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SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will
accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in
order to participate in this meeting. SCAG is also committed to helping
people with limited proficiency in the English language access the
agency’s essential public information and services. You can request such
assistance by calling (213) 236-1858. We require at least 72 hours (three
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*Regional Council Member*
The Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee 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
(Hon. Paula Lantz, 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 speaker’s card to the Assistant prior to speaking. Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes. The Chair may limit the total time for all comments to twenty (20) minutes.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

1. Minutes of the February 7, 2013 Meeting
   Attachment
   1

Receive and File

2. Summary Report from Subcommittees
   Attachment
   6

INFORMATION ITEMS

3. List of Jurisdictions that Participated in the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Housing Element Assistance Workshop
   Attachment
   10

4. 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (RTP/SCS) Growth Forecast: Planning & Policy Implications
   Attachment
   20 mins.
   13

5. 2013 Local Profiles Update
   Attachment
   10 mins.
   24

ACTION ITEM/DISCUSSION ITEM

6. Sustainability Program Call For Proposals Ranking Criteria
   (Huasha Liu, Director, Land Use & Environmental Planning)
   Attachment
   10 mins.
   76

   Recommended Action: Recommend Regional Council approval of Call for Proposals ranking criteria.
COMMUNITY, ECONOMIC AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE AGENDA
MARCH 7, 2013

SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

CHAIR’S REPORT
(Hon. Paula Lantz, Chair)

STAFF REPORT
(Frank Wen, SCAG Staff)

FUTURE AGENDA ITEM(S)

ADJOURNMENT

The next CEHD Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 4, 2013, at the SCAG Los Angeles Office.

The 2013 Regional Conference and General Assembly will be held on May 2-3, 2013 at the JW Marriott Desert Springs Resort & Spa, 74855 Country Club Drive, Palm Desert, CA 92260.
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Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE
COMMUNITY, ECONOMIC & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE. AN AUDIO
RECORDING OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING.

The Community, Economic & Human Development Committee held its meeting at SCAG’s
downtown Los Angeles office.
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CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
Hon. Paula Lantz, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:10 AM and led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD
There were no public comments.

REVIEW AND PRIORITIZE AGENDA ITEMS
There was no reprioritization of the agenda.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Item

1. Minutes of the January 3, 2013 Meeting

Receive and File

2. Summary Report from Subcommittees

A MOTION was made (Jahn) to approve the Consent Calendar. The MOTION was SECONDED (Morehouse) and unanimously APPROVED.

INFORMATION ITEM

3. California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Housing Element Update Guidance Streamlined Review Option
Ma’Ayn Johnson, Senior Regional Planner, stated that HCD has recently implemented a program intended to assist local governments and stakeholders with streamlined updates and HCD review for the fifth cycle housing element. Ms. Johnson further stated that use of the streamlined update is voluntary, but emphasized that use of the streamline update can potentially reduce time and resources dedicated to developing the housing element and minimize the number of draft housing element submittals by the jurisdiction to HCD.
Chair Paula Lantz requested that CEHD members receive the names of the cities represented at the HCD workshops where the streamlined review option was outlined.

4. **Process to Consider Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) and Housing Element Reform**

Huasha Liu, Director of Land Use and Environmental Planning, stated that as a follow-up to the adoption of the 5th cycle RHNA Plan and HCD Director Linn Warren’s presentation to the Regional Council at its January 3, 2013 meeting, staff has provided a framework to discuss developing a process for RHNA and housing element reform. Ms. Liu asked that the Committee consider the options to either continue CEHD’s review of the work plan described in the agenda report, or to recommend to the Regional Council the continuance of the RHNA Subcommittee for six (6) months and fund additional costs with General Fund reserves.

At the city’s request, Ms. Liu read for the record a letter from the City of Ojai in support of the ongoing efforts to reform the RHNA and housing element process and funding for the continuance of the RHNA Subcommittee.

Several members expressed their support to continue the RHNA Subcommittee in order to utilize the expertise of the members involved in the 4th and 5th cycles of the RHNA process. Hon. Larry McCallon stated that although he would likely support the continuation of the RHNA Subcommittee, he expressed concern about the establishment of subcommittees at SCAG. Hon. McCallon stated that he believes subcommittees are detrimental to the process of policy making because they undermine the policy committees, which have a broader perspective on the issues. After further discussion, a MOTION was made (Robertson) to recommend to the Regional Council the continuance of the RHNA Subcommittee. The MOTION was SECONDED (Jahn) and unanimously APPROVED.

5. **Information Regarding Local Input Process for 2016-40 RTP/SCS and Growth Forecast Development**

Huasha Liu stated that a letter will be going out to SCAG’s 191 cities and 6 counties advising them of the start of the local input process and the collection of the base-year data necessary for the development of the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. Hon. McCallon inquired about the effectiveness of the data collection request. Ms. Liu stated that in the past staff has received approximately a 70% response ratio. Hon. McCallon stated that a 100% response ratio should be the goal. Ms. Liu agreed and stated that staff is committed to reaching this goal. Several members inquired about the contents of the letter and who should receive the letter. Several committee members also requested that SCAG establish a formal data submittal process with the local jurisdictions. After further discussion, there was a consensus of the Committee that the draft letter, local jurisdiction review, and approval options for the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS Growth Forecast be brought back to the March 7, 2013 CEHD meeting as an action item.

**SUSTAINABILITY SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

A written report was provided.

**CHAIR’S REPORT**

There was no report provided.
STAFF REPORT
There was no report provided.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS
There were no future agenda items presented.

ANNOUNCEMENTS
There were no announcements.

ADJOURNMENT
The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:10 AM.

Minutes Approved By:

[Signature]
Frank Wen, Manager
Research & Analysis
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DATE: March 7, 2013

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

FROM: Michele Martinez, Chair, Active Transportation Subcommittee
      Barbara Messina, Chair, Goods Movement Subcommittee
      Pam O’Connor, Chair, Sustainability Subcommittee
      Gary Ovitt, Chair, Transportation Finance Subcommittee
      Deborah Robertson, Chair, Public Health Subcommittee
      Karen Spiegel, Chair, High-Speed Rail and Transit Subcommittee

SUBJECT: Summary Report from Subcommittees

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The Active Transportation, Goods Movement, High-Speed Rail and Transit, Public Health, Transportation Finance, and Sustainability Subcommittees have been meeting since September 2012. Presentations by SCAG staff, industry professionals, and other stakeholders have provided background information and input on issues facing the region relevant to each Subcommittee to facilitate implementation of the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and develop policy recommendations for the next RTP/SCS. In an effort to keep all Regional Council and Policy Committee members informed, a monthly report will be provided summarizing the work and progress of the Subcommittees.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports SCAG’s Strategic Plan, Goal 1: Improve regional decision-making providing leadership and consensus building on key plans and policies.

BACKGROUND:
At its April 5, 2012 meeting, the Regional Council approved the formation of Subcommittees as part of the implementation strategy for the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. Charters for each Subcommittee were approved by the Regional Council in July 2012, and SCAG President Glen Becerra thereafter appointed to each of the six (6) Subcommittees both Regional Council and Policy Committee members representing the six SCAG counties as subcommittee members and representatives from the private sector (including non-profit organizations) and stakeholder groups as ex-officio members. The Active Transportation, Goods Movement, High-Speed Rail and Transit, and Transportation Finance Subcommittees report to the Transportation Committee (TC). The Public Health Subcommittee reports to the Energy and Environment Committee (EEC). The Sustainability Subcommittee reports to the Community, Economic and Human Development Committee (CEHD). The Subcommittees began meeting in September 2012 with a goal of completing their discussions by February 2013 so that policy recommendations may be presented to TC,
EEC and CEHD, and thereafter to the Regional Council, as well as to the General Assembly, as part of the annual meeting in May 2013.

