional Base Case

Collaborative Envisioning & New Technology Adoption

System Impacts: Transportation & Emissions Outcomes; Sustainability, Housing, and Economic Co-Benefits

Regional Transportation Plan & Sustainable Communities Strategy
Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process

Phases and Schedule

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

**Concurrent Process:**
Regional Housing Needs Assessment
(June 2017 – Fall 2021)

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

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

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

**197 Jurisdictions**

**Process will Began in October 2017 and will conclude in September 2018**

**Data Elements**

- Present
- Future
Bottom-Up Local Input and Envisioning Process

Guiding Principles

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

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

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

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

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

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

• Input from local jurisdictions throughout the process will be accepted from each jurisdiction’s city manager, community development/planning director, or their designee.

Questions? – Thank You!
2017 Meeting Schedule
Regional Council and Policy Committees

All Regular Meetings are scheduled on the 1st Thursday of each month
(Approved by the Regional Council 09-01-16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive/Administration Committee (EAC)</td>
<td>9:00 AM – 10:00 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Economic and Human Development Committee (CEHD)</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Committee (TC)</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 12:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Council (RC)</td>
<td>12:15 PM – 2:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

January 5, 2017
February 2, 2017
March 2, 2017
April 6, 2017
May 4 – 5, 2017
(SCAG Regional Conference and General Assembly, JW Marriott Desert Springs)
June 1, 2017
July 6, 2017
August 3, 2017 (DARK)
September 7, 2017
(Note: League of California Cities Annual Conference, Sacramento, CA; Sep. 13 - 15)
October 5, 2017
November 2, 2017
December 7, 2017
(SCAG 8th Annual Economic Summit — in lieu of the regularly scheduled Regional Council and Policy Committees)*

Note: SCAG 8th Annual Economic Summit: Thursday, November 9, 2017
DATE: September 7, 2017

TO: Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)

FROM: Grieg Asher, Program Manager, Sustainability Department, asher@scag.ca.gov, (213) 236-1869

SUBJECT: Los Angeles Regional Collaborative

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S APPROVAL: [Signature]

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only – No Action Required

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Laurel Hunt, Executive Director, Los Angeles Regional Collaborative for Climate Action and Sustainability (LARC), will brief the EEC on its role in helping local governments become more sustainable while reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG Regional Goal 1) Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies, c) Provide practical solutions for moving new ideas forward

BACKGROUND:
LARC was created a number of years ago as a non-profit membership organization to assist local governments in Los Angeles County to become more sustainable while reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. LARC is one of five similar groups around California. LARC has helped cities with GHG inventories and developing strategies to reduce GHG emissions. LARC is housed at the University of California – Los Angeles (UCLA).

FISCAL IMPACT:
No Fiscal Impact. This is not a SCAG funded project.

ATTACHMENT:
PowerPoint Presentation: A Greater LA – Climate Action Framework
A Greater LA
CLIMATE ACTION FRAMEWORK

Laurel Hunt, LARC Executive Director
Los Angeles Regional Collaborative for Climate Action and Sustainability (LARC)
www.laregionalcollaborative.com + www.climateaction.la

BUILDING A CLIMATE-RESILIENT LA TOGETHER

✓ Healthy, carbon-free and thriving
✓ The only climate collaborative in LA
✓ Network of climate practitioners and decision-makers in academia, cities, LA County, regional agencies, non-profits and businesses
REGIONAL CLIMATE ACTION + SUSTAINABILITY

- Creating Livable Communities
- Supporting 12 Million People
- Preparing LA for Climate Change
- Investing in Leadership

LA’S TRUSTED SUSTAINABILITY HUB

GOALS
- Climate Action Center
- Inclusive Green Economy
- Prosperous Communities

METHODS
- Coordination & Planning
- Resources
- Engagement
PROJECTS + RESOURCES

Los Angeles County Regional Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2010

