

SB 375 DRAFT FRAMEWORK & GUIDELINES **QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES – PART 1**

On July 21, 2009, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) released for review and comment by stakeholders/interested parties, a working draft document entitled, “Framework and Guidelines by the Southern California Association of Governments for the Development of Subregional SCS/APS.” This draft document is currently posted on SCAG’s website at the following address:

<http://www.scag.ca.gov/pptac/pdfs/agendas/072109/pptac072109-5-1.pdf>

As of September 9th, 2009, SCAG has received approximately 150 comments. The questions and responses received have been grouped under the following categories:

- General
- RHNA
- SCS
- APS
- RTP
- Conformity
- Finance
- Growth Forecast/Data
- Targets
- Legal
- Policy
- Tools
- CEQA
- Public Participation/Outreach

This Part 1 includes questions and responses in the General, RHNA, and SCS categories received by SCAG (submitted electronically or posed during meetings) through July 29, 2009. However, there may be additional questions in these categories received through July 29, 2009 for which responses have not been prepared yet. These responses, as well as responses to questions in the other categories, will be released subsequently.

General

Q1 *Is the RTAC still on its original schedule?*

R1 Yes, the Regional Target Advisory Committee (RTAC) is scheduled to submit a final report with its recommendations to the State Air Resources Board (CARB) by September 30, 2009, as required under SB 375. The RTAC’s role under SB 375 is to recommend to ARB the factors to be considered and methodologies to be used for setting regional greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

(GCCOG 7/21)

Q2 ***In Sec. III(E), p. 3, what do you envision for "on-going communication mechanisms"?***

R2 SCAG anticipates regular communications such as regular conference calls, check-in meetings, and email communication.

(GCCOG 7/22)

Q3 ***In Sec. IV(C)(3), p. 10, instead of "measuring" GHG emission reductions, would "estimating" be a better word?***

R3 Comment noted; an appropriate edit will be made to the Framework and Guidelines in the next draft.

(GCCOG 7/22)

Q4 ***In Sec. IV(C)(12), p. 13, will the assigned staff liaison come from the SCAG planning staff?***

How do we find out who this is?

R4 Each subregion has an assigned liaison from SCAG Government Affairs/Communications. In addition, there is at least one SCAG planning staff member on each team.

A list of staff assignments is attached here for information.

(GCCOG 7/22)

Q5 ***How does a city specify in which subregion they should be included for planning purposes? (if they have membership status in more than 1)***

R5 In consultation with the cities and subregions, SCAG has assigned each city to one subregion for planning purposes. Should a city wish to change its designation for the development of 2012 RTP/SCS, it should indicate this in writing to SCAG by November 30, 2009.

(SGVCOG 7/23)

Q6 ***What is the role of the CTC (county transportation commission) in the subregional/regional process?***

Can cities commit to any land use changes if the CTC is not able to commit to the appropriate infrastructure to support it?

R6 SCAG anticipates active and full participation from the county transportation commissions pertaining to each subregion's effort to develop a regional SCS and/or a subregional SCS. We encourage strong collaborations among the subregional organizations and CTCs, together with local jurisdictions and other

stakeholders. There is a lot of flexibility in terms of how SCAG, subregional organizations, and the CTCs work together. We are currently pursuing direct discussions with each CTC to determine the best working arrangements within each county and subregion. This may include partnership arrangements with the CTC working to coordinate planning activity in their areas. Under any arrangement, the CTC needs to identify the transportation investments that would be included in the SCS. At this stage, the CTCs should consider what flexibility they might have in directing future investments to either incentivize or better serve the land use measures included in the SCS.

(SGVCOG 7/23)

Q7 *Is the deadline for deciding on whether to do a subregional SCS Dec. 1st or Dec. 31st?*

R7 December 31st, 2009.

(WCCOG 7/27)

Q8 *Regarding the July 1st, 2008 starting point, can we only count the transit routes & stops that are operational on that date?*

R8 Yes, for determining “current conditions,” transportation infrastructure must be operational as of the base year. Please note however that while SCAG intends to use a July 1st, 2008 base year for the 2012 RTP, the base year for SB 375 purposes statewide is still subject to discussion by the RTAC, which includes a 2005 base year as part of the draft report. .

(WCCOG 7/27)

Q9 *What is the likelihood that the whole thing will just go away?*

R9 SCAG is committed to successful implementation of the new requirements under current state law.

(GCCOG 7/29)

RHNA

Q1 *Does RHNA need to conform to HCD construction needs and the consistency between SCS land use and RHNA?*

R1 Yes, the housing construction needs determined by HCD must be accommodated within the SCS at the regional level. The consistency requirement under SB 375 between RHNA and SCS is at the jurisdictional level.

(SGVCOG 7/23)

Q2 *The cities just completed a RHNA round, and developed agreed upon numbers and maps. Why aren't those numbers & maps being used in the SCS process?*

R2 This is based on the requirements of SB 375.
(WCCOG 7/27)

SCS

Q1 *Will the process for subregions not accepting SCS delegation be different from these Framework & Guidelines? (Sec. I last paragraph, p. 2)?*

R1 Staff expects and hopes for full participation from subregions whether or not the subregion develops its own SCS. Staff is also developing an overall guidance document which will, among other things, delineate opportunities for subregional participation in the event that a subregion does not prepare its own SCS. What distinguishes the subregional SCS option is the opportunity for a subregion to develop and adopt its own SCS.

(GCCOG 7/21)

Q2 *Could some subregions submit an SCS and others an APS? (Sec. II first paragraph, p. 2)*

R2 Currently the draft Framework & Guidelines calls for developing an SCS as a necessary first step. The process for APS development and submittal is subject to further discussion.

(GCCOG 7/21)

Q3 *Does SCAG have a sense and/or expectation as to how many of the 14 subregions will commit to doing the SCS?*

R3 Subregions have until December 31, 2009 to notify SCAG of their intent to commit to doing an SCS. To date, we have no definitive indication of how many subregions will commit to doing an SCS.

(Caltrans 7/21)

Q4 *List pros & cons - especially the advantages - what can the subregion and/or cities gain by accepting delegation?*

R4 SB 375 allows for this option to afford subregions greater autonomy and responsibility, and with the idea that subregions can be more responsive than SCAG to a range of local issues. Potential cons include additional staffing and risk assessment costs.

(GCCOG 7/29)

Q5 *What's the cost, scope, and technical capability needed to create an SCS?*

What internal resources could we draw on?

R5 Development of a subregional SCS (or a regional SCS) requires that cities and the respective county transportation commission identify land use and transportation strategies. It further requires technical and process elements as described in the SB 375 and the draft Framework & Guidelines. Subregions and local jurisdictions will have technical tools provided by SCAG to assist in these planning and communications functions. SCAG provided a preliminary cost estimate of \$2 million to the California League of Cities, assuming participation of all 14 subregions in preparing subregional SCSs.

SCAG staff is unable to determine specific cost and capacity for any subregion and would defer to subregions on what resources might be applicable.

(GCCOG 7/29)