The following represents a summary of the recent Subcommittee meetings:

**Active Transportation, Public Health and Sustainability Subcommittees**

The meeting was postponed and there is nothing to report.

**Goods Movement Subcommittee**

*4th Meeting, January 28, 2013*
This was a joint meeting with the Transportation Finance Subcommittee that focused on public-private-partnerships, innovative financing, and funding strategies for goods movement. Staff provided background and context for funding and financing freight transportation. Dan Smith, Principal, Tioga Group, provided a summary of research findings on potential new dedicated revenue mechanisms for freight transportation investment. Jack Kitowski, Chief, Freight Incentive Branch, California Air Resources Board (ARB), provided an overview of State’s Cap-and-Trade Program and auction proceeds process. Geoffrey Yarema, Partner, Nossaman LLP, discussed public-private partnerships, tolling, innovative financing options, and new transportation revenue sources.

*5th Meeting, February 11, 2013*
This meeting focused on implementation and the next steps for the regional clean freight corridor system in the RTP and primarily focused on the East-West Freight Corridor (EWFC) component. Michael Fisher, Principal and Director of Business Development, Cambridge Systematics, discussed the analysis done to date including right-of-way analysis, proximity to manufacturing and warehousing, and the ability of the corridor to serve regional markets, improve air quality, improve safety and reduce traffic. J.D. Ballas, City Engineer, City of Industry, presented on potential engineering and design concepts related to the portion of the EWFC between the 605 and the 57 freeway. Jerry Wood, Director of Transportation & Engineering, Gateway Cities COG, presented the Gateway Cities Transportation Strategic Plan, which includes study of significant connections with the East West Freight Corridor as well as on-going studies to better understand feasibility of zero emission vehicles and Intelligent Transportation Systems.

**High-Speed Rail & Transit Subcommittee**

*5th Meeting, February 7, 2013*
This meeting was a joint meeting with the Transportation Finance Subcommittee.

*6th and Final Meeting, February 15, 2013*
This is the final meeting that began with discussions on transit/rail emergency preparedness and response procedures at Metro and Metrolink and the recently proposed California earthquake early warning system. Presentations were made by SCAG staff on the draft Transit System Performance Report and the draft Passenger Rail Report. The former report is intended to be an annual profile of performance indicators for the region’s transit operators. The latter describes the region’s passenger rail network, with performance statistics for Metrolink and Amtrak’s Pacific Surfliner, and near-term and future rail improvements which will also be updated on a regular basis. The meeting concluded with the discussion and approval of the draft subcommittee recommendations. The recommendations are intended to strengthen the implementation of
the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS and the development of the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS. The recommendations include developing a coordinated regional rail vision; identifying and evaluating potential transit best practices; and strategies for inclusion in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS update. These recommendations will be taken to the Transportation Committee and Regional Council for review and approval.

Public Health Subcommittee

5th Meeting, February 12, 2013
This meeting focused on the subcommittee’s policy recommendations for discussion and revision. The proposed policy staff recommendations was a result of combining all the discussions and input received from the past four (4) meetings of the subcommittee into three (3) policy recommendations: 1) “Seek opportunities to promote transportation options with an active component/physical activity” was based on the subcommittee’s support of active transportation in order to encourage physical activity. The recommendation also reflects the subcommittee’s discussion about not only promoting active transportation as a means to encourage active and healthy lifestyles, but also safe active transportation; 2) “Provide robust public health data and information, as feasible, to better inform regional policy, the development of the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, and support public health stakeholder participation” was for SCAG to assure, as much as possible, to allow for interested public health stakeholders the ability to better follow the plan development. Staff noted that SCAG currently does not have the capacity to include the technical work included in the policy recommendation, but are working with the appropriate staff and scenario-planning model developer to include information and enhancements included in the policy recommendation; and 3) “Promote and seek on-going partnerships with regional partners, local public health departments and other stakeholders” was to capitalize on the collaboration opportunities presented during the subcommittee meetings. There was a general consensus that the policy recommendations presented by staff reflected positively on the discussions of the subcommittee. Minor revisions were recommended and staff will revise and send out for review. These recommendations will be presented at a joint meeting of the Active Transportation, Public Health and Sustainability Subcommittees at the sixth meeting.

Transportation Finance Subcommittee

4th Meeting, January 28, 2013
This was a joint meeting with the Goods Movement Subcommittee that focused on public-private partnerships, innovative financing, and funding strategies for goods movement.

5th Meeting, February 7, 2013
This was a joint meeting with the High-Speed Rail & Transit Subcommittee and focused on funding options for public transportation. Paul Sorensen, Associate Director, RAND Corporation, provided a report on mileage-fee design strategies to reduce system cost and increase public acceptance. Richard Bernard, Partner & Senior Vice President, FM3 Research, presented findings on public understanding and acceptance on transportation funding options for the SCAG region. Marv Hounjet, Vice President, Plenary Group, provided an overview of public-private partnerships (P3) and applicability to transit projects. Kern Jacobson, Principal Consultant, InfraConsult LLC, provided a report on the P3 rail component of the High Desert Corridor. Denny Zane, Executive Director, Move LA and Transportation Finance Subcommittee member, outlined funding options for rail initiatives.
Sustainability Subcommittee

5th Meeting, February 14, 2013

This meeting focused exclusively on draft policy recommendations. Staff proposed four policy recommendations for discussion and revision at the meeting. The subcommittee engaged in a wide range and collaborative discussion resulting in language change suggestions. However over all there was wide agreement that the four recommendations synthesized the discussions and important points raised at the subcommittee meetings. The following four recommendations represent the output of comments and discussions held at the meetings of the Sustainability Subcommittee along with input provided by ex-officio members and stakeholders.

- Adopt a definition of sustainability which recognizes the importance of local decision making, yet fosters regionally significant sustainability
- Consider and refine the availability of data and information to evaluate the RTP/SCS and its alternatives relative to sustainability, as defined
- Support regulatory framework and project delivery financing that allows for sustainable development
- Seek opportunities to promote transportation options with an active component/physical activity

The four recommendations and supporting goals will be revised based on subcommittee member input, and will be presented again at the next meeting which will be another joint meeting of the Active Transportation, Public Health and Sustainability Subcommittees.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Funding for the Subcommittees is included in the FY 2012-2013 Budget.

ATTACHMENT:
None
DATE: March 7, 2013

TO: Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee

FROM: Ma’Ayn Johnson, Senior Regional Planner, 213-236-1975, johnson@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: List of Jurisdictions that Participated in the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) Housing Element Assistance Workshops

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S APPROVAL:

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only - No Action Required.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
At the request of several CEHD Committee members, this report includes a list of jurisdictions that responded to an invitation to participate in the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) housing element workshops in fall 2012.

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 SCAG Regional Council adopted the 5th cycle Final Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Allocation Plan on October 4, 2012. The RHNA Allocation Plan represents the projected household growth for all SCAG jurisdictions for the January 1, 2014 to October 1, 2021 projection period. Jurisdictions are required by State housing law to update their respective housing element by assessing existing housing need and accommodating their assigned RHNA allocation through a sites and zoning analysis. Jurisdictions must adopt the updated 5th cycle housing element by October 15, 2013. While SCAG is responsible for developing the Final RHNA Allocation, housing elements are prepared by local jurisdictions, and reviewed and certified by HCD.

To assist jurisdictions with the preparation of their respective housing elements, HCD held six workshops throughout the SCAG region between October and December 2012. Videoconferencing was available as well for the SCAG office workshop on November 13, 2012. Topics covered were the new housing element streamline review process, developing a suitable sites inventory, and achieving compliance with State housing law. At the Workshops, SCAG staff provided an overview of the existing housing needs data database that compiles in a user-friendly format specific data needed by local jurisdictions as part of the housing element update.