CLIMATE CHANGE L.A. LA Energy Atlas

Regional AdaptLA:
Coastal Impacts Planning for the Los Angeles Region

Transit Supportive Planning Toolkit

WWW.LAREGIONALCOLLABORATIVE.COM

LARC NETWORK ADVANTAGE

- Technical Assistance
- VIP corporate training and information sharing
- Sharing the latest research
- Supporting new, emerging and unconventional partnerships
- Promoting emerging technologies
- Encouraging working together across political boundaries
- Advocating for multiple benefits
- Connecting work through the State
- Advocating for visionary standards
- Advocating for the most important policies
- Planning resources

WWW.LAREGIONALCOLLABORATIVE.COM
California is committed to dramatically reducing its contribution to global climate change. The state’s goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions 40% below 1990 levels by 2030 will require collaboration among cities, agencies, and regional government. As 25% of the state’s population, the Los Angeles region will play an essential role.
Scientists expect the impacts of climate change to include increased heat, decreased water reliability, and rising sea levels to increase through midcentury.

Meeting these challenges will require transformation in energy, transportation and land use, water, public health, and ocean and coastal management. A Greater LA: A Framework for Climate Action lays out a set of recommendations in each of these areas to maximize regional benefits and help California achieve its ambitious goals.
JOIN US + GET INVOLVED TODAY!

Support LARC + Adopt the Framework via:

- SPONSORSHIP
  Official supporter of LARC – Recognized in publications and at public events
- MEMBERSHIP DUES
- OFFICIAL PROJECT PARTNERSHIPS
- VIP REGIONAL LEADERSHIP CIRCLE (New!!)
THANK YOU

Laurel Hunt, Executive Director lhunt@ioes.ucla.edu or (310) 903-2316

LARC BRAIN TRUST

Jonathan Parfrey, Climate Resolve
Shannon Parry, City of Santa Monica
Steve Baule, LADWP
Thomas Yee, LA Thrives
Walker Well, Global Green
Jason Greenspan, SCAG
Adam Smith, Southern California Edison
Stephanie Pincetl, PhD - UCLA
Phyllis Griffman, USC Sea Grant
Gary Gero, LA County
Elizabeth Rhoades, PhD - LA County
Craig Perkins, The Energy Coalition
Jacob Lieb, LA Metro
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DATE: September 7, 2017

TO: Environment and Energy Committee (EEC)

FROM: Sarah Jepson, Manager, Active Transportation & Special Programs, jepson@scag.ca.gov, 213-236-1955

SUBJECT: California Data Collaborative

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL:

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only- No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The California Data Collaborative (http://californiadatacollaborative.org/) is a coalition of municipal water utilities dedicated to sharing water usage data to ensure water reliability. Patrick Atwater, Argo Labs, coordinates the collaborative and will present before the EEC on their efforts to better manage water resources through enhanced data infrastructure and analysis.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG's Strategic Plan, Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies/ Objective 2: Develop external communications and media strategy to promote partnerships, build consensus, and foster inclusiveness in the decision making process.

BACKGROUND:
In July 2017, the EEC received a presentation on opportunities that SCAG could pursue in the current fiscal year to increase coordination between water planning and the agency’s core land-use and transportation planning functions. The report highlighted data-sharing as a mutually beneficial area for SCAG and water agencies to collaborate in order to increase our collective understanding of the relationships between land-use, transportation and water policy. The report specifically recommended staff engage water stakeholders as part of the efforts of the Open Data/Big Data Committee and other initiatives to better integrate data and analysis into planning tools and resources.

The California Data Collaborative was formed to enhance water data infrastructure and analysis to better manage water resources. Mr. Atwater will discuss some of the applications and outcomes of developing more robust water data platforms at a regional scale and provide examples on how these analyses may be used to inform land-use planning.

FISCAL IMPACT:
None

ATTACHMENT:
PowerPoint Presentation: Advanced Research in Government Operations
SURFING THE DIGITAL TSUNAMI

Cities cannot navigate global upheaval and digital disruption with the current excel-for-everything & consultant dependent model.
THE WORLD'S FIRST DATA UTILITY

ARGO leverages a Palantir like public data infrastructure that is actually aligned with municipal managers goals and the public good.

A UNIQUE PEOPLE PLATFORM

The California Data Collaborative is a coalition of water utilities committed to sharing data and ensuring reliability into an uncertain future.
MEETING A HISTORIC CHALLENGE

LONG-TERM ARIDITY CHANGES IN THE WEST

% DROUGHT AREA

YEAR

B.

936 1034 1150 1253

1321

1613

1829

1915

DRIER

WETTER

MEANINGFUL BENCHMARKS

Governor Brown’s statewide efficiency framework aims to make “conservation a CA way of life” and prepare for that future.

RESIDENTIAL EFFICIENCY TARGET =

Reasonable Indoor per person water use + Water needed for landscaping (varied by local climate)

Indoor

Outdoor

EEC 09/07/17 --- Page 68 of 92
DELIVERING THAT DATA

ARGO delivered the first ever statewide data integration necessary to calculate the governor’s efficiency framework.

Data inputs
1. Population from supplier reports (SWRCB / Geo Ops)
2. CIMIS (DWR)
3. Remote sensing (CGU)
4. Service area (DWR / CEHTP)
5. Parcel level land use (OPR)

Efficiency formula

Example uses

indoor

outdoor

RESULTING TOOL

CALIFORNIA DATA COLLABORATIVE
About Efficiency Designer v1.2

Scenario Builder
Supplier

Mudhar Niquel Water District

Residential Efficiency Class 101-160 0.5 Acre
Efficiency: 1128.32 AF within goal in this scenario | 26%
Data Quality: Limited Data representation

Date Range
Jul 2016 - Jun 2017

CPCD ET Adjustment Factor
66
55
0.8
MULTIPLE BENEFITS

Kraken powered analytics routinize current excel-for-everything workflows and incentivize data sharing with academics to go much, much deeper.

### EARLY IMPACT

- Funded to deliver first ever Governor Brown’s statewide water efficiency targets for 4% of $4 MM state budgeted.
- $20 million in savings from demand forecasting analytics
- Grown CaDC coalition by 620% in population served over first 12 months
**WHAT MAKES KRAKEN DIFFERENT?**

- Palantir
- enigma

**THEORY OF CHANGE**

- Approximately 80% of the CA water industry doesn’t utilize modern water efficiency analytics
- CaDC participating agencies are industry leaders
- Seed investment and leadership to make modern analytics the “new normal” in water management
MANAGE DATA LIKE WATER

By addressing the underlying administrative issues, Kraken enables a new take on outstanding smart cities challenges.

WHAT CAN THE PUBLIC DATA WORLD LEARN FROM CALIFORNIA WATER?

Artisanal, ad hoc

Integrated infrastructure

STORMWATER AND STREETS

GIS-based data exchange

Parking Data

Traffic Data

Unreconcilable data sets

SharedStreets data exchange

Parking Data

Traffic Data

SharedStreet Reference + Traffic Data

SharedStreets Referencing system
NEW STREET DATA COLLABORATIVE

The Future of City Streets

Working together to ensure equitable and efficient urban mobility now and into an autonomous future

QUESTIONS?

“The people of California have not lost their pioneering spirit or their capacity to meet life’s challenges.”

– Jerry Brown

Contact:
Patrick@argolabs.org
DATE: September 7, 2017

TO: Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)

FROM: Grieg Asher, Program Manager, Sustainability Department, asher@scag.ca.gov, (213) 236-1869

SUBJECT: Los Angeles County Community Choice Aggregation Program

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S APPROVAL: [Signature]

RECOMMENDED ACTION: For Information Only – No Action Required

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Gary Gero, Chief Sustainability Officer, County of Los Angeles, will brief the committee on the county’s Community Choice Aggregation program that allows local governments for providing green energy for their cities by purchasing electricity in the wholesale power markets.

STRATEGIC PLAN: This item supports SCAG Regional Goal 1) Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies, c) Provide practical solutions for moving new ideas forward.

BACKGROUND: Pursuant to state laws, Assembly Bill (AB) 117 passed by the California legislature in 2002 and amended in 2011 by Senate Bill 790, allows all cities, counties, or groups of cities and counties to provide an electric power supply source to customers within their jurisdictions that are currently served by traditional utility providers such as Southern California Edison, Pacific Gas & Electric or San Diego Gas & Electric.