In order to maximize participation, HCD coordinated with SCAG as well as the Kennedy Commission in Orange County to ensure awareness of the workshops. Electronic notices and reminders for the workshops were directly emailed to planning directors, city managers, and County Chief Executive Officers. Over 179 individuals representing 77 jurisdictions registered for the workshops. See attached list of jurisdictions that submitted an rsvp to HCD Housing Element workshops.
Although no additional workshops are scheduled for the SCAG region, workshop materials and resources, along with further technical housing element assistance, are posted on HCD’s webpage: www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Work associated with this item is included in the current FY 2012/13 General Fund Budget (13-800.0160.03:RHNA).

**ATTACHMENT:**
List of Jurisdictions that Provided an RSVP to HCD Housing Element Workshops
List of Jurisdictions That Submitted an RSVP to HCD Housing Element Workshops
Fall 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Adelanto</th>
<th>City of Loma Linda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Agoura Hills</td>
<td>City of Mission Viejo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Alhambra</td>
<td>City of Montebello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Aliso Viejo</td>
<td>City of Moreno Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Anaheim</td>
<td>City of Murrieta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Beaumont</td>
<td>City of Needles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Big Bear Lake</td>
<td>City of Newport Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Brea</td>
<td>City of Ojai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Buena Park</td>
<td>City of Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Burbank</td>
<td>City of Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cerritos</td>
<td>City of Palm Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chino</td>
<td>City of Palmdale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chino Hills</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cucamonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Colton</td>
<td>City of Rancho Mirage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Costa Mesa</td>
<td>City of Rancho Palos Verdes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Covina</td>
<td>City of Rancho Santa Margarita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cudahy</td>
<td>City of Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Culver City</td>
<td>City of San Clemente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cypress</td>
<td>City of San Juan Capistrano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Dana Point</td>
<td>City of San Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of El Segundo</td>
<td>City of Santa Ana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fillmore</td>
<td>City of Santa Clarita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fountain Valley</td>
<td>City of Santa Fe Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fullerton</td>
<td>City of Sierra Madre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gardena</td>
<td>City of South Pasadena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>City of Stanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Grand Terrace</td>
<td>City of Temecula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hawthorne</td>
<td>City of Tustin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Huntington Beach</td>
<td>City of Twentynine Palms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Indian Wells</td>
<td>City of Upland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Irvine</td>
<td>City of Ventura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Irwindale</td>
<td>City of Villa Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Canada Flintridge</td>
<td>City of Walnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Habra</td>
<td>City of West Covina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Palma</td>
<td>City of Yorba Linda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Puente</td>
<td>County of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of La Verne</td>
<td>County of Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Laguna Hills</td>
<td>County of Ventura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Lake Forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: March 7, 2013

TO: Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee

FROM: Simon Choi, Chief of Research & Forecasting, 213-236-1849, choi@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (RTP/SCS) Growth Forecast: Planning & Policy Implications

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL:

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For Information Only – No Action Required

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Steve Levy, Director of the Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy, will discuss policy and planning implications for the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) growth forecast along with new California Department of Finance (DOF) projections released January 31, 2013.

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:
SCAG adopted its regional growth forecast as part of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS in April 2012. The regional growth forecast is used as a key guide for future transportation investments in the SCAG region. The 2012–2035 RTP/SCS growth forecast was developed reflecting both the short term and long term perspectives. The latest 2010 Census data and 2011 California Employment Development Department (EDD) data indicate lower population, households and employment for 2010 than forecasted in the 2008 RTP.

The region is expected to grow over the RTP planning period (2008–2035)—adding 4.2 million new residents, 1.5 million new households, and 1.7 million new jobs by 2035. The slower population growth pattern experienced in the last decade is expected to continue into the future. Between 2010 and 2035, the annual average population growth rate will be 0.9 percent, which is lower than the annual average growth rate of 1.2% for the past 20 years. The region will grow mainly through natural increase (births over deaths).

The most salient demographic characteristics of the projected population in the region will be the aging of the population and shifts in ethnic composition. With the aging of the baby boomer generation (born between 1946 and 1964), the median age of the population is projected to increase from 34.2 in 2010 to 36.7 in 2035. The share of the population 65 years old and over is projected to increase from 11 percent in 2010 to 18 percent in 2035, while the share of the population less than 65 years old decreases from 89 percent in 2010 to 82 percent in 2035. In particular, the share of the working age population (age 16–64) will decline from 65 percent to 60 percent during the projection period. This implies a future shortage of workers. With the increasing share of the older population and the decreasing share of the working age population, the
aged dependency ratio (i.e., the number of aged people per hundred people of working age) is projected to increase from 17 percent in 2010 to 30 percent in 2035 (an increase of 13 percent during the period).

The other characteristic of the projected population worth noting is with respect to the racial/ethnic diversity. The region already had a high level of racial/ethnic diversity in 2010 with a Hispanic population of 45 percent, a non-Hispanic White population of 34 percent, a non-Hispanic Asian population and others of 14 percent, and a non-Hispanic Black population of 7 percent. The region’s racial/ethnic composition is projected to exhibit a rapid change toward a majority Hispanic population of 56 percent in 2035, while the share of the non-Hispanic White population is projected to drop to 22 percent.

California Department of Finance (DOF) released its new population projections in January 2013. DOF’s new population projections for SCAG’s planning target year 2035 are found to be less than SCAG’s regional growth forecast by 1.7%, which is within an acceptable range. The new population forecasts of SCAG and DOF will have policy and planning implications for the SCAG region.

Steve Levy, Director of the Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy, will present an overview of policy and planning implications of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS growth forecast and 2013 DOF projections for the SCAG region. These policy and planning implications include but are not limited to the following: housing, land use, transportation, economy and workforce, energy, climate change, local public finance, etc.

FISCAL IMPACT:
Work associated with this item is included in the current FY 2012/13 under 055.SCG00133.05: Integrated Growth Forecasting Data Analysis & Development for 2016 RTP/SCS

ATTACHMENT:
Powerpoint Presentation: Planning & Policy Implications of Growth in the SCAG Region
Planning and Policy Implications of Growth in the SCAG Region

Stephen Levy
Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy
March 7, 2013 SCAG Meeting

Major Topics

• Planning and Policy Implications of the 2012 RTP/SCS Growth Forecast—What is Likely to Happen and What Needs to be Done

• Related Issues
  --New Information from the 2016 growth forecast preparation including new DOF population forecast
  --The planned SCAG demographic conference in September will provide insight from around the state and world on planning for regional growth
Major Findings of the 2012 Growth Forecast

- Most population growth will be in residents 55 years of age and older. After 2025 the 75+ population will surge.
- Very slow growth in the number of residents aged 0-24 as DOF and Census Bureau project lower fertility rates for all groups. A new finding!!
- Also slow growth in the 25-54 age groups
- Continuing ethnic change with population gains concentrated in Hispanic and Asian residents
Key Growth Forecast Assumptions

• The regional economy will recover and grow in line with the national economy to 2035
• The investments and plans incorporated in the 2012 RTP/SCS/RES will be, for the most part, successfully funded and implemented
• The forecasted growth will not, by itself, solve longstanding challenges of poverty and equity
The Region has Recovered from a Deep Recession Before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Millions of Jobs</th>
<th>Share of U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major SCAG Planning and Policy Initiatives

- The 2012 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- The 2012 Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)
- Ongoing Regional Economic Strategy Initiatives (RES)
- Bottom Line: All of these initiatives are important for economic competitiveness as well as transportation, land use, air quality and other goals. These plans and policies make the region a better place to live and work.
Implications for Housing-- A Reversal in Growth for Large Homes at the Edge of the Region??

- 2010-2025
  -- Growth in 25-34, 55-64 and 65+ age groups
- 2025-2035
  -- Growth in 35-54 and 65+ age groups
- Fewer children and smaller households
- A lot depends on what older HHs choose to do
- But demand for smaller units in high amenity areas should grow, facilitating SCS planning and policies. Expect market demand to follow demographic trends.