Community Choice Aggregation (CCA) is a customer opt-out program where the CCA provides power supply and behind the meter services, and traditional utilities provide transmission and distribution (wires) service. The County of Los Angeles has formed a CCA within the county after completing a business plan in July 2016 that studied the feasibility of establishing a CCA within the county.

FISCAL IMPACT: No Fiscal Impact. This is not a SCAG funded project.

ATTACHMENT: PowerPoint Presentation: LACCE
This Page Intentionally Left Blank
Los Angeles Community Choice Energy (LACCE)

GARY GERO, CHIEF SUSTAINABILITY OFFICER
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

---

Los Angeles Community Choice Energy

Overview

1. What is a CCA?
2. CCA Benefits:
   - Customer Choice and Local Control
   - Rates
   - Greenhouse Gas Emissions
   - Economic Impacts
3. LACCE Business Plan and JPA Formation
   - County and Cities together
   - LA County Board of Supervisors Adoption
4. JPA – Governance
5. Risks and Risk Management
6. Schedule for CCA in L.A. County
7. Next Steps for Cities
Community Choice Aggregation (CCA): A Hybrid Approach to Utility Operations

IOU Investor-Owned Utility
- IOU Purchases Power, Sets Rates, Provides Customer Programs
- IOU Maintains Transmission Lines
- IOU Provides Meter Reading and Billing Services

CCA Community Choice Aggregation
- CCA Purchases Power, Sets Rates, & Provides Customer Programs
- IOU Maintains Transmission Lines
- IOU Provides Meter Reading and Billing Services

Cities in Operational CCA Programs

Sonoma Clean Power
- Santa Rosa
- Sonoma County
- Mendocino County
- Town of Windsor
- Sebastopol
- Petaluma
- Cloverdale
- Cotati
- Town of Sonoma
- Rohnert Park
- Fort Bragg

Silicon Valley Clean Energy
- Cupertino
- Los Gatos
- Mountain View
- Santa Clara County
- Los Altos Hills
- Los Altos
- Campbell
- Gilroy
- Morgan Hill
- Sunnyvale
- Monte Sereno
- Saratoga

Peninsula Clean Energy
- San Mateo County
- City of San Mateo
- Atherton
- Belmont
- Brisbane
- Burlingame
- Colma
- Daly City
- Foster City
- East Palo Alto
- Hillsborough
- Menlo Park
- Half Moon Bay
- Millbrae
- Pacifica
- Portola Valley
- Redwood City
- San Bruno
- San Carlos
- Woodside
- South San Francisco

Lancaster Choice Energy
- Lancaster
- Pico Rivera
- San Jacinto

Marin Clean Energy
- Mill Valley
- Walnut Creek
- County of Marin
- Richmond
- Benicia
- San Rafael
- El Cerrito
- Town of Ross
- Larkspur
- Sausalito
- Town of San Anselmo
- County of Napa
- San Pablo
- Town of Tiburon
- Novato
- Belvedere
- Town of Sonoma
- Rohnert Park
- Fort Bragg

Clean Power San Francisco
- San Francisco

Apple Valley Choice Energy
- Apple Valley
CCA Benefits: Customer Choice and Local Control

- Customer Choice
  - CCAs offer customers new options (CCA rate offerings), without removing old options (SCE)
  - Having both CCA and SCE products gives customers choice
  - Customers may opt out of the CCA at any time and return to SCE

- Local Control
  - CCAs enable communities to invest locally; instead of sending money to SCE, CCA revenues can be reinvested in the local community
  - CCAs have total local control over their power supply, rates, and customer programs (e.g., energy efficiency, solar incentives, EV incentives, etc.)