Key Housing Age Groups (Population in Millions)
Implications for the Economy of the RTP/SCS Plans

- The RTP investments are crucial to improving the movement of people and goods and thus important for attracting many of the jobs in the growth forecast. Full funding is not yet in place. SCAG has documented the economic gains from these investments. RTP investments are a part of the regional air quality plan.
- SB 375 requires the region to provide housing to match job growth while reducing GHG emissions. Adequate housing is critical to regional economic competitiveness. The climate change study identified specific SCAG land use, housing and transportation policies as the most cost effective strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while having a positive economic impact.

The Regional Economic Strategy has Important Short AND Long-Term Policies

- Transportation investments and other policies in support of foreign trade
- Expediting project review and other policies to improve customer service
- Exploring public-private partnerships, lowering voter thresholds and other policies for better infrastructure funding
- Exploring development of sector strategies
The Tsunami of Baby Boomer Retirements

- The region’s labor force was 8.8 million in 2012
- By 2020 900,000 baby boom workers will retire
- Between 2020 and 2030 another 1.5 million baby boomers will retire
- The region will add 2.2 million jobs by 2035 (500,000 to replace remaining recession losses) while needing to replace 2.4 million retiring baby boomers

Workforce Implications of the Growth Forecast

- Near term there will be delayed retirements and still unemployed workers available
- Starting soon, though, the region will need skilled workers for the new jobs and to replace the more educated and experienced retirees
- Additional considerations are the smaller number of children expected as well as ongoing increases in skill requirements for many jobs
Workforce Implications (cont’d)

• Educating ALL children is both an economic prosperity and equity imperative
• There will be job openings at ALL skill levels
• High school graduation AND something beyond will be needed by most. Community colleges are a critical resource for the economy and businesses
• The smaller number of children will make it important to ease and target immigration to focus more on labor market needs

The 2016 RTP Growth Forecast

• Key issue is assessing the region’s competitive position for job growth, which will determine how fast the region grows.
• The age and ethnic changes described above will continue. There will be fewer children than previously anticipated.
• Immigration and labor force participation trends will be revisited.
• The links to SCAG policies will be identified.
The Upcoming Demographic Conference

• Will explore the implications of demographic change in the region
• Will have guests from around the state and world to share experiences of planning for growth in large urban regions like SCAG
• Will identify best practices with regard to transportation, land use, housing and energy/climate change
• Will be an input to 2016 cycle plans and policies
DATE: March 7, 2013

TO: Community, Economic and Human Development Committee (CEHD)

FROM: Ping Chang, Program Manager, chang@scag.ca.gov, (213)236-1839

SUBJECT: 2013 Local Profiles Update

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Local Profiles reports contain primarily demographic and socioeconomic information to support local planning and outreach. As an important member benefit, one profile is created for each of SCAG’s member cities and counties (including separate profiles for the unincorporated areas). The profile focuses on the change in the jurisdiction since 2000. First released at the SCAG General Assembly in May 2009 and updated every two years thereafter, Local Profiles have been utilized by local jurisdictions and other stakeholders for variety of purposes. The final 2013 local profile reports are scheduled for release at the annual Regional Conference and General Assembly meeting on May 2-3, 2013 with a sample draft report attached for illustrative purpose.

STRATEGIC PLAN:
This item supports the Strategic Plan, 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:
Since 2009, SCAG has prepared Local Profiles reports every two years for each of the member jurisdictions as part of the member services. The reports, containing data related to population, home prices, employment, and retail sales for the member jurisdictions, are information resources to support local planning and outreach efforts. The inaugural reports were developed through extensive local input and review by the CEHD Policy Committee and Regional Council with respect to project scope and contents. Local Profiles have been released at SCAG’s annual General Assembly conference. In addition to being posted on the SCAG web site, printed reports have been provided to member jurisdictions and state and federal legislative delegates from the region. The profiles have been utilized by local jurisdictions and other stakeholders for variety of purposes including community planning and outreach, economic development, local visioning initiatives and grant application support. It should be noted that use of data in Local Profiles by member jurisdictions is voluntary.

Staff is updating the Local Profiles reports with the most current data available. The 2013 update includes nine additional data items as related to housing, employment and education. For example, it includes information on the top ten places where residents commute to work.
Draft profile reports are being provided to the Planning Directors and staff of member jurisdictions for review and comments. The final local profile reports are scheduled for release at the SCAG General Assembly on May 2-3, 2013.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
Resources needed for updating the local profile reports have been included in the approved Work Program Task 13-080.SCG153.05.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
1. PowerPoint Presentation: 2013 Local Profiles Update
2. Draft 2013 Local Profile Report for the City of Anaheim (for illustrative purposes only)
Regional Council/CEHD Meeting

2013 Local Profiles Update

Southern California Association of Governments

March 7, 2013

Overview

- Free service to all member cities (180) and counties (6) to support local planning
- Portraits of local conditions and changes since 2000
- First released at 2009 GA with updates every two years thereafter
2013 Profiles Content
Updated through 2012

- Population
- Households
- Housing
- Transportation
- Employment
- Retail sales
- Education
- Regional highlights

Population Share by Age

![Population Share by Age Graph]

- 0-4
- 5-20
- 21-34
- 35-54
- 55-64
- 65+
Housing Production
Total Residential Permits Issued

Journey to Work for Residents
Jobs in Construction 
2007-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013 Profiles New Features

- Number of permits for single and multi-family housing
- Housing units by housing type
- Age of housing stock
- Homeownership
- Foreclosures
- Top 10 places residents commute to work
- Top 5 employers
- Median household income
- Percent completing high school or higher
- Percent with a Bachelor's degree or higher
2013 Profiles New Features

Local Review

- Draft local profiles to be provided for local Planning Directors’ review in March 2013
- Local reviews have been valuable
How Local Profiles Have Been Used

- Information resources for elected officials, business and residents
- Community planning and outreach
- Economic development
- Local visioning initiatives
- Grant application support

Accessing Local Profiles

- 2011 Local Profiles Available on SCAG website: [www.scag.ca.gov/resources.htm](http://www.scag.ca.gov/resources.htm)

- 2013 Local Profiles will be released at the General Assembly in May 2013
Additional Information

Please contact:
Ping Chang
Program Manager,
Land Use & Environmental Planning
Chang@scag.ca.gov
(213)236-1839
This Page Intentionally Left Blank
Profile of the City of Anaheim (Draft)

Southern California Association of Governments’ (SCAG) Regional Council includes 67 districts which represent 191 cities in the SCAG region.

SCAG Regional Council District 19 includes only Anaheim
Represented by: Hon. Kris Murray

This profile report was prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments and shared with the City of Anaheim. SCAG provides local governments with a variety of services including planning data and information as well as technical and planning assistance such as GIS training and growth visioning.

Southern California Association of Governments
March 2013
## Southern California Association of Governments
### Regional Council Roster

**March 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Glen Becerra</td>
<td><em>Simi Valley</em></td>
<td>District 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Greg Pettis</td>
<td><em>Cathedral City</em></td>
<td>District 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Carl Morehouse</td>
<td><em>San Buenaventura</em></td>
<td>District 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jack Terrazas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imperial County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Michael Antonovich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mark Ridley-Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Shawn Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jeff Stone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Gary Ovitt</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Bernardino County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Linda Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ventura County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td>OCTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Robert “Bob” Botts</td>
<td><em>Banning</em></td>
<td>RCTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Alan Wapner</td>
<td><em>Ontario</em></td>
<td>SANBAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Keith Millhouse</td>
<td><em>Moorpark</em></td>
<td>VCTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td>ICTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Cheryl Viegas-Walker</td>
<td><em>El Centro</em></td>
<td>District 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jim Hyatt</td>
<td><em>Calimesa</em></td>
<td>District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jeff DeGrandpre</td>
<td><em>Eastvale</em></td>
<td>District 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ronald Roberts</td>
<td><em>Temecula</em></td>
<td>District 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jon Harrison</td>
<td><em>Redlands</em></td>
<td>District 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Larry McCallon</td>
<td><em>Highland</em></td>
<td>District 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Deborah Robertson</td>
<td><em>Rialto</em></td>
<td>District 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paul Eaton</td>
<td><em>Montclair</em></td>
<td>District 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ed Graham</td>
<td><em>Chino Hills</em></td>
<td>District 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hon. Bill Jahn</th>
<th>Big Bear Lake</th>
<th>District 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mike Munzing</td>
<td>Aliso Viejo</td>
<td>District 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Kathryn McCullough</td>
<td>Lake Forest</td>
<td>District 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steven Choi</td>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>District 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Leslie Daigle</td>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
<td>District 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Michele Martinez</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>District 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. John Nielsen</td>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>District 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Leroy Mills</td>
<td>Cypress</td>
<td>District 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Kris Murray</td>
<td>Anaheim</td>
<td>District 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Andy Quach</td>
<td>Westminster</td>
<td>District 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Art Brown</td>
<td>Buena Park</td>
<td>District 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Brett Murdock</td>
<td>Brea</td>
<td>District 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Bruce Barrows</td>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>District 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Gene Daniels</td>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>District 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mario Guerra</td>
<td>Downey</td>
<td>District 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jim Morton</td>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>District 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Frank Gurulé</td>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>District 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Dan Medina</td>
<td>Gardenia</td>
<td>District 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steven Neal</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>District 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Johnson</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>District 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Stan Carroll</td>
<td>La Habra Heights</td>
<td>District 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Margaret Clark</td>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>District 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Keith Hanks</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>District 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Barbara Messina</td>
<td>Alhambra</td>
<td>District 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Margaret E. Finlay</td>
<td>Duarte</td>
<td>District 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Donald Voss</td>
<td>La Cañada/Flintridge</td>
<td>District 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Carol Herrera</td>
<td>Diamond Bar</td>
<td>District 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paula Lantz</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>District 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. James Gazeley</td>
<td>Lomita</td>
<td>District 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Judy Mitchell</td>
<td>Rolling Hills Estates</td>
<td>District 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Frank Quintero</td>
<td>Glendale</td>
<td>District 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Steven Hofbauer</td>
<td>Palmdale</td>
<td>District 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mark Rutherford</td>
<td>Westlake Village</td>
<td>District 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Bryan A. MacDonald</td>
<td>Oxnard</td>
<td>District 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Ed P. Reyes</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Paul Krekorian</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>District 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dennis Zine</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Tom LaBonge</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Paul Koretz</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Richard Alarcón</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Bernard C. Parks</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Jan Perry</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Herb Wesson, Jr.</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Bill Rosendahl</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Mitchell Englander</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Eric Garcetti</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>José Huizar</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Joe Buscaino</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Karen Spiegel</td>
<td>Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Matthew Harper</td>
<td>Huntington Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Ryan McEachron</td>
<td>Victorville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Lupe Ramos Watson</td>
<td>Indio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Sylvia Ballin</td>
<td>San Fernando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VACANT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Lisa Bartlett</td>
<td>Dana Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Randall Lewis</td>
<td>Lewis Group of Companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Antonio Villaraigosa</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide the City of Anaheim with current information and data to support its planning and outreach efforts. Information on population, housing, transportation, employment, retail sales, and education can be utilized by the city to make informed planning decisions. The profile provides a portrait of the city and its changes since 2000, using average figures for Orange County as a comparative baseline. In addition, the most current data available for the region is also included in the Statistical Summary (page 3). This profile demonstrates the current trends occurring in the City of Anaheim.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is the largest Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in the nation. The SCAG region includes six counties (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura) and 191 cities. As the designated MPO, SCAG is mandated by federal and state law to research and develop a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which incorporates a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). SCAG is currently undertaking a variety of planning and policy initiatives to foster a more sustainable Southern California.

In 2008, SCAG initiated the Local Profiles Project as a part of a larger initiative to provide a variety of services to its member cities and counties. Through extensive input from member jurisdictions, the inaugural Local Profiles Reports were released at the General Assembly in May 2009. The Profiles were last updated in 2011 to incorporate the 2010 Census information.

Local Profiles provide basic information about each member jurisdiction including, but not limited to, the following:

- How much growth in population has taken place since 2000?
- Has the local jurisdiction been growing faster or slower than the county or regional average?
- Have there been more or less school-age children?
- Have homeownership rates been increasing or decreasing?
- How and where do residents travel to work?
- How has the local economy been changing in terms of employment share by sectors?
- Have the local retail sale revenues been recovered from the recession?

Answers to questions such as these provide a snapshot of the dynamic changes affecting each local jurisdiction.

New Features of the 2013 Report

Building on the foundation of the 2009 and 2011 Reports, the 2013 Local Profiles provide additional information related to income, housing, employment, and education. The expanded reports now also include the following: median household income, single-family and multi-family permits, types and age of the housing stock, foreclosures, major work destinations for residents, major employers, and educational attainment for...
residents. These additional information help to better characterize the conditions and provide a more complete profile of local jurisdictions.

**Factors Affecting Local Changes Reflected in the 2013 Report**

Overall, member jurisdictions since 2000 were impacted by a variety of factors at the national, regional and local levels. For example, the vast majority of member jurisdictions included in the 2013 Local Profiles reflect the national demographic trends toward an older and a more diverse population. Evidence of the slow process towards economic recovery is also apparent through gradual increases in employment, retail sales, building permits and home prices. Dispersed work destinations and commute times have correlation with regional development patterns and the geographical location of the local jurisdictions, particularly in relation to the regional transportation system.

**Uses of the Local Profiles**

Once released at the SCAG General Assembly, the Local Profiles have been posted on the SCAG website and used by interested parties for a variety of purposes including, but not limited to the following:

- Data and communication resources for elected officials, businesses and residents
- Community planning and outreach
- Economic development
- Visioning initiatives
- Grant application support

The primary user groups of the Profiles include member jurisdictions and state and federal legislative delegates of Southern California. This profile report is a SCAG member benefit and the use of the data within this report is voluntary.

**Report Organization**

This profile report has three sections. The first section presents a Statistical Summary for the City of Anaheim. The second section provides detailed information organized by subject areas. This section also includes brief highlights on the impacts of the recent recession and recovery at the regional level, which are reflected in almost all Profiles. Lastly, the Methodology section describes technical considerations related to data definitions, measurement, and data sources.
## 2012 STATISTICAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Anaheim</th>
<th>Orange County</th>
<th>Anaheim relative to Orange County*</th>
<th>SCAG Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[11.3%]</td>
<td>18,242,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Population</td>
<td>343,793</td>
<td>3,055,792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Median Age (Years)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Hispanic</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>-16.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Non-Hispanic Asian</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Non-Hispanic Black</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Non-Hispanic American Indian</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Non-Hispanic All Other</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Number of Households</td>
<td>99,633</td>
<td>995,933</td>
<td>[10%]</td>
<td>5,870,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Average Household Size</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Median Household Income ($)</td>
<td>56,985</td>
<td>71,193</td>
<td>-14,208</td>
<td>57,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Number of Housing Units</td>
<td>105,657</td>
<td>1,052,361</td>
<td>[10%]</td>
<td>6,356,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Homeownership Rate</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>-9.8%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Median Existing Home Sales Price ($)</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>457,750</td>
<td>-87,750</td>
<td>323,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2012 Median Home Sales Price Change</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Drove Alone to Work</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>-4.6%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Mean Travel Time to Work (minutes)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Number of Jobs</td>
<td>178,942</td>
<td>1,523,697</td>
<td>[11.7%]</td>
<td>7,462,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 - 2012 Total Jobs Change</td>
<td>2,983</td>
<td>26,990</td>
<td>[11.1%]</td>
<td>109,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Average Salary per Job ($)</td>
<td>43,849</td>
<td>53,307</td>
<td>-9,458</td>
<td>49,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 K-12 Public School Student Enrollment</td>
<td>61,829</td>
<td>503,736</td>
<td>[12.3%]</td>
<td>3,096,034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau; Nielsen Co.; California Department of Finance; MDA Data Quick; and SCAG
* Numbers with [ ] represent Anaheim’s share of Orange County. The other numbers represent the difference between Anaheim and Orange County.
II. Population (City of Anaheim)*

* The following charts in this report contain data for the City of Anaheim unless noted otherwise.