Los Angeles Community Choice Energy

LACCE Benefits: Rate Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Type</th>
<th>SCE</th>
<th>LACCE</th>
<th>SCE</th>
<th>LACCE</th>
<th>SCE</th>
<th>LACCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Rate (¢/kWh)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Rate</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>18.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% Renewable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Renewable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rates are taken from the LACCE Business Plan
* LACCE rates include considerable financial reserve
LACCE Benefits: GHG Emissions

Example: Average City in Los Angeles

![Graph showing GHG emissions comparison between SCE, LACCE 50%, and LACCE 100%]

*The natural gas category refers to use for heating and cooking in buildings, not for use in electricity generation.

Los Angeles Community Choice Energy

CCA Benefits: Economic Development

- **Total Electricity Savings CCA vs. SCE**
  - In Phase 2, a 5.3% rate reduction saves LACCE customers $20 million/year
  - This $20 million rate reduction is estimated to create 200 new jobs in LA County.
  - In aggregate, these benefits could add $16 million to the County’s economy.

- **Power Supply Construction Projects**
  - Construction of one 50 MW solar project in County could create 1,500 jobs during construction and 15 full-time permanent jobs.
  - LACCE will need several dozen of these projects at full build-out.
LA County Board of Supervisors

LACCE Business Plan

- LA County Board of Supervisors approved a motion in March 2015 asking staff to conduct a CCA feasibility study for LA County
- Report completed in June 2016
- LACCE Feasibility Study/Business Plan
  - Includes all eligible cities in LA County
  - Financially viable
  - Cheaper and greener power than SCE
  - Considerable environmental and economic benefits

LA County Board of Supervisors

Board Direction: Cities and County Together

- September 27, 2016 Board of Supervisors Motion:
  - Following Feasibility Study, Board said like the idea but wanted to work together with cities to craft a regional program.
  - Directed that staff negotiate a JPA with interested cities to create a joint cites-county program
  - Ensure equitable representation for all cities
  - Model after existing, successful CCAs in northern California (Marin, Sonoma, San Mateo)

- JPA Process: December 2016 – March 2017
  - Bi-weekly meetings with interested cities
  - Two public workshops to get input from the community and stakeholders
  - Public review and comment on draft final JPA
  - Negotiations completed at the end of March
  - BOS approval on April 18, 2017
LA County Board of Supervisors

April 18, 2017 Action

- On April 18, the Board of Supervisors approved a joint motion from Supervisors Shelia Kuehl and Mark Ridley-Thomas to approve:
  - LACCE Joint Powers Agreement
  - CCA enabling ordinance
  - $10 Million in startup funding
  - Plan for program implementation

Los Angeles Community Choice Energy

Joint Powers Agreement

- LACCE Governance
  - Every member government gets an equal seat on the Board
  - Most votes are by a majority of members present
  - Some special items require 2/3s of all members
  - Option to call for a weighted vote based on load share, with the following restrictions:
    - 3 members must agree to have a weighted vote
    - Weighted votes can only follow an affirmative vote of the Board
Los Angeles Community Choice Energy

Joint Powers Agreement

*LACCE Standing Committees*
- Executive Committee
- Finance Committee
- Community Advisory Committee

*Directors and Alternates*
- Primary Directors must be an elected official of that city
- City’s may appoint two Alternate Directors, who may be:
  - Another elected official
  - An appointed official (Commissioners)
  - A city staff person
  - Member of the public with industry expertise

Risks and Risk Management

*The primary risk in forming LACCE is that it will be unable to stay competitive with SoCal Edison, which could be caused by:*
- Sudden and unfavorable changes to the energy market
- High customer opt-out rate
- Unreasonable costs imposed by SCE
- New California State laws or regulations

*Risk Management*
- Diverse power portfolio with varied power sources
- Sound fiscal policies and rate stabilization plan to remain competitive
- Engagement with the State agencies and State elected officials

*The LACCE Business Plan concludes that there are no reasonable set of risk-related circumstances that would harm the ability of LACCE to be competitive with SCE*
Los Angeles Community Choice Energy

Other Key Questions

▪ Franchise Fee
  ▪ The Franchise Fee is unaffected
  ▪ Collected by SCE and distributed to cities

▪ Utility User Tax (UUT)
  ▪ UUT is a tax on customer’s total electrical bill
  ▪ Therefore, a city’s UUT revenue will decrease in proportion to the total savings their customers receive from LACCE