Population Growth


- Between 2000 and 2012, the total population of the City of Anaheim increased by 15,779 reaching 343,793 in 2012.

- During this 12-year period, the city’s population growth rate of 4.8 percent was lower than the Orange County rate of 7.4 percent.

- The City of Anaheim comprises 11.3% of Orange County’s total population.

Sources: California Department of Finance, E-5, 2012
Population by Age:

- Between 2000 and 2018, the age group 55-64 is projected to experience the most growth in share, growing from 6.7 to 11.2 percent.

- The age group expected to experience the greatest decline, by share, is projected to be age group 21-34, decreasing from 24 to 20.3 percent.

- Age group 55-64 is expected to add the most population, with an increase of 19,341 between 2000 and 2018.

**Population by Race/Ethnicity**

**Hispanic or Latino of Any Race: 2000, 2010, 2012**

- Between 2000 and 2012, the share of Hispanic population in the city increased from 46.8 percent to 54 percent.

![Bar chart showing Hispanic population percentages for 2000, 2010, and 2012.]

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Census; Nielsen Co., 2012


- Between 2000 and 2012, the share of Non-Hispanic White population in the city decreased from 35.9 percent to 25.6 percent.

![Bar chart showing Non-Hispanic White population percentages for 2000, 2010, and 2012.]

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Census; Nielsen Co., 2012
Between 2000 and 2012, the share of Non-Hispanic Asian population in the city increased from 11.9 percent to 15.4 percent.

Between 2000 and 2012, the share of Non-Hispanic Black population in the city remained at 2.4 percent.
• Between 2000 and 2012, the share of Non-Hispanic American Indian population in the city decreased from 0.3 percent to 0.2 percent.

• Between 2000 and 2010, the share of Non-Hispanic All Other population group in the city decreased from 2.8 percent to 2.4 percent.

• Please refer to the Methodology section for a definition of the ethnicities included in this category.
### III. Households

#### Number of Households

**Number of Households: 2000 - 2012**

- Between 2000 and 2012, the total number of households in the City of Anaheim increased by 2,664 or 2.7 percent.

- During this 12-year period, the city’s household growth rate of 2.7 percent was lower than the overall county growth rate of 6.5 percent.

- The City of Anaheim comprises 10 of Orange County’s total number of households.

- Note: 2000 and 2010 data are based on actual Census counts.

- In 2012, the city’s average household size was 3.4, higher than the overall county average of 3.

- Between 2000 and 2012, average household size increased by 1.7 percent in the city.

---

#### Average Household Size: 2000 - 2012

**Source:** California Department of Finance, E-5, 2012
In 2012, 59 percent of all city households had 3 people or fewer.

About 18 percent of the households were single-person households.

Approximately 25 percent of all households in the city had 5 people or more.

In 2012, 45 percent of households earned less than $50,000.

Approximately 33 percent of the households earned between $50,000 and $99,999.
**Households Income**


- From 2000 to 2012 the Median Household Income increased by $10,068.
- Note: Dollars are not constant

**Renters and Homeowners**


Between 2000 and 2012 homeownership rates decreased slightly and percentage of renters increased slightly.
IV. Housing

**Total Housing Production**

Total Permits Issued for all Residential Units: 2000 - 2012

Source: Construction Industry Research Board, 2000 - 2012

- Between 2000 and 2012, permits were issued for 5,208 new residential units. About 11.3 percent of these were issued in the last 3 years.

**Permits Issued per 1,000 Residents for City of Anaheim:** 2000 - 2012

Sources: Construction Industry Research Board, 2000 - 2012; SCAG

- In 2000, the City of Anaheim had 1 permit per 1,000 residents compared to the overall county figure of 4.5 permits per 1,000 residents.

- For the city in 2012, this figure remained at 1 permit per 1,000 residents and for the county overall decreased to 3.3 permits per 1,000 residents.
Single-Family Housing Production
Single-Family Permits Issued: 2000 - 2012

• Between 2000 and 2012, permits were issued for 1,135 new single family homes.

• About 18.7 percent of these were issued in the last 3 years.

Single-Family Permits Issued per 1,000 Residents: 2000 - 2012

• In 2000, the City of Anaheim had 0.3 permits per 1,000 residents compared to the overall county figure of 2.4 permits per 1,000 residents.

• For the city in 2012, this figure increased to 0.4 permits per 1,000 residents and for the county overall decreased to 1.3 permits per 1,000 residents.
Multi-Family Housing Production

Multi-Family Permits Issued: 2000 - 2012

- Between 2000 and 2012, permits were issued for 4,073 new residential units.
- About 33 percent of these were issued in the last 3 years.

Multi-Family Permits Issued per 1,000 Residents: 2000 - 2012

- In 2000, the City of Anaheim had 0.6 permits per 1,000 residents compared to the overall county figure of 2 permits per 1,000 residents.
- For the city in 2012, this figure remained at 0.6 permits per 1,000 residents and for the county overall increased to 2.1 permits per 1,000 residents.
Between 2000 and 2012, median home sales price increased 72 percent going from $215,000 to $370,000.

Median home sales price increased by 5.7 percent between 2010 and 2012.

In 2012, the median home sales price in the city was $370,000, $87,750 lower than that in the county overall.

Note: Median home sales price reflects resales of existing homes and simply provides guidance on the market values of homes sold in the city.

Between 2000 and 2010, annual home sales price change was between -32.9 and 28.6 percent.

Between 2010 and 2012, the change in annual home sales prices was between -5.1 and 11.4 percent.
### Housing Units by Housing Type: 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Percent of Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Detached</td>
<td>44,829</td>
<td>42.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached</td>
<td>8,902</td>
<td>8.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family 2 to 4 units</td>
<td>11,390</td>
<td>10.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family 5 units plus</td>
<td>35,851</td>
<td>33.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>4,685</td>
<td>4.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105,657</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance, E-5, 2012

- The most common housing type is Single Family Detached.
- Approximately 50.9% were single family homes and 44.7% were multi-family homes.

### Age of Housing Stock

- 46 % of the housing stock was built before 1970.
- 54 % of the housing stock was built between 1970 and 2012.
- The age of housing stock data reflects the local development history.

Source: Neilsen, Co., 2012
• The city had a total of 442 foreclosures in 2012.

• Between 2007 and 2012, there were a total of 5,449 foreclosures in the City.
V. Transportation

*Journey to Work for Residents*


- Between 2000 and 2012, the greatest change occurred in the percentage of individuals who traveled to work by carpool, whose share decreased by 4 percentage points.

**Average Travel Time (minutes): 2000, 2010, 2012**

- Between 2000 and 2012, the average travel time to work decreased by approximately 2 minutes.
VI. Employment

Top 10 Places Where Residents Commute to Work: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Number of Commuters</th>
<th>Percent of Total Commuters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anaheim</td>
<td>22,384</td>
<td>15.92 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Los Angeles</td>
<td>10,113</td>
<td>7.19 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Santa Ana</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td>6.87 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Irvine</td>
<td>8,469</td>
<td>6.02 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Orange</td>
<td>6,523</td>
<td>4.64 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fullerton</td>
<td>4,506</td>
<td>3.20 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Garden Grove</td>
<td>3,448</td>
<td>2.45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Long Beach</td>
<td>3,146</td>
<td>2.24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Costa Mesa</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>2.24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Buena Park</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td>1.88 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Destinations</td>
<td>66,589</td>
<td>47.35 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012; LODES Data; Longitudinal-Employer Household Dynamics Program

- This table identifies the top 10 locations where residents from City of Anaheim commute to work.
- 15.9% work in the city where they live, while the remaining commutes to places outside the city.
Major Work Destinations

* Top 10 work destinations in 2010 for City of Anaheim residents. Please refer to the Employment section table for details. (Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2012, LODES Data.)

** Based on the SCAG 2012–2035 RTP/SCS Plan.
In 2012, total jobs in the City of Anaheim numbered 178,942, decreased by 9 percent from its 2007 level.

Total jobs included wage and salary jobs and jobs held by business owners and self-employed persons. The total job count does not include unpaid volunteers or family workers, and private household workers.

Manufacturing jobs include those employed in various sectors including food, apparel, metal, petroleum and coal, machinery, computer and electronic product, and transportation equipment.

Between 2007 and 2012, the number of manufacturing jobs in the city decreased by 14.5 percent.
Construction jobs include those engaged in both residential and non-residential construction.

Between 2007 and 2012, construction jobs in the city decreased by 35.2 percent.

Retail Trade jobs include those at various retailers including motor vehicle and parts dealers, furniture, electronics and appliance, building material, food and beverage, clothing, sporting goods, books, and office supplies.

Between 2007 and 2012, the number of retail trade jobs in the city decreased by 8.7 percent.
Jobs in the professional and management sector include those employed in professional and technical services, management of companies, and administration and support.

Between 2007 and 2012, the number of professional and management jobs in the city decreased by 6.6 percent.

Sources: California Employment Development Department, 2007 to 2012; InfoGroup; and SCAG
Between 2007 and 2012, there were minor changes in the share of jobs by sector in the City of Anaheim.

From 2007 and 2012, the share of Leisure sector jobs increased from 13.6% to 16.10% while the share of construction jobs decreased from 10.4% to 7.6%.

In 2012, the Professional-Management sector was the largest job sector, accounting for 18.5 percent of total jobs in the city.

Other large sectors included Education-Health (16.2 percent), Leisure-Hospitality (16.1 percent), and Manufacturing (12.6 percent).
### Top 5 Employers: 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Number of Employees</th>
<th>Percent of Total Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ANAHEIM CITY HALL</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1.11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. HILTON-ANAHEIM</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0.67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ANAHEIM MEMORIAL MEDICAL CTR</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.61 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. DISNEYLAND RESORT</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0.61 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ANGELS BASEBALL</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>0.57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Employers</td>
<td>173,717</td>
<td>96.43 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: InfoGroup, 2012.

- The top employer in City of Anaheim is ANAHEIM CITY HALL with 2,000 employees.
Average Salaries

Average Annual Salary per Job: 2003, 2009, 2011

- Average salaries for jobs located in the city increased from $38,072 in 2003, to $43,849 in 2011, a 15.2 percent change.

Average Annual Salary by Sector: 2011 (in $ thousands)

- In 2011, the sector providing the highest salary per job in the city was Professional-Management ($63,019).
- The Leisure-Hospitality sector provided the lowest annual salary per job ($24,243).
VII. Retail Sales

Real Retail Sales: 2000 - 2010 (in 2010 $ millions)

- Real retail sales (inflation adjusted) in the City of Anaheim increased by 28.3 percent between 2000 and 2005.
- Real retail sales decreased by 25.2 percent between 2005 and 2010.

Real Retail Sales per Person: 2000 - 2010 (in 2010 $ thousands)

- Between 2000 and 2010, real retail sales per person for the city decreased from $8,310 to $7,941.
VIII. Education

K-12 Public School Student Enrollment: 2000 - 2012

- Between 2000 and 2012, total K-12 public school enrollment for schools within the City of Anaheim decreased by 4,623 students, or about 7 percent.

K-6 Public School Student Enrollment: 2000 - 2012

- Between 2000 and 2012, total public elementary school enrollment decreased by 6,079 students or 15.9 percent.
Grades 7-9 Public School Student Enrollment: 2000 - 2012

- Between 2000 and 2012, total public school enrollment for grades 7-9 decreased by 581 students or 4 percent.

Grades 10-12 Public School Student Enrollment: 2000 - 2012

- Between 2000 and 2012, total public school enrollment for grades 10-12 increased by 2,037 students, about 15 percent.
Percent of Population 25 Years and Over Completing High School or Higher

- In 2012, 73.6% of the population 25 years and over completed high school or higher, which is higher than 2000 level.

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Census; Nielsen Co., 2012

Percent of Population 25 Years and Over Completing a Bachelor’s Degree or Higher

- In 2012, 23.4% of the population 25 years and over completed a Bachelor’s degree or higher, which is higher than 2000 level.

Sources: 2000 and 2010 Census; Nielsen Co., 2012
IX. Regional Highlights


- After reaching its peak in 2007, the median sales price for existing homes in the region dropped by almost half in 2011 from its 2007 level and rebounded slightly in 2012.
- Median home sales price was calculated based on total existing home sales in the region.

Regional Real Retail Sales: 2000 - 2010 (in 2010 $ millions)

- Retail sales tend to follow closely with trends in personal income, employment and consumer confidence.
- Between 2000 and 2005, real retail sales increased steadily by 19 percent but then dropped continuously between 2005 and 2009 for a total of $52 billion, or 25 percent.
- In 2010, total real retail sales were still nine percent lower than the 2000 level.
X. Data Sources

California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit
California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division
California State Board of Equalization
Construction Industry Research Board
Info Group
MDA Data Quick
National Center for Education Statistics
Nielsen Company
U.S. Census Bureau
XI. Methodology

Statistical Summary Table

In the Statistical Summary Table (page 3), the values in field “Jurisdiction Relative to County/Region” are the differences between the jurisdiction’s value and the county/region value, except for the following categories which represent the jurisdiction’s value as a share of the county (or in the case of an entire county as a share of the region). These categories include Population, Number of Households, Number of Housing Units, Number of Jobs, Total Jobs Change, and K-12 Student Enrollment.

Median Age, Homeownership Rate, and Median Household Income are based on Nielsen Company data. Number of Housing Units is based on the 2010 Census and estimates from the California Department of Finance. Data for all other categories are referenced throughout the report.

Population Section

Where referenced, data from 2000 to 2012 was taken from the California Department of Finance’s (DOF) E-5 estimates, were recently published in 2012. This dataset was benchmarked to population figures from the 2000 and 2010 Censuses. Data relating to population by age group and by race/ethnicity was derived from the 2000 and 2010 Censuses, and Nielsen Co. The 2000 figure was based on U.S. Census figures for April 1, 2000 and the 2010 figure was based on U.S. Census figures for April 1, 2010.

Below are definitions for race and ethnicity, which are taken from the U.S. Census Bureau. The Hispanic or Latino origin category is:

- A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.

The race categories are:

- American Indian or Alaska Native – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North and South America (including Central America), and who maintains tribal affiliation or community attachment.

- Asian – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.

- Black or African American – A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa, including those who consider themselves to be "Haitian."

- White – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.

- Some other race – This category includes Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands) and all other responses not included in the "American Indian or Alaska Native," "Asian," "Black or African American," and "White" race categories described above.
Charts for population based on age were tabulated using 2000 and 2010 Census data and Nielsen Company data for 2012 and 2018. Charts for race/ethnicity were tabulated using 2000 and 2010 Census data and Nielsen Company data for 2012.