▪ Customer Programs
  ▪ LACCE will develop and implement customer programs (EE, PV, EV, etc)

▪ Customer Billing
  ▪ SCE still bills customers for their electrical use
  ▪ The bill from SCE will include a line item noting LACCE power charge

Los Angeles Community Choice Energy

Schedule

▪ Open enrollment period – 6 months
  ▪ No cost for cities to join

▪ Phases
  ▪ Phase 1 – January 2018 – County municipal accounts
  ▪ Phase 2 – Q2 2018– County and city commercial and industrial accounts
  ▪ Phase 3 – Q3/4 2018– All County and city residents
Next Steps for Cities

1. Adopt enabling ordinance and JPA agreement
2. Designate Board Director and alternate(s)
3. Evaluate your constituents’ priorities for services and programs
4. Assist with public outreach and noticing

Contact Information

Gary Gero
Chief Sustainability Officer

ggero@ceo.lacounty.gov
213-974-1160

More information/documents can be found at:
lacounty.gov/sustainability
DATE: September 7, 2017

TO: Energy and Environment Committee (EEC)
Community, Economic, and Human Development Committee (CEHD)
Transportation Committee (TC)

FROM: Jason Greenspan, Manager, greenspan@scag.ca.gov, 213-236-1859

SUBJECT: SCAG Green Region Initiative Sustainability Indicators Map

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S APPROVAL:

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only - No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The CivicSpark program is a statewide Governor’s Initiative AmeriCorps program administered by the State of California’s Office of Planning and Research and the Local Government Commission (LGC). SCAG is a regional partner and beneficiary of the CivicSpark program, and has hosted CivicSpark fellows working in the Sustainability Department for the past three (3) years. SCAG’s 2016-17 CivicSpark Fellows—Monica Dorsey, Adrienne Garcia, and Catherine Saint —will present an update to the SCAG Green Region Initiative (GRI) map. The goal of GRI is to illustrate the status and progress of the region across 25 sustainability indicators.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan Goal 1: Improve Regional Decision Making by Providing Leadership and Consensus Building on Key Plans and Policies and Goal 4: Develop, Maintain and Promote the Utilization of State of the Art Models, Information Systems and Communication Technologies.

BACKGROUND:
The CivicSpark program is a statewide Governor’s Initiative AmeriCorps program administered by the State of California’s Office of Planning and Research and the LGC. The program places 48 fellows in local governments around the state to build capacity for climate mitigation and adaptation. SCAG is a Regional Partner and beneficiary of the CivicSpark program, and has hosted CivicSpark fellows working in the Sustainability Department for the past three (3) years, since the program began. This year’s CivicSpark fellows have continued work on the Green Region Initiative – Sustainability Indicators project, which charts and maps progress across 25 sustainability topics in every city and county in the SCAG region. The final deliverable of the 2016-17 CivicSpark program year is an updated Green Region Initiative map, which will provide a resource for SCAG staff, local governments, and the public to explore best practices in the region, facilitate collaboration, and advance sustainability planning and programming in Southern California. Tasked with updating the current sustainability map to be interactive and include specific policy data as well as performance data, the fellows developed a map with SCAG’s GIS team.
using the GIS StoryMaps platform. The updated version of the map is interactive, and includes both policy and performance data for cities and counties in the region across the 25 sustainability topics. This project supports the 2016 RTP/SCS Land Use Strategy to Support Local Sustainability Planning because it highlights best practices around the region and serves as a resource for other cities to replicate existing projects and tailor them to suit their unique needs.

HIGHLIGHT OF RESULTS:
Over the course of their term, the fellows:
- Developed metrics to track progress for policy and performance across 25 sustainability indicators including GHG reduction and climate action planning, active transportation, energy, waste, water, and urban greening.
- Researched and recorded all relevant policies of cities and counties in the region, measuring each jurisdiction’s policy progress.
- Used the data obtained to produce the interactive regional map, develop fact sheets, and outline a plan for future workshops to share best practices discovered in the research.

NEXT STEPS:
SCAG’s partnership with CivicSpark will continue through the 2017-18 program year. The CivicSpark fellows will continue collecting data on sustainability progress. The fellows will also conduct outreach to receive feedback from stakeholders on the map’s functionality and purpose. They will then use this feedback to further refine and update the map. Finally, the fellows will organize targeted workshops and technical assistance for local governments on sustainability best practices in the region.

FISCAL IMPACT:
The CivicSpark program is funded jointly by the by the LGC and SCAG in its FY17-18 Overall Work Program (065-0137.10, Civic Sparks Program).

ATTACHMENT:
PowerPoint Presentation: GRI Sustainable Indicators Map
GREEN REGION INITIATIVE
SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS PROJECT

Presented by CivicSpark Fellows
Monica Dorsey, Adrienne Garcia & Catherine Saint

CivicSpark
72 fellows in local governments around the state of California dedicated to building capacity for climate mitigation and adaptation

SCAG’s role
- Regional partner and beneficiary of CivicSpark
- Has hosted 9 fellows since the program began 3 years
Purpose

- Define, measure and track sustainability progress
- Visualize sustainability progress in the SCAG region
- Provide a resource for local governments to
  - explore best practices
  - collaborate on programs
  - assess the needs of communities
  - target assistance

Overview

- 191 cities and 6 counties in the SCAG region
- 25 indicators in 10 categories
  - Detailed metric reports
  - Policy and performance charts
- GRI V 2.0 highlighted policy & programs
- GRI V3.0 incorporates performance
Methodology

Collected data based on **interim** metrics

- **V 2.0:** Categorized jurisdictions‘ sustainability policies, plans, and programs
- **V 3.0:** Measured performance & implementation
  - Info obtained from various open data sources & contacting jurisdictions
    - Population - Department of Finance
    - Renewable Energy - California Solar Statistics
    - Parks - California Protected Areas Database

**Identified ideal metrics for future updates**

---

Policy Chart

![Policy Chart Image]

- **White** = Opportunity Area
- **Light Green** = Taking Action
- **Medium Green** = Making Progress
- **Dark Green** = Leading the Way
1. Renewable Energy

Local renewable energy generation usually takes the form of solar production, whereas other forms of renewable energy are more frequently produced at a regional scale. Performance data measuring solar capacity is derived from California Solar Statistics.

2. Municipal Energy Efficiency

3. Community Energy Efficiency
Version 3.0 Categories

1. Renewable Energy

Local renewable energy generation usually takes the form of solar production, whereas other forms of renewable energy are more frequently produced at a regional scale. Performance data measuring solar capacity is derived from California Solar Statistics.

2. Municipal Energy Efficiency

3. Community Energy Efficiency

Version 3.0 Slide Function

1. Renewable Energy

Local renewable energy generation usually takes the form of solar production, whereas other forms of renewable energy are more frequently produced at a regional scale. Performance data measuring solar capacity is derived from California Solar Statistics.

2. Municipal Energy Efficiency

3. Community Energy Efficiency
Version 3.0 Search Tool

1. Renewable Energy

Local renewable energy generation usually takes the form of solar production, whereas other forms of renewable energy are more frequently produced at a regional scale. Performance data measuring solar capacity is derived from California Solar Statistics.

2. Municipal Energy Efficiency

3. Community Energy Efficiency

Version 3.0 Pop Up

1. Renewable Energy

Local renewable energy generation usually takes the form of solar production, whereas other forms of renewable energy are more frequently produced at a regional scale. Performance data measuring solar capacity is derived from California Solar Statistics.

2. Municipal Energy Efficiency

3. Community Energy Efficiency
Next Steps

- Analysis of performance results to create best practice documents for future outreach
- Reevaluation of existing metrics as more data sources become available
- Provide an open data source for local jurisdictions
- Further development of the map to show progress in sustainability efforts in the region over time

QUESTIONS?

Grieg Asher, Sarah Dominguez, Monica Dorsey, Catherine Saint, Adrienne Garcia

scaggreenregion@scag.ca.gov
http://sustain.scag.ca.gov/Pages/default.aspx