**Households Section**

The 2000 figure was based on U.S. Census figures for April 1, 2000 and the 2010 figure was based on U.S. Census figures for April 1, 2010. Information for 2012 was supplied by the Nielsen Company. Average household size was developed using information from the California Department of Finance (DOF). Households by size were calculated based upon Nielsen Company Data.

**Housing Section**

Housing units by housing type information was developed using data from DOF. Age of housing stock information was made available by the Nielsen Company.

The number of residential units with permits issued was obtained using Construction Industry Research Board data, which are collected by counties from self-reporting by individual jurisdictions. It represents both single family and multifamily housing units that were permitted to be built, but may not actually have been built.

The median home sales price, compiled from MDA Data Quick, was calculated based on total resales of existing homes in the jurisdiction, including single family units and condominiums. The median price does not reflect the entire universe of housing in the jurisdictions, only those that were sold within the calendar year.

**Transportation Section**

The journey to work data for the year 2000 was obtained by using the 2000 Census Summary File 3. Data from 2010 is based on the 2010 Census. Information for 2012 was provided by the Nielsen Company.

**Employment Section**

Data sources for estimating jurisdiction employment and wage information include the 2010 Census – Local Employment Dynamics Survey, and information from the California Employment Development Department, InfoGroup, and SCAG for years 2007-2012.

**Retail Sales Section**

Retail sales data is obtained from the California Board of Equalization, which does not publish individual point-of-sale data. All data is adjusted for inflation.

**Education Section**

Student enrollment data is based on public school campuses that are located within jurisdiction boundary. Data is obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics.
Regional Highlights

Information for this section was developed through data from MDA Data Quick and the California Board of Equalization.

Data Sources Section

In choosing the data sources used for this report, the following factors were considered:
- Availability for all jurisdictions in the SCAG region,
- The most recognized source on the subject,
- Data sources within the public domain, and
- Data available on an annual basis.

The same data sources are used for all Local Profiles (except where noted) to maintain overall reporting consistency. The jurisdictions are not constrained from using other data sources for their planning activities.

The preparation of this report has been financed in part through grants from the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, under the Metropolitan Planning Program, Section 104(f) of Title 23, U.S. Code. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect the official views or policy of the U.S. Department of Transportation. Additional assistance was provided by the California Department of Transportation.
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DATE: March 7, 2013

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

FROM: Huasha Liu, Director, Land Use and Environmental Planning, 213-236-1838, liu@scag.ca.gov

SUBJECT: Sustainability Program Call For Proposals Ranking Criteria

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S APPROVAL: [Signature]

RECOMMENDED ACTION for CEHD, EEC, and TC:
Recommend Regional Council approval of Call for Proposals ranking criteria.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
Staff has developed a consolidated Sustainability Program “call-for-proposals” grant program, as called for in the FY 2013/14 Overall Work Program (OWP). As previously reported to the Policy Committees, the goal of the Sustainability Program is to build on the success of the Compass Blueprint effort to provide additional member services for communities and partners with two new components: Active Transportation and the Green Region Initiative. As such, the new Sustainability Program will contain three components - the two new components in addition to Compass Blueprint. Project selection criteria will be used to evaluate grant proposals and rank them for available funding.

The Active Transportation component will provide funding to plan and facilitate bicycle and pedestrian plans and programs in the region. Compass Blueprint grants will continue to focus on integrated land use and transportation planning. The Green Region Initiative component will provide grants to assist local jurisdictions in funding sustainability plans or studies, such as climate action plans and water, energy, or open space studies. A new consolidated “call-for-proposals” will solicit project proposals for Active Transportation, Compass Blueprint, and the Green Region Initiative proposals. The Sustainability Program “Call for Proposals” criteria are being presented simultaneously to the three Policy Committees due to CEHD’s on-going oversight of Compass Blueprint. EEC’s role will be the development of the Green Region Initiative, and TC’s role will be Active Transportation. The Policy Committees’ recommendations will be presented to the Regional Council on April 4, 2013.

The intent is to grow the Sustainability Program each year. After the release of the “call for proposals” in April 2013, this program will begin in early Fall 2013. Proposed proposals will be evaluated and selected based on the criteria presented in this staff report.

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:
Since 2004, Compass Blueprint has been a successful component of SCAG’s efforts to assist local jurisdictions and implement RTP/SCS policies. To date, 133 Compass Blueprint-funded local planning projects have been completed or are currently in progress. Each of these Demonstration Projects provides an example of integrated transportation and land use planning, tailored to local needs and aligned with regional priorities that other cities and counties can emulate.

At the May 2011 SCAG General Assembly, Executive Director Hasan Ikhrata announced that SCAG would initiate a Green Region Initiative, a key element of SCAG’s ongoing sustainability work, with funding to assist jurisdictions. The Green Region Initiative is part of a package of post-RTP/SCS follow-up activities, including Active Transportation, to assist local jurisdictions and others in implementing strategies identified in the RTP/SCS. The Green Region Initiative will join Active Transportation and Compass Blueprint in providing small grants to member jurisdictions to carry out a full suite of planning activities that help make the SCAG region more sustainable and implement the approved 2012-2035 RTP/SCS.

In coordination with the existing Compass Blueprint effort, a consolidated Sustainability Program “call-for-proposals” has been developed by SCAG staff to help fund innovative approaches to solving regional issues. The “call-for-proposals” will be released in April 2013, with work on approved planning activities to begin in Fiscal Year 2013-2014. Pending review and approval by the Policy Committees and the Regional Council, project proposals will be evaluated and selected based on the criteria below. We anticipate approximately $1 million in total funding will be available as part of this “call for proposals”.

Staff is seeking approval of the ranking criteria for the “call for proposals” and has placed emphasis on the following:

- Rollout of the Sustainability Program, including new Active Transportation and Green Region components, along with the on-going Compass Blueprint component
- Assistance in updating local General Plans consistent with RTP/SCS strategies
- Implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS
- Cross-jurisdictional and multi-party collaborations
- Promoting ‘on-the-ground’ implementation of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS

Proposed 2013 Project Ranking Criteria:

General (for all proposals): [70 points]
- SCAG membership
- Demonstrates reasonable commitment to implement the project
- Implements the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS
- Promotes or encourages sustainability (3 E’s: Economy, Equity and Environment)
- Demonstrates a clear need for the project and requested services
- Involves public and private and/or cross-jurisdictional partnerships
- Demonstrates innovative approaches to regional planning issues that can be replicated elsewhere
- Leverages other public and private funding sources
- Outlines a realistic timeline
For Compass Blueprint Proposals:  [30 points]
- Integrates land use and transportation planning
- Promotes infill, Transit Oriented Development (TOD), and other forms of sustainable development
- Promotes a sustainable land use mix, including new housing

For Green Region Initiative proposals:  [30 points]
- Addresses climate change through GHG emission reduction or adaptation planning
- Promotes energy and/or water efficiency and savings
- Promotes overall sustainability on various resource issues

For Active Transportation proposals:  [30 points]
- Promotes Active (Bicycle and Pedestrian) Transportation Planning
- Promotes physical activity, safety, education and outreach
- Promotes linkages within existing active transportation and transit networks

FISCAL IMPACT:
Funding for the selected proposals resulting from the Sustainability Program’s Call for Proposals is proposed as part of the draft FY2013/14 Overall Work Program (OWP) Budget, which includes $500,000 from a Strategic Growth Council grant awarded to SCAG. Funding of any work for FY2013/14 is contingent upon approval of the OWP Budget and availability of funding. Staff’s work for the current fiscal year is included in FY2012/13 OWP 13-225.SCG01641E.01 and 13-065.SCG00137.01.

ATTACHMENT:
None